



Published in the interests of African solidarity and as a forum for
Marxist-Leninist thought throughout our Continent, by the
SOUTH AFRICAN COMMUNIST PARTY

CONTENTS

NUMBER SIX

JULY, 1961

★ EDITORIAL NOTES	2
★ FASCIST PORTUGAL MUST QUIT AFRICA <i>by P. Dias</i>	11
★ TWO GERMAN STATES AND THE NEW AFRICA <i>by B. Pela</i>	19
★ TOWARDS REAL INDEPENDENCE <i>by Toussaint</i>	32
★ SOCIALISM FOR AFRICA <i>by A Socialist</i>	42
★ WHAT OUR READERS WRITE	50

EDITORIAL NOTES

The Apartheid Republic

SOUTH AFRICA gained its formal political independence in 1910, when the Union of South Africa was formed out of the four British colonies of the Transvaal, Cape of Good Hope, Orange Free State and Natal. The new State was established following a National Convention representing, mainly, the White settlers of the colonies. (Only in the Cape Colony were non-Whites allowed to vote, and they had to choose White delegates to the Convention). Naturally, then, "independence" for the Union meant that power passed not into the hands of the African majority, but into those of the local White imperialists, who have used it ever since to enlarge their own privileges and monopolies of political rights and economic opportunities, and to intensify their colonial-type domination over and exploitation of the non-White masses.

This process was greatly accelerated in 1948, when the Parliamentary elections were won by the ultra-imperialist Nationalist Party, the party of extreme Afrikaner (Boer) chauvinism, admirers of Hitler, the Party of the big farmers, with their slave-owning mentality, and of the racialistic Afrikaner bourgeoisie. Their policy of "apartheid" ("separateness") has proved to be one of undiluted oppression of the masses of the people, and has been specifically condemned as such no less than fourteen times by the United Nations. Increasingly their government has been one based on terror and repression. Organisations such as the Communist Party and the African National Congress have been declared unlawful. Hundreds of peoples' leaders have been banned from gatherings and deprived of all political rights; scores have been exiled to remote parts of the country. Peaceful protests have been answered by machine-gun bullets and armoured cars, as at the infamous Sharpeville massacres of 1960 (repeated at Warmbaths in April, 1961).

The process of Nazification was carried a stage further on May 31, 1961. The Nationalist Party declared the end of the Union and the establishment of the "Republic" of South Africa. The former Governor-General, Swart, was proclaimed State President in the pouring rain at Pretoria, at a time when the country was virtually under martial law. All meetings had been banned (even organisers of sports meetings had to apply for special

permission from the police) and the country had been placed on a war basis by the conscription of Whites to the Active Citizen Force. These measures were taken in an attempt to break the three-day general strike called by the All-African People's Conference (backed by democratic movements of Indian, Coloured and White democrats) in protest against the Apartheid Republic.

Not a single foreign Government sent congratulations to Pretoria — a fitting demonstration of the isolation of the so-called Republic which is as unpopular among democrats abroad as it is hated by nine-tenths of the population of South Africa itself.

THE PEOPLE FIGHT BACK

Verwoerd and his Nationalists tried to give some semblance of popular support to their "Republic" by holding a so-called Referendum on the issue in September, 1960. But only Whites are allowed to vote, and even then a bare majority of less than ten per cent. voted "Yes".

This exclusion of the majority of the people (12 out of 15 million) from the voting was of course not accidental. It was a reaffirmation of Verwoerd's notorious concept that only White people are fit to govern or be consulted about the affairs of South Africa. It was a crude announcement of what sort of "Republic" his Party means to construct — one in which all the privileges of the colonialist minority will be entrenched and fortified, and Africans, Coloured people and Indians treated like dirt.

This insulting and arrogant rebuff to the aspirations of the mass of the people for freedom and democracy has called forth yet another round of militant struggles. The most representative conference of African delegates ever held called upon the Government to call a constituent assembly; and when Verwoerd refused even the courtesy of a reply a national general strike was called for three days on the eve of the proclamation of the Republic.

The Government, as pointed out above, resorted to the most extreme measures to try to break this strike. The fact that despite such unprecedented intimidation tens of thousands of patriots nevertheless responded to the strike call is a remarkable illustration of the courage and solidarity of the people. It is true that, in many areas, the response was less than had been expected, although the reports in the imperialist press at home and abroad that the strike was a "failure" were absurdly distorted. In such major industrial centres as Johannesburg, Durban and Port Elizabeth a response of

between sixty and seventy per cent. was reported, and as more and more suppressed reports come out it becomes clearer and clearer that workers, non-White businessmen, students and others gave a massive vote of confidence to the strike leaders, in all parts of South Africa.

Indeed, in a sense, the general strike call demonstrated its success by the very panic which it called forth in the ranks of the ruling classes. With the country in a state of "siege" against its own inhabitants, draconic new laws being rushed through Parliament suspending the powers of the courts, thousands of political arrests, and practically every democratic people's leader in prison or in hiding, the republican "celebration" could not but be a miserable fiasco. For weeks before May 31 the main question of public discussion was not the republic at all, but the just demands of the non-White people, and the central personality in South Africa was not Verwoerd, but the secretary of the All-African Action Council, Mr. Nelson Mandela, prominent leader of the now-outlawed African National Congress.

That in the face of such drastic counter-measures by the authorities—and to these must be added intimidation by employers and the treacherous role of the anti-Nationalist bourgeois press—there was such a widespread response to the strike appeal, is most encouraging to South Africa's freedom fighters and their friends abroad. Yet the fact is that the response would, armed troops and police notwithstanding, have been even greater, but for certain unfortunate internal factors. One of these was the miserable scabbing role of such organisations as the Pan-Africanist Congress and the Trotskyist Coloured group known as the "Anti-CAD". By calling on workers to disregard the strike call, they spread disunity and confusion and played the part of police agents.

The strike leaders themselves were not free of certain mistakes. The repeated eve-of-strike calls for non-violence from the people (when it was obvious that the police, not the people, were as usual preparing for violence) were not only unnecessary, but also, in the circumstances, dampening to militancy; as also the insistence that there should be no picketing or demonstrations. Fortunately, the leaders are honest and courageous men; we have no doubt that they will recognise these lessons and apply them in future campaigns.

WHAT NEXT ?

The May general strike was only the first blow in what is recognised will be a bitter and protracted struggle for the liberation

of South Africa from the tyranny of apartheid and white supremacy. The Maritzburg Conference decided that the African people recognise neither the legitimacy nor the moral validity of the new regime, nor any other form of government that rests on the usurpation of power by a racial minority. The leaders will now call upon the people to embark upon a series of actions of non-collaboration with oppression, details of which have not yet been announced.

One thing is certain : the growing Nazification of the South African state, and the decision of the Government to keep the country in what amounts to a state of permanent mobilisation, will make it more and more difficult for the political movements to demonstrate their opposition and resistance to oppression in traditional and legal ways. With practically every channel of legal opposition stopped by Verwoerd's dictatorship, it is inevitable that patriots and democrats will be compelled to an increasing extent to find new methods of struggle which are "unconstitutional and illegal". Such methods will require courage, resourcefulness and imagination : the liberation movements of South Africa have given ample proof in the past that they possess these qualities in good measure.

INTERNATIONAL SOLIDARITY

The independent States of Africa, and other friends of South African freedom abroad, have in the past on many occasions shown their contempt for apartheid and their solidarity with the people of South Africa. They will be called on to do so even more in the future. The recent Cairo All-African People's Conference (discussed elsewhere in this issue of the *African Communist*) appealed to all African States "and other freedom loving countries of the world" to : —

- sever diplomatic relations with South Africa,
- boycott South African goods,
- close their seaports and airports to South African craft,
- restrict and halt the stream of migratory labour to SA mines and factories,
- urge the trade union movement in Africa "and throughout the world" to refuse to handle cargo to and from South Africa.

Already, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah has announced that Ghana will not recognise the so-called "Republic of South Africa", and the U.A.R. has closed its Consulate in Cape Town. The People's

Republic of China has declared an official State boycott of trade with South Africa. Following on the recent virtual expulsion of the Republic from the Commonwealth, on the insistence of Afro-Asian members, against vigorous opposition by Verwoerd and Macmillan, these actions increase the isolation of the colonialist regime in South Africa, and hasten the day of emancipation for the oppressed people.

HANDS OFF, VERWOERD !

One aspect of the policy of the South African racists has not received sufficient attention — the threat which they represent to their neighbours.

Already they have illegally swallowed up the Mandated Territory of South-West Africa, and subjected its peoples to the indignities and horrors of apartheid. This blatant act of aggression has several times been discussed by the United Nations, without any effective action whatever being taken.

A similar danger exists in regard to the British "High Commission Territories" of Basutoland, Swaziland and Bechuanaland which border on South Africa, the first, indeed, being entirely surrounded by the Republic. The White imperialists of S.A. have never troubled to conceal their appetite to swallow up these small countries. Even now, with the connivance of their "protector", imperialist Britain, South Africa dominates many aspects of the life of three territories, such as their currency, postal services and imports. The excuse in the past has been that after all, all were "Commonwealth" countries. But even that excuse has disappeared.

During the military mobilisation preceding May 31, particularly large and threatening troop concentrations were carried out by the Verwoerd Government at Ficksburg, Ladybrand and elsewhere on the Basutoland border, causing grave disquiet among the Basuto people.

In its fear of offending the Verwoerd regime, the British government is proceeding at a snail's pace in implementing its promises of independence and self-government to the High Commission Territories. In the territories, under the Union Jack, segregation is rife, and in Bechuanaland and Swaziland large areas of land have been alienated to Whites from South Africa. No steps are being taken to provide the three countries with viable economic systems, their own postal and communications services, currency system, airfields, and above all, means of self-defence.

The result is that all three are at present largely economically

dependent on South Africa; lack of internal development means that thousands of their people are forced to seek work under conditions of terrible exploitation in the mines, farms and factories of their rapacious neighbour; and all three countries seem a tempting and defenceless prize for the rabid racialists in Pretoria.

What is the way out of this dangerous situation? Clearly, it is no good looking to imperialist Britain—indeed the first essential for the High Commission Territories is that the demand of the third AAPO conference—“that Britain grant unconditional independence immediately”—should be carried out.

But, in the meantime, it is essential that practical steps be taken at once to establish the practical independence of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland from the *Republic*, that they establish their own communications and financial services and defence forces, and that international opinion be alerted to stand by their people, so that Verwoerd may be told, in no uncertain tones, “HANDS OFF!”

THE CONGO AND THE UNITED NATIONS

More and more, as events in the Congo come into proper focus, they will be seen to be absolutely crucial, not only for the people of that unhappy and strife-torn country themselves, but also for all of Africa. And more than that: resolution of the deadlock arising out of the Congo events has become an absolutely vital question for the future of the United Nations itself, and the cause of world peace.

Let us reconsider the facts.

Patrice Lumumba, lawfully elected Prime Minister of the united Congo Republic appealed to the United Nations for assistance to maintain the integrity and independence of his country, which was threatened by aggressive Belgian imperialism and its paid agents inside the country. The General Assembly duly condemned the Belgian imperialists, told them to quit the country, and *in response to an invitation by Premier Lumumba sent in U.N. Forces to assist him and his recognised lawful Government.*

Then, in the presence of the same U.N. Forces, with their *connivance* and *assistance* Patrice Lumumba is seized and brutally murdered by Belgian agents. Belgium flouts the U.N. resolution—but nothing is done about it. Belgium has been allowed to re-establish herself as a colonial power, exercising under the transparent veil of the so-called “Tshombe Government” a sheer military dictatorship.

So far from punishing the murderers of their host, Lumumba,

the United Nations sits down and collaborates with them, and actually subsidises them. The London *Financial Times* has shown how the U.N. Command has actually contributed two hundred and fifty million Belgian Francs to Mobutu for payment of the rebel soidiers of the Force Publique (a force raised and trained by Belgium for the suppression of the African people). It has placed the resources of the Central Bank at his disposal. As Dr. Nkrumah bluntly put it at the General Assembly of the United Nations in March :

“The United Nations monetary policy in the Congo has in practice been one of supporting not only Mobutu’s rebels, but also of assisting Belgium to re-establish influence in the Congo”.

(Ghana Evening News, March 8, 1961).

According to a Special Correspondent of the “London Times” in Leopoldville, experts from the U.S. dominated International Monetary Fund, headed by United Nations delegate Dr. Victor Umbright, have decided to form a New Bank for the Congo, to “re-organise the financial system”, with liberal U.N. assistance. And who is the head of the new bank to be but one Ndele, one of Mobutu’s lieutenants who were responsible for sending Patrice Lumumba to his death !

How does it come about that the United Nations, called in to assist the Government of the Congo, stands by while its leaders are done to death, connives at the dismemberment of the State, and finances and aids the aggressors, assassins and traitors, while the people of the country suffer from famine and chaos, from unbridled terror at the hands of gangsters in soldiers’ uniforms paid by the U.N. itself ?

There is only one realistic answer. In his speech at the General Assembly, Dr. Nkrumah indignantly denounced, with much shocking detail, the crimes of which the U.N. executive has been guilty in the Congo; its glaring failure to implement the clear directives of the General Assembly; the fact that it has openly acted as the agency of United States, British, Belgian, French, Portuguese and West German colonialists. But what he failed to do, and what he should have done, was to draw the obvious conclusion — that the executive of the United Nations, and in the first place the Secretary-General, Mr. Dag Hammar-skjold, *is not the servant of the General Assembly* but of *the collective imperialist gang headed by the United States*. Instead of doing this, Dr. Nkrumah spoke vaguely of the “cold war” being to blame.

Well, of course there is such a thing as the cold war, and a very bad thing it is too. But it is not an abstraction known as the "cold war" which did Patrice Lumumba to death and is now pillaging the Congo; it is the real live monster of colonialism, the actual agents of the imperialist powers, including Hammarskjold himself. And one serves neither the cause of peace nor of Africa by covering up these glaring facts.

The situation is far too serious for polite diplomacy. We may make excellent proposals at the General Assembly and have them passed "unanimously" — the imperialists voting with their tongues in the cheeks. But what is the good of excellent decisions when their implementation is going to be left to Mr. Hammarskjold and his lieutenants, who are committed to the hilt to maintain colonialism in the Congo and elsewhere in Africa? For the past fourteen years the General Assembly has condemned monstrous apartheid — without the slightest effect. It is now discussing Portugal's acts of genocide in Angola; but who can have confidence of effective decisions being carried out by Hammarskjold after his performance in the Congo?

We are for the United Nations. It can be made into a mighty instrument for peace and human welfare, against colonialism and race domination. But we must not confuse the essence and purpose of UN with its temporary officials. If there is a choice between the future of the organisation and one man, the man must go. We recall very well the events of some years ago when, with the connivance of Hammarskjold's predecessor, Trygve Lie, the United Nations was used as a cloak for American aggression against Korea. Lie went, but the United Nations remained.

This time it is not merely a question of Hammarskjold going. Go he must, but clearly the whole machinery of the United Nations needs overhauling, in the light of the lessons of the past and the realities of the modern world. In this connexion, we are sure that the statesmen of Africa will in time weigh and realise the solid merits of the proposals of N. S. Khrushchov for a three-man secretariat, representing the three main groups of countries: the socialist, the imperialist and the neutralist.

Equally pertinent is the question of removing the headquarters of UN from the United States, where not only are their officials subjected to constant pressure from capitalist interests, but also, as more and more African delegations are learning to their cost, people of African and other non-White descent have to face constant indignities and humiliations that are bred in the climate of U.S. imperialism.

It is a matter of urgency for the UN to begin to right the wrongs and undo the crimes that have been committed in its name in the Congo.

But UN will not be able to deal satisfactorily with the affairs of any nation until it has cleaned its own house and rescued its administration from imperialist domination.

BRAVO, CUBA !

Colonial and formerly colonial peoples all over the world are thrilled with the fearless stand taken by Fidel Castro and the people of Cuba, in the face of the blatant aggression against their country financed and organised by Cuba's mighty neighbour, the United States. The "invasion" failed ignominiously, faced with a united stand by the people of the island.

Why did the people of Cuba rise like one man behind the government, against the Yankee-inspired putsch? The answer must be sought in the tremendous surge forward in the people's freedom and living standard which has been brought about since the Cuban revolution. Imperialist owned monopolies have been restored to the Cuban people; the land has been redivided among the tillers of the soil; new schools for the children have been opened everywhere; with the generous assistance of the socialist countries, Cuba is fast overcoming the economic backwardness of her colonial past and advancing, in a socialist direction, towards a well-balanced, industrial economy. Important, especially for Africans, is that Castro's administration has outlawed racialism, and for the first time in the island's history the many Cubans of African descent enjoy equal rights and human dignity. That is one of the reasons why New York's Harlem population gave the Cuban leader such a genuinely warm welcome when he visited New York last year for the General Assembly session.

The whole world knows by now that the United States government agency which plotted the Cuba invasion was the notorious and sinister Central Intelligence Agency, headed by Alan Dulles — the same organisation which plotted the Hungarian counter-revolution and which was responsible for the infamous U2 spy-plane aggression against the Soviet Union, which wrecked the Summit talks; the same body which, to come closer to Africa, stood behind the conspiracy of the fascist generals in Algeria; **and more and more facts are now coming to light to show that it was this very same C.I.A. gang of international fascist adventurers that plotted the murder of Patrice Lumumba and his comrades in the Congo.**

Fascist Portugal must quit Africa

by P. DIAS

THE war of national liberation launched by the heroic patriots of Angola, and supported by the broad masses of the people, has focussed the attention of the world on the crimes of Fascist Portugal. Under the military-clerical dictatorship of Salazar established by an illegal military *putsch* in 1926, the workers and peasants of Portugal have (with those of Franco Spain) living standards which are the lowest in Europe. Year after year thousands of Portuguese communists, trade unionists and other patriots and democrats have been tortured and murdered in the grim prison camps of the PIDE — the Fascist Secret Police.

In the Portuguese colonies, all the evils of Fascism have been added to the horrors of a colonialism which is among the most hateful Africa has ever experienced. The Africans have been ruthlessly dispossessed of their *land* by the Salazar regime, which exports Portuguese unemployed to Africa as settlers (*colonatos*). In Angola over four-fifths of the coffee growing area has been seized by Whites. In Mozambique all the richest land — over half the total cultivated area — is in the hands of the Portuguese minority, and on the rest of the land the Africans are forbidden to grow food for themselves, are forced to produce cotton and other cash crops and to sell them to the Roman Catholic Church and other White authorities at ridiculous prices, far below their market value.

FORCED LABOUR

A system of *forced labour*, virtually amounting to slavery, has long been openly practiced by the Portuguese colonialists. Henrique Galvao, hero of the famous incident of the captured liner, *Santa Maria*, was formerly himself an administrator in Angola — it was his sickening experiences there which turned him against the Fascist regime. In a report which Salazar sought vainly to suppress, he wrote :

“Only the dead escape forced labour. The present situation is worse than that created by pure slavery”.

Other observers have borne out Galvao's testimony. Prof. C. A. Julien of the Sorbonne wrote in his *Histoire de l'Afrique* :

“Contractual workers (*contrados*) are requisitioned by force, and their fate differs from that of slaves only because its character is intermittent”.

And Basil Davidson, the British author, estimated after examining the files of the Native Affairs Department at the Angolan capital, Luanda, that there were 379,000 *contrados* "or forced workers, who are really slaves".

This slave labour is in general use on European-owned sugar, coffee, sisal and other plantations. It is used in the notorious *Diamang* diamond mining company (a subsidiary of De Beers and Oppenheimer's Anglo-American Company) and also exported to the Union of South Africa to work in the gold and coal mines, and other enterprises. In 1942, the Governor of Mozambique issued an order (circular No. 818/D-7) which said :

"The supply of labour in Africa cannot continue to depend on the whim of the Negro".

Women and children are not exempted from the forced labour slave system. Basil Davidson wrote :

"Since many men are absent on forced labour elsewhere the local chief or headman will frequently call up women and quite small children.

One sees women with babies on their backs and pregnant women, and quite small girls, scraping at roads with primitive hoes and carrying cupfuls of earth in little dark containers on their heads".

(The African Awakening, 1956).

Naturally these slave *contrados* receive starvation wages. According to the 1958 ILO survey, farm workers in Angola received 15s. a month. Wages at Diamang average £53. 15s. a year. Physical violence against *contrados* is habitual. Overseers flog their labourers with whips and the *palmatoria* (a special mallet to beat workers' hands).

Galvao reported a very high death rate among *contrados*. "There are employers", he wrote, "who have a thirty per cent. mortality rate among their workers, but they never had any trouble obtaining new workers".

"CIVILISERS"

The Portuguese colonialisers, like other imperialists, claim that they are carrying out a "civilising mission" in Africa. We shall be in a better position to understand the audacity of this claim if we consider conditions in Portugal itself.

United Nations statistics show that 44 per cent. of Portugal's population is illiterate.

Average monthly earnings of Portuguese workers : £4. 14s. (Official figures for 1958, from the Lisbon *Instituto Nacional de*

Estatistica, cited by Kofi Badu, in *The Ghanaian Times*, 14.3.61).

Portuguese deaths from tuberculosis and infant mortality are the highest in Europe.

“This is the Portugal”, writes Mr. Badu, “which claims a ‘predestined mission’ to ‘civilise’ eleven million Africans in Angola, Mozambique, ‘Portuguese’ Guinea, Sao Thome and Timor”.

The results are what might be expected.

99 per cent. of the population in the Portuguese African colonies is illiterate. Of 1,342,027 African children of school age in Angola, less than 50,000 are in schools — and even then the schools themselves, run by the clergy, are mainly devoted to agricultural “instruction” (i.e., free labour on the latifundia) and indoctrination with religious superstitions.

Health services follow the same pattern. The Galvao report states that medical services for Africans in Angola, Mozambique and ‘Portuguese’ Guinea are “virtually non-existent”. African villages are “filled with invalids”. In Angola there is one hospital for every 280,000 people and one doctor for 20,000, and in Mozambique the figures are even worse. But even these medical services are mainly for the White minority.

The Portuguese try to split the African population by giving privileges to a small minority, on the grounds that they alone are “civilized”. Those, who *by Portuguese standards* could thus claim to be “civilized” — the so-called *assimilados* — amount to 0.3 of the population. What an unwitting self-admission of the effectiveness of the so-called “civilising mission!” — after three centuries of Portuguese rule. (The ancient kingdom of Angola was occupied by the Portuguese in 1671).

CRUEL REPRESSION

Portugal is perhaps the only present-day state which openly uses and justifies torture against political prisoners. Dr. Salazar, the dictator, answered allegations of this vicious practice by saying :

“I wonder whether the life of some children and defenceless people is not more than sufficient to justify half a dozen timely blows at these sinister characters”.

In fact, membership of the Portuguese Communist Party and other opposition organisations is automatically punishable by up to twelve years. In prison, prisoners are savagely beaten. Francisco Miguel Duarte is 52 years old. He has spent twenty years in

political prisons and was again arrested by the PIDE last July. He states :

“I was arrested for the first time on January 10, 1938 . . . I was brutally beaten for a whole night by five agents . . . They used a horsewhip, a two-foot-long wooden club, 2½ inches in diameter and two planks . . . I was kept in solitary confinement for seven months . . . After that I was kept in Tarrafal concentration camp for five and a half years . . .”.

Many political prisoners have died in this terrible Tarrafal camp in the Cape Verde islands.

If this is how they treat Portuguese democrats, it is hardly surprising that the Portuguese fascists subject African freedom-fighters to the most savage repression. The Conference of African patriots from Portuguese colonies, held in London last December, declared in its Communique :

“Since 1957, the Portuguese Gestapo, the PIDE, has increased its systematic and brutal repression of the people. Portugal has taken a series of measures to terrorise the people of Angola : air bases, military exercises with napalm bombs, constant movement of troops with their arms; 20,000 soldiers scattered in various camps in Angola, indiscriminate arrests and *even massacres such as those of the Icolo and Bengo last June*. Several leaders of the MPLA are in jail as well as many leading Africans who have refused to express their loyalty to Portugal. Hundreds of Africans are in jail or in the concentration camps of Bie and Baia dos Tigres. Not a single African has been tried but *many have been murdered*”.

THE ANGOLA WAR OF LIBERATION

The brave people of Angola have never submitted meekly to Portuguese colonial rule. In 1902 (the Bailundu War), from 1913 to 1915 (the Buta “Rebellion”), in 1924 in Porto Amboim and in 1925 in Ambriz, and on other occasions as well, they rose in armed revolt. But these earlier revolts were usually local, ill-organised and without clear aims.

In recent years the fight for freedom has become more widely organised, and has clearly raised the banner of independence. The reply of the Portuguese fascists to every peaceful appeal has been one of unlimited savagery.

On February 5, 1961, 3,000 Africans were brutally massacred in cold blood, at the capital city, Luanda.

No wonder that the patriots of Angola have realised and decided that their only remedy, if they wish to achieve their

aspirations, is to take to arms against the bloodstained murderers of Angolan men, women and children.

Already at London, in December, the assembled liberationist leaders from Portuguese colonies, had considered the experience of the *satyagraha* (passive resistance) movement in *Goa* (India) where patriots were deported to other Portuguese territories, sentenced to up to 28 years imprisonment and 87 either shot dead or tortured to death. Considering these facts the leaders decided :

"This cannot be repeated; it is criminal folly to launch a peaceful struggle under a Fascist colonial regime".

United under the FRAIN (Revolutionary Front for the National Independence of Portuguese Colonies) the organisations of the people of Angola such as the People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola (formed in 1953) and the Movement for the National Independence of Angola, are conducting a determined armed struggle for the freedom and independence of their country.

At first the Fascist authorities tried to play down the importance of the movement, giving out press reports about small, isolated attacks and pretending that they consisted of Ghanaians or Congolese bands. But as the weeks have gone by it has become impossible for the Portuguese authorities to conceal that they are faced with a full-fledged war of national liberation, supported by the broad masses of the people. Their lying propaganda stories about "atrocities" committed by the patriots cannot conceal the truth : the people of Angola are fighting against foreign rule, and they will not rest until Portugal has been forced to quit their country.

In fact, the truth is that atrocities are being committed in Angola. They are being committed day after day by the Portuguese Fascists who are resorting to genocide in order to try and maintain their criminal rule. Reliable reports speak of whole villages being exterminated, young and old, men and women — estimates of those already killed amount to the staggering figure of 70,000 — one correspondent who gives this figure adds : "They will go on killing ten times more if they are not stopped".

WHO IS BACKING PORTUGAL ?

Meanwhile the United Nations, which on November 12 last passed a resolution asking Portugal immediately to supply information on its nine overseas territories, stands by and does nothing, although Salazar flouts the resolution and is conducting a full-scale war against the people of Angola.

Why does UN stand by and watch Portugal committing acts of genocide? To answer this question, we must look deeper, and ask ourselves how it comes about that this small, backward European country, with negligible military forces (the Salazar regime could never trust its population with arms) manages to hold down vast colonial areas in Africa and Asia. The answer is that Portugal does not stand alone. For many years she has been closely bound up with the general system of Western imperialism, which is today dominated by the United States. Portugal herself, economically speaking, is hardly an independent country: all the major economic resources of the country, transport, mines, etc., are owned by British, American and other foreign monopolies. Big British interests are involved not only in the Diamang diamondfields, mentioned above (which are owned by British and South African interests), but also in the Benguela railway, which runs from Lobito in Angola to Katanga. The West German firm of Krupps exploits the valuable iron ore of Katanga, and the United States has heavy investments in the territory.

It is worth remembering that the arms Portugal is using to murder the Angolans (like those which France has been using all the time to murder Algerians) are supplied by the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) — the imperialist aggressive bloc dominated by the United States.

Fascist Portugal was the only country to vote against the UN resolution condemning South Africa. Now the Fascist "Republic" of South Africa is returning the favour. Its Defence Minister Fouché is travelling to Europe for secret military talks — but the part of the secret that has already leaked out is that his mission will include discussions on South African military aid in butchering the people of Angola, and co-operation in retaining colonialism in Mozambique and South-West Africa.

When Liberia asked recently that the Security Council discuss Portuguese repression in Angola, the request was turned down point blank by the chairman, who was at that time the United States representative, Adlai Stevenson.

REPERCUSSIONS IN PORTUGAL

The Angolan war of national emancipation has already had shattering effects in Portugal, Mozambique and other parts of Salazar's crumbling empire. The army leaders, realising that the Portuguese forces are not capable of winning a colonial war, attempted a coup d'état, but it was not backed by the popular

masses, and they failed to arrest Salazar, who, after running into hiding for two days, managed to stage a come-back with a reshuffled cabinet.

Widespread sections of the bourgeoisie both in Portugal and Mozambique are, however confusedly, taking bolder steps in opposition to the Fascist regime. Bourgeois democrats in Mozambique issued a memorandum, denouncing colonialism and racial discrimination, which they admitted was rife in the colony, demanding autonomy . . . but asking for more troops to be sent. Despite this evident confusion, two of the authors of the memorandum were arrested in Beira. This called forth public demonstrations, demanding their release. The Governor refused and flew them to Portugal, where they are still in jail; but the Governor himself has since been recalled to Lisbon and dismissed.

Fierce repressions not only against Africans but against all Europeans suspected of democratic leanings or sympathy with the African masses are taking place both in Angola and Mozambique; the political police, terrified at the impending collapse both of the colonial system and of the Fascist regime in Portugal—which means their own downfall—are more and more openly emerging as the only real power in the State. And the heart and soul of the growing resistance in Portugal and staunch ally of the African patriots in their fight for independence is being increasingly recognised in the form of the revolutionary Portuguese working class, headed by its heroic Communist Party.

ALL AID TO ANGOLA

The sympathy of the people of the whole of Africa goes out to the brave freedom fighters of Angola. Sympathy, however, is not enough. How can Africa, and especially the independent States of our Continent, stand aside with folded arms and watch while our brothers and sisters are being murdered in their tens of thousands by the brutal Portuguese fascists? Already many demands are being made at the United Nations for intervention against Portugal; these demands are becoming more and more urgent every day.

A stern warning, however, must be issued. We do not want to see a repetition of the tragic events of the Congo. We do not want to see Mr. Dag Hammarskjold, under cover of the UN flag, step

in and hand Angola back to Portuguese control, backed by a consortium of United States, British, West German, South African and Belgian capitalists and financiers.

There is only one solution to the troubles in Angola — Portugal must quit, lock stock and barrel, and hand the government of their country, together with the land, natural resources and wealth they have unjustly seized, back to the African inhabitants of Angola itself.

And the same applies to Mozambique and other Portuguese colonies in Africa; and to Goa, Macao and other Portuguese colonies in Asia as well.

THE TALKS ON ALGERIA

“The Algerian Communist Party welcomes the Evian talks (between the National Liberation Front and de Gaulle) but stresses that the talks do not yet mean peace. To achieve peace it is necessary to overcome such obstacles as the economic, strategic and political claims of the French imperialists. De Gaulle wants to confront our people and our Government with an unacceptable choice: neo-colonial bonds and truncated independence or true independence and truncated territory. Despite their defeat the “ultras” continue their terrorist activity in order to create a permanently tense atmosphere. At the moment when a hope of peace appears the Algerian Communist Party points out again that it fights for the complete independence of Algeria. It regards as possible co-operation between Algeria and France in peaceful spheres in mutual interests on conditions of equality and respect for the sovereignty of both nations. The Algerian Communist Party fully supports the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic at the Talks”.

— From a Statement by the Algerian Communist Party,
May 21, 1961.

Two German States and The New Africa

by B. PELA

I. A THREAT TO AFRICA

THE peoples of Africa are once again being threatened by the dangers of German imperialism.

For many decades Africans suffered from brutal colonial suppression by the imperialists of Germany. Since the Second World War, the financial “kings” of West Germany have put aside the weapons of “classical” colonialism — war, annihilation, robbery and floggings — and have put on the mask of neo-colonialism.

WHAT IS NEO-COLONIALISM ?

In their new plans to plunder Africa they have become active in the newly independent states, declaring themselves as the “benefactors” of the African people, who have always favoured liberation for the colonies, and whose one thought now is to help Africa overcome its economic backwardness.

Neo-colonialism of this type was considered by the Third All-African Peoples' Conference, held in Cairo in March 1961, to be “the greatest threat to the African countries that have newly won their independence or those approaching this status”. The Conference exposed such countries “as the United States, Federal Germany, Israel, Britain, Belgium, Holland and South Africa and France” as “the main perpetrators of neo-colonialism”. Dr. Nkrumah has aptly described neo-colonialism as “the handing of independence over to the African people with one hand, only to take it away with the other hand”.⁽¹⁾

The imperialist powers have adopted this policy not because they have changed heart and sworn to abandon their sinful past. They have been compelled to find camouflaged methods of exploitation because of the rapid growth of the world socialist system and the strength of the national liberation movement. Today it is the forces of socialism and liberation which turn the wheels of history and not, as in the past, the forces of imperialism. In pursuing this new policy the imperialists have had to pool their resources and, so to say, allocate the roles in this deceptive drama beforehand.

They know that the African peoples fighting for freedom

1. Address to the 15th Session of the U.N. General Assembly, September 23rd, 1960.

have a particular hatred for British, French, Portuguese and South African imperialism. These powers are therefore shoved into the background, to be used only as examples of the "big bad wolf" of "old-type" colonialism to "frighten" the African people and throw them into the arms of the new "hero", U.S. imperialism. But the colonial aims and methods of the United States are becoming more and more discredited in Africa, and it has turned out that this "hero" is another wolf at the door of African freedom.⁽²⁾ So a new actor has had to be found to play the role of imperialist "hero" in Africa. This role has been assigned to West German imperialism. Thus, the London *Financial Times* commenting on the role of the German monopolies in the Middle East, wrote in August 1958 that West Germany should be regarded as "the particularly important ally" though in the field of trade "it is a dangerous rival".

TWO GERMAN STATES

Of course, the actual relations of the imperialist powers with Africa are not as simple as this. They are many-sided, complex and subject to laws of change. They are influenced by many historical, political and economic factors. Among the most decisive of the new influences at work is the fact that the Federal Republic of Germany (with a population of 48.7 million) is not the only state on German soil.

There are today two German states with differing social systems. The one state, the Federal Republic, is a monopoly capitalist state, a state which represents the interests of the industrial and financial empires of Krupps, I. G. Farben, Siemens and others, the very same banking and industrial chiefs who backed Hitler. The other state is the German Democratic Republic (with a population of 17.3 million) a socialist state, in which imperialism has been ended forever and workers' and peasants' power has been established.

The demarcation line running through the heart of Germany is the boundary between the socialist world and the capitalist world. The difference between capitalism and socialism is clearly seen in the two German states.

The Democratic Republic is realising the aims of the working-class movement, ending exploitation and establishing relations of peace, friendship and mutual assistance with the independent African states. The Federal Republic continues to pursue the

2. The present writer analysed U.S. neo-colonialism in an earlier issue of this journal (No. 3, 1960).

expansionist aims of German imperialism.

II. IMPERIALIST GERMANY AND AFRICA

The plunder of Africa by imperialist Germany falls into three historical periods : the first from the 1880's until the Great World War (1914-18); the second from the end of that war until the Second World War (1939-45); and the third from 1945 until the present day.

BLACK PAGES OF HISTORY

In the first of these periods Germany directly ruled a number of colonies in Africa. This period is a black page in the history of Germany which the neo-colonialists now want to forget.

Like the other colonial powers, Germany seized, stole and swindled her way into Africa. In 1883 the German Lüderitz annexed the Bay of Angra Pequena and "purchased" a large chunk of coast of South-West Africa from a local chief. The following year Chancellor Bismarck declared the Lüderitz settlement to be under the "protection" of the German Empire. By another swindle Togoland was declared a German "protectorate" in 1884, and in the same year Kamerun came under the German flag. In East Africa the German East Africa Co. plundered and robbed the local population. When the Sultan of Zanzibar protested Bismarck dispatched a squadron of warships to the scene. In 1886 British imperialism sealed a pact with Germany, by which the Kilimanjaro region and most of what is now Tanganyika was declared a "German sphere of interest". Another colonial "deal" took place in 1911 when Germany received 107,000 square miles of the "French" Congo (Ruanda-Urundi) in return for agreeing to a French "protectorate" over Morocco.

Even today German politicians like to whitewash this rape of Africa by quoting the words of Hohenlohe, who was the German Chancellor, in 1894 : "The German name would be belittled in the world if the German nation were unwilling to take part in the mission of culture by which the past cruelties of slavery will be abolished and the light of Christianity be carried into the Dark Continent".

The "light of Christianity" and "German culture" were carried into Africa with the *kiboko* (a heavy strip of rhinoceros or elephant hide or a plaited rope dipped in tar and then rubbed in sand to give it a rough surface, causing wounds which bring illness and often death) and the rifle. Whole peoples were murdered in a fashion matched only by Hitler's stormtroopers in

Europe. The *Deutsche Koloniale Zeitung* described in 1907 how “unprincipled recruiters of labour have dragged people by force from distant villages to the coast, after setting the villages on fire, like modern slave hunts” for forced labour. In 1880, before the Germans came, there were about 1 million Hereros in South-West Africa. By 1918 there were a mere 200,000 left. Leutwein, German Governor of South-West Africa described the destruction of one of the Hottentot tribes : “The rising of Khauas Hottentots in 1896 ended by bringing the whole tribe to Windhoek, the two leaders were shot by court-martial and the whole tribe was practically annihilated and deprived of 12,000 head of cattle . . . The tribe as such has disappeared. As for the Hereros most of their land, or the best of it, was parcelled out among German colonists and land companies”. “It is only just” said Leutwein “and conforms to the aims of colonisation in this territory that all lands should pass from natives to whites”.⁽³⁾ The Hereros heroically rose against this robbery and were slaughtered. A German Pastor estimated that seventy-five thousand Hereros died in battles, 14,000 were driven to die in the Kalahari desert and thousands more in the concentration camps and in forced labour on the railways. The *Cape Argus* of September 28th, 1905, bears a report of the forced labour of Herero women and children under the Germans : “They are sjambokked when they fall until they get up . . . Their funerals take place daily, averaging from nine to a dozen a day, with many children and babies among them”.

This horrible story can be told of every people whom German imperialism conquered.

In Togoland the population was 2½ millions in 1894; by 1911 German rule had reduced it to less than one million. In Kamerun Akwa chiefs vainly complained to Berlin in 1905 of barbarities by German colonial troops, including the slaughter of whole villages and the mutilation and flogging of tribesmen. Without right and without compensation the Germans appropriated the lands which they fancied of the Dualas and Akwas. In East Africa the German ruling caste looked upon forced labour and brutality as the only method of rule. In fact General von Liebert exclaimed : “It is impossible in Africa to get on without cruelty”.

German imperialism ended this period of its relations with Africa dripping from head to toe with African blood, with its pockets bulging with the stolen wealth of the African people.

3. Leutwein, *Elf Jahre Gouverneur in Süd-west-Afrika*, p.270.

COLONIALIST HOPES AFTER 1918

Herr Gerstenmaier, President of the Bundestag (Parliament) of the present Federal Republic of Germany, and also President of the German Africa Society which is a subsidiary of the Bonn (Federal) Government, has declared that Germany abandoned her colonialist policy in 1918.

Now it is true that during the First World War the German colonies in Africa were occupied by other colonial powers and after the war these powers divided up the "swag" amongst themselves in the form of League of Nations' mandates (e.g. South Africa got South-West Africa, Britain got Tanganyika, part of Kamerun and Togo, Belgium got Ruanda-Urundi, and France got part of Kamerun and Togo) and so Germany lost her ill-gotten possessions to another band of robbers.

But Herr Gerstenmaier, who served Hitler as a propagandist in Northern and South-Eastern Europe during the Second World War, should know better than to say that because of this Germany "abandoned" her colonial policy after 1918.

In fact, as far back as 1927 Konrad Adenauer, now Chancellor of the Federal Republic and then Chief Burgomaster of Cologne, in answer to the question "Should Germany pursue a colonial policy?" replied :

"The German Reich must certainly strive to obtain colonies . . . We must obtain more space for our people and thus colonies . . . Colonial activity of the German Reich in the form of colonial mandates is, of course, less desirable than the possession of colonies of our own. In my view we should in the first place strive to obtain colonial mandates in order to make at least one step forward, but we should never lose sight of the aim of freely possessing colonies of our own".⁽⁴⁾

This statement indicates the readiness of Adenauer to use any form of colonialism as long as it provides an opportunity for German monopoly capital to exert influence and control in Africa and to possess markets and sources of raw materials.

This policy of demanding colonies for Germany was continued by fascist German imperialism. The Nazi Party demanded "land and territory (colonies) for the nourishment of our people and for settling our superfluous population". Hitler demanded "the return of the former German colonies" as the "easy and natural way" of re-shuffling the colonies in favour of German imperialism. It ought to be remembered, filled with warning for the future, that

4. *Europäische Gespräche* — Hamburger Monatshefte für Auswärtige Politik — No. 12, December 1927, p.611.

there were powerful reactionary forces in South Africa (such as Malan's Nationalists and Pirow) who fully supported these demands of Hitler. The present rulers of South Africa must still find themselves well-disposed to Germany's imperialist claims. It was, after all, Hitler who declared in 1936 that "the white race is destined to rule"!

Hitler wanted to bring the African peoples into a new colonialist domination. But the victory of the Soviet Union in the Second World War, the liberation of the peoples from fascism and the victory of the great Chinese peoples' revolution sparked off the tremendous liberation movement which has resulted in the breakdown of imperialist colonialism in Africa and elsewhere.

REVISED COLONIALISM

In the new period of German imperialism since the Second World War, Adenauer has remained true to the principle he pronounced in 1927 of pursuing a colonial policy.

The West German imperialists are adapting this policy to the new situation in the world, marked by the rise of a mighty socialist camp and the collapse of the colonial system.

The chief instrument of modern German neo-colonialism is economic expansion. Of course, as the need arises the imperialists still resort to plotting, intrigues and military gambles to further their colonial policy.

The capitalist propagandists have spread the myth of the West German "economic miracle"—the recovery of Germany from the ravages of war. They have managed to create an impression in some African states that the West German barons have been able, for the first time in history, to overcome the anarchy of capitalist production. In this way they hope to make capitalism sound attractive to the newly independent peoples who stand before the problem: capitalism or socialism? Of course it is becoming a bit difficult to keep up this myth while huge stocks of coal lie unsold in the Ruhr and other economic troubles are recurring. The purpose of this propaganda is to keep these states on the capitalist road and so deprive them of genuine economic independence, tying them down to the major imperialist countries which continue to use the African countries as sources of cheap raw materials, and passing on capitalist crises to these weaker "partners".

ECONOMIC PENETRATION

What are the main ways in which West German economic penetration and expansion is being achieved in Africa ?

Firstly, Federal Germany exploits the underdeveloped countries through unequal trade relations. West Germany concentrates on the export of machinery and industrial plant, and the African countries are suppliers of raw materials which West Germany needs. For her part West Germany wants to buy these materials as cheaply as possible so as to put her in a better position than her capitalist rivals who also export industrial machinery. Figures show that while the prices charged on the world market for West German machinery have been rising, prices paid for important raw materials which West Germany imports from Africa have shown a marked decline. This has resulted in fabulous profits for the West German monopolies. The monopolies admit that in the period January - April 1958 alone this difference in prices brought them about 650 million marks. Over a longer period this will swell to billions.

Secondly, The Federal Republic is second only to the U.S.A. in granting credits and loans. These total about 20,000 million marks.

West Germany is able to do this because she has accumulated vast gold and foreign exchange reserves through buying cheap and selling dear with the underdeveloped countries, and through the exploitation of the working people in West Germany itself. These credits and loans bring in high rates of interest and increase the strings which tie African states to imperialism. An example of this is seen in the case of the United Arab Republic. West Germany has granted this country a credit of nearly 600 million marks, and according to U.S. reports over 500 representatives of West German monopolies and other big firms have made Cairo the centre of their activities in the Middle East. When it made this credit West Germany put forward certain demands to the U.A.R. Government, in particular, the return of the bulk of German property confiscated in Egypt during the war. In this way West Germany is stepping into the shoes of British imperialism in Egypt.

Thirdly, German imperialism is making use of the European Economic Community (E.E.C.) to penetrate the African possessions of France and Belgium, whose overseas territories have been incorporated into the Community.

The Federal Government has allocated 850 million marks

for the so-called E.E.C. Overseas Development Fund. Further expansion is foreseen by the participation of the West German monopolies in exploiting the important iron ore deposits in Tindouf, Fort Gouraud and Mekambo, the bauxites (the Inga and Kouilou projects) and the oil fields (Hassi-Messaoud). This is why West Germany gives financial and political support through the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation to the French in the colonial war in Algeria and to the nuclear tests in the Sahara. *Die Welt*, commenting on West German financial help to France (some 1,500 million marks) noted that this subsidy would be used "directly or indirectly for the Algerian war".

In supplying "aid" to African countries through the E.E.C. West Germany insists that the countries in question must accept a state of dependence on the Community. At the same time the E.E.C. and West Germany favour the greatest possible dismemberment of African states, such as the separation of Katanga from the Congo. The E.E.C. Commission, headed by Professor Hallstein of West Germany, made it clear (in November 1960) that Katanga is being treated as "an associated oversea area of the E.E.C." and that "investment projects" would be undertaken there.

Fourthly, the West German imperialists have come out against the efforts being made by the liberated African states to industrialise their countries, an essential step towards economic independence.

Particularly Professor Ludwig Erhard, vice-Chancellor and Economics Minister of the Federal Republic, has consistently opposed the construction of high capacity industries which would explore and utilise the resources of the African countries — such valuable sources of profit for Erhard's monopolist colleagues. In August 1960, Erhard sneered at the steelworks in those countries as "national monuments, not fulfilling their economic function" and recommended the young states to concentrate on developing craft industries and agriculture. Such bits of advice were given with the intention of keeping the new national states as suppliers of raw materials to the monopolies, keeping their economies backward and distorted to line the pockets of the West German financiers.

Finally, the giant West German monopolies are penetrating many African countries.

Concerns like Haniel (Gutehoffnungshütte, Ferrostahl), A.F.G., Krupps, Siemens, I. G. Farben and others have rapidly expanded their interests in Africa. Monopolies like the Mannesman

firm have been active in North Africa since the last century. Krupps (one of the major backers of Hitler) is investing capital in Angola and Mozambique at the invitation of the Portuguese colonialists. The West German Deutsche Bank allied itself to the Anglo-American Finance Corporation of South Africa (headed by Oppenheimer) by lending an Anglo-American subsidiary £4½ million to exploit the diamond mines of East Africa.

By the beginning of 1959 the privately-owned (as opposed to State-owned) West German monopolies had invested 148.6 million marks in Africa. This has now grown by several more millions.

The success of these monopolies was stressed by *Time* magazine (February 23rd, 1959) : “The historic Berlin-to-Baghdad ambitions of the Germans got nowhere politically under the whip of the Kaiser or Führer, but before the peaceful push of West Germany’s prosperous economy, they are succeeding surprisingly well. Armed now with sample case and blueprints instead of howitzer and battle plans, West Germany’s businessmen are aggressively pushing ahead with a more realistic version of the old ‘Drive to the East’.”

POLITICAL SIDESHOWS

The result of the economic tentacles of West Germany for the peoples of Africa is the continuation of age-old poverty and misery. It is therefore all the more necessary for the imperialists to put on political and diplomatic sideshows by which they delude the African masses about the true nature of German imperialism, hide its shameful past and paint a beautiful picture of its present designs on the awakened Continent.

One of these political sideshows is the German Africa Society of the Federal Government which held an “African Week” at the end of October 1960, in West Germany.

The President of this Society, Herr Gerstenmaier, spoke to his “dear Africans” and assured them that West Germany’s policy of “partnership” excludes “any discrimination of races”. It is interesting to note, therefore, that this same Gerstenmaier was an arch-racialist in the Hitler period. In 1937 he published a book entitled “Church, People and State” in which he justified Hitler’s racial policies which led to the extermination of millions of Jews, Poles, Czechs, Russians and other peoples. In one passage Gerstenmaier said :

“Any people desiring to preserve their racial peculiarity and and thus biological conditions for their culture must therefore

be anxious to avoid any immigration of racially alien people. The popular state in Germany has begun to fulfil this task . . . by effecting the ethnic and racial separation between people of German origin and racially alien people, in particular the Jews, by virtue of a series of laws. Any racially mixed marriage is prohibited in Germany".⁽⁵⁾

Today Gerstenmaier is still the arrogant representative of the "white master race". In an article published in *Christ und Welt* (Stuttgart, October 20th, 1960) Gerstemaier denied that Africans are capable of developing their culture to a new high level. For this reason he praised the "education aid" to be given to Africa by West Germany, which is in fact a new gesture to enslave the minds of the free peoples of Africa.

During the Second World War Gerstenmaier travelled to Northern and South-Eastern Europe on behalf of Hitler's Foreign Ministry, trying to find out suitable forms of domination for German imperialism in those areas. Today he travels to Africa on behalf of Adenauer's Foreign Ministry to explore the possibilities for West German Big Business.

After a trip to Africa in 1955, Gerstenmaier pointed out that "Africa offers many and wide possibilities for German economy . . .". He loudly praised the colonialist rule of Belgium in the Congo stating that he "was unusually strongly impressed by the planned energy, particularly of the great Congo mining company Union Minière". The German Africa Society has been placed by Gerstenmaier at the service of those who want to dominate Africa.

Besides its own "education aid" programme, the Federal Government is closely co-operating with the Vatican in a plan to recruit and train young Africans. A special Catholic centre, the Katholischer Akademischer Ausländer Dienst, has been opened in Bonn for this purpose. Several dozen African students are being trained in colleges in Munich, Hamburg, Frankfurt and West Berlin. West German Bishops arranged a special three-month training course for 26 students from the Pius XII College of Basutoland. The purpose of these "training" schemes is to make African intellectuals into disciples of reactionary capitalist dogmas.

The occasional protests by Federal Germany against falling dictators, or against racial discrimination, the setting up of "works of relief" out of the fantastic profits of the monopolies, are all part of the armoury of neo-colonialism, the camouflage behind which West Germany is bringing Africa under her economic domination.

5. E. Gerstenmaier, *Kirche, Volk und Staat*, Munich 1937, p.70.

III. SOCIALIST GERMANY AND AFRICA

One of the most blatant examples of interference by the Federal Republic with the independent rights of the new states is to be found in the attitude of the Adenauer Government to any African state which wishes to establish normal relations with the German Democratic Republic (GDR).

The Federal Government pretends that the GDR does not exist. As soon as an African state agrees to exchange trade representatives with the GDR, feathers fly in West Germany. On more than one such occasion, Gerstenmaier has declared, "We do not like this at all", and Adenauer has threatened to break off all relations with states which exercise their sovereign national rights to enter into relations with the GDR. This is the usual petty action of the West German imperialists.

To the African peoples this shows just how worried the imperialists are by the new, socialist Germany. It is a case of "we know our friends by your enemies". In marked contrast to the West German Federal Republic, the GDR always sides with the African peoples in protecting their independence. This is in line with the basic foreign policy of the GDR which aims at peaceful co-existence, the maintenance and safeguarding of peace and the development of international co-operation.

The Chairman of the State Council of the GDR stated on September 26, 1960 :

"The two basically different traditions in the history of Germany became also manifest in the attitude of the two German states towards the anti-colonial liberation movement, towards the national states of Latin America and the new national states of Asia and Africa. Most of these national states have but recently thrown off the yoke of inhuman colonial suppression. They are now waging a hard struggle for the complete liberation from political and economic backwardness, from hunger and want and from all the sad heritage of the rule of imperialism. To support them is a humanistic obligation and the commandment of international solidarity".⁽⁶⁾

This policy is in the tradition of the German working-class and the German humanists who have always despised and opposed colonial suppression and exploitation and always advocated the sacred right of colonial peoples to freedom and human dignity.

In every period of German colonialism there has been another Germany — that of the Communists, Socialists and

6. *Neues Deutschland* (Berlin), September 27th, 1960.

Democrats — who have fought and exposed imperialism.

It was the Germans, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, who founded modern scientific socialism and gave the oppressed peoples of Africa their greatest weapon, the understanding of capitalist exploitation and of the laws of development of society which will enable them to rid themselves of all forms of oppression. It was the Socialist deputies in the Reichstag (Parliament) who exposed the brutality of the German colonial system before 1914. One of these deputies declared in March 1914: "The comparatively tiny white stratum in our colonies sits like a vampire on the neck of the African people, and sucks the blood out of its veins and the marrow from its bones . . . an awful decimation of the Native population runs parallel with the coming to the fore of the so-called capitalist *Kultur*". Between the wars, tens of thousands of German Communists, Socialists and Democrats died for exposing the colonialist aims of Germany. Today it is the GDR, led by the Marxist-Leninist Socialist Unity Party, and the West German Communists, once again forced into difficult underground conditions by the neo-Nazis, who are forging links of iron between the African people and progressive Germany.

The sympathies of the African people for the German people are switching more and more to the GDR.

Proof of this is the growing economic ties between the GDR and the young African states. In the GDR there are no oppressing classes and no imperialists seeking to dominate Africa. The Nazis have been entirely routed in the GDR. The ruling classes are the workers and peasants, whose concern is to raise living standards rapidly and bring about the well-being and happiness of the people through the triumph of socialism. An important aspect of this policy is the unstinting assistance and aid which the GDR is giving to Africa's people. Trade relations are being built on the firm foundation of mutual benefit and assistance.

Another proof of the growing bonds between the GDR and the African people was the warm welcome given by the workers and Governments of Guinea and Ghana to the delegation of the Confederation of Free German Trade Unions headed by Comrade Herbert Warnke in 1960. Warnke said: "We brought a great idea to Africa and found the same idea there, the great idea of fraternity, of friendship, of a fighting alliance between the white and black workers for peace, for social progress, and against imperialism". Regular trade union exchanges between the GDR and Africa are taking place.

The GDR and the German Communists are educating the

youth as well as those Germans who lived through the Hitler period regarding the dangers of the neo-colonialist policies of the imperialists.

IV. NEW BONDS FOR OLD

The *Afrika Post*, a journal published in Pretoria on behalf of West German interests, has admitted what it calls "the collapse of the Bonn line". A reason for this, it says, is that many people have already lost their illusions that Federal Germany is not a colonialist power.

But we should not underestimate the potential dangers of German expansion in Africa. This is part of a world-wide imperialist policy, throttling the liberation struggle, not only on this continent, but in Latin America, Asia, and particularly the Middle East. It must never be forgotten that it is the same old monopolies headed by the self-same people pursuing the self-same policy which are today penetrating the African states. They have for the present, dropped the open barbarities which they employed in their old colonial conquests. But in the guise of "aid" they are achieving the same objects—above all, monopoly profits. These profits are obtained by keeping the African people in starvation, illiterate and backward, substituting one colonial master for another.

There is every reason to expose these intrigues at every opportunity.

There is also every reason to build up the closest bonds with the socialist camp, which holds the imperialist camp in check, and which is beginning to surpass it in all fields. The socialist countries, headed by the Soviet Union, are pulling out the teeth of imperialism, and at the same time giving material support to the peoples of the underdeveloped countries. This is placing the African countries on the road to full independence and towards a better life for her peoples.

Lenin said often that one day the forces of the European workers would be joined to the forces of the colonial peoples and this would finally crush imperialism. That day has arrived, and it is nowhere better shown than in the growing ties between the African peoples and the working class movement of Germany.

Towards Real Independence

The Policies of the All-African Peoples' Conference.

Cairo — March, 1961

by TOUSSAINT

ONE of the most remarkable witnesses to Africa's developing political understanding is the resolution on neo-colonialism adopted by the All-African Peoples' Conference in its meeting in March of this year. Despite some diffuseness of language — which might well be the result of inadequate translating from the original language of the draft — this resolution is the first serious attempt in Africa to define the nature of neo-colonialism, and to come to grips with the menace it presents to the future of liberated Africa. Previous All-African Peoples' Conferences had touched on the issue, but only casually and without the wealth of detail and perception which characterises the 1961 resolution. Experience in the struggle for independence — and especially the recent experiences in the Congo and in the countries of the former French Empire — has made the difference.

The first All-African Peoples' Conference, which met at Accra in December 1958, made no reference to neo-colonialism in its resolutions; nor did its resolutions draw attention to the need, even after formal political independence, for continuing struggle to liquidate imperialist economic domination. The resolutions imply — and this was doubtless the main current of African liberationist thinking at the time — that formal political independence was in fact the same thing as total liberation.

By the time of the Second All-African Peoples' Conference in Tunis in January 1960, experience was already opening up new views on these matters. Neo-colonialism as such was only touched on in a passing reference, which recommended African Governments to “. . . actively set about liquidating the gangs of neo-colonialism”. The very wording of this reference makes it clear that, even at this time, the nature of neo-colonialism was understood not as the main trend of contemporary imperialism, but rather as some sort of sinister scheming by nefarious gangs. But that Conference did perceive more clearly the relation between economic domination and political domination. It declared that

the “tendency” of the Colonial powers was “. . . to substitute economic for political domination and thus rob the newly-won independence of African States of its true content”. It proposed that African states should intensify their efforts to combat foreign economic domination, by such means as :

“The refusal to enter into any undertaking with foreign powers which may . . . prejudice the movement for the liberation and unity of the African continent.

“The promotion of industrialisation, the direction of effort towards agrarian reform and the modernisation of agriculture.

“The encouragement of joint enterprises and inter-African companies in order to achieve the maximum result from the development of the resources of Africa . . .”

THE LEAP FORWARD

The resolutions of the 1961 Conference are more than just an extension of these earlier views. They are, in reality, a tremendous leap forward in understanding and clarity. Neo-colonialism is here, for the first time, recognised and branded as “. . . the greatest threat to African countries that have newly won their independence or those approaching this status”. It is defined concisely as “the survival of the colonial system in spite of formal recognition of political independence”. It manifests itself through “economic and political intervention, intimidation and blackmail in order to prevent African states from directing their political, social and economic policies towards the exploitation of their natural wealth for the benefit of their peoples”. It deprives independence of its real essence by “imposing unequal economic, military and technical conventions, by creating puppet governments following false elections, or by inventing so-called constitutional formulas of multi-national co-existence intended only to hide the racial discrimination favouring settlers”. It operates “through the guided intervention of the United Nations, the balkanisation of newly-independent States or the systematic division of the political or trade union forces, and in desperate cases like in the Congo, . . . by plots, repressive measures by army and police, and murder in cold blood”. Its main perpetrators are “such countries as the United States, Federal Germany, Israel, Britain, Belgium, Holland and South Africa and France”. Thus the preamble to the resolution.

The resolution does not end with generalisation. It has two further sections giving specific details of the character of neo-imperialism based on African experience, and the agencies through which the colonial powers continue to exercise their power. Of the "Manifestations of Neo-Colonialism", some are simply expansions of the summarised views above; others are more pointed, such as :

"Regrouping of states, by an imperial power in federation or communities linked to that imperial power.

"Balkanisation as a deliberate political fragmentation of states by creation of artificial entities, such as, for example, the case of Katanga, Mauritania, Buganda etc.

"Economic infiltration by a foreign power after independence, through capital investments, loans and monetary aids or technical experts or unequal concessions, particularly those extending for long periods.

"Direct monetary dependence, as in those emergent independent states whose finances remain in the hand of and directly controlled by colonial powers.

"Military bases sometimes introduced as scientific research stations or training schools, introduced either before independence or as a condition for independence".

ACTIVE AGENTS

The resolution warns against the following "active agents" of neo-colonialism :

"Colonial embassies and missions serving as nerve centres of espionage and pressure . . .

"So-called foreign and United Nations technical assistance which ill-advises and sabotages national . . . development.

"Military personnel in armed forces and police, as officers or advisers who serve above all the colonial interests . . .

"The representatives from imperialist and colonial countries under the cover of religion, Moral Re-armament, Cultural and Trade Unions and Youth or Philanthropic Organisations.

"The malicious propaganda by radio, press, literature controlled by imperialist and colonialist countries . . .

"Puppet governments . . ."

It is, perhaps, unfortunate that here the resolution was not somewhat more specific. Several of the formulations are of a

“catch-all” nature, which cannot fail to lead to some obscurity of intention, and to blur the lines of differentiation between those organisations and institutions which *do* serve the purposes of colonialism, and their counterparts which do not.

Something of this obscurity is carried over into the preamble of the final section of the resolution, “Means for Fighting Neo-Colonialism”. It declares that the reason for existence of the All-African Peoples’ Conference is to mobilise the masses of Africa in struggle for liberation; and it calls, obscurely, on the peoples’ organisations to “. . . be vigilant to control the correct application of the general outline and to denounce all those who attempt to deviate it from its real objectives”. Somewhat more pointedly, it calls for struggle against “all forms of opportunism which is the mask of imperialist accomplices”, and for the following specific steps against colonialism :

“Invites all independent African states to give aid and assistance to liberate the African countries still under foreign domination.

“Urges all independent African states which still retain foreign military and para-military bases, to liquidate these bases as soon as possible.

“Urges the independent African states to intensify their efforts for the creation of an effective form of co-operation . . . in the economic, social and cultural domains, in order to frustrate neo-colonialism.

“Calls for the immediate launching of the All-African Trade Union Federation . . .”

THE NEW COLONIALISM

Before considering some of the other resolutions of the Conference, it is necessary to consider exactly what is *new* in neo-colonialism. The resolution already referred to states that neo-colonialism is “the survival of the colonial system” under conditions of political independence in the colonies. It follows that in neo-colonialism there is not a new *colonialism*, but new *conditions* for an old colonialism. The new conditions are not conditions of strength, but of weakness of colonialism. Formal political independence is not the chosen condition, but the condition forced upon a resisting and unwilling colonialism in times of its own weakness. Two factors have gone to force this

condition upon colonialism—the upsurge and revolt of the colonial peoples themselves; and also, the shrinkage of the capitalist world in the face of the successful establishment of a socialist sector over one quarter of the world. Neo-colonialism is colonialism in retreat.

Nevertheless, it pursues the aims and purposes of the earlier colonialism, even though its tactics and strategy may be different. It pursues the aim of bending the colonial peoples and their natural resources to the exploitation of foreign capital; it pursues the aim of securing the maximum profit from that exploitation; it pursues the aim of holding back the economic development of the colonial lands, and preventing their natural development towards socialism. That it is forced to pursue these aims under new conditions does not alter the aims themselves.

It is thus in the field of economic development that Africa has to meet and master the real menace of neo-colonialism. It is a formidable task. Colonialism leaves all Africa backward economically, under-developed, poverty stricken, without basic industries and transport, often chained to a single-crop economy and generally without capital resources of its own. It is this very backwardness which makes it possible for African states to fight a bitter and finally victorious battle against foreign imperialism for political independence, only to remain firmly dependent on the same imperialist domination exercised now indirectly through economic control.

In earlier times, there was no alternative to this course of development. Peoples who threw off imperialist political domination remained, willy-nilly, under imperialist economic domination. Not so today. In our times, the possibilities already exist for even the most backward and under-developed states to set out on the road to economic development along non-capitalist paths. The existence of a stable and prosperous socialist sector of the world opens up new possibilities for economic aid and assistance, which is not directed towards maintaining economic subservience but towards the creation of economically developed, industrialised and self-supporting states. Lack of capital resources can be made good not by surrendering the commanding heights to foreign capital, but by state enterprise based on socialist loans. Within the new states themselves, new political consequences flow. Formerly, imperialism found willing accomplices amongst the national

bourgeoisie, while other classes of colonial society were unorganised and quiescent. Today, the vital living core of the national movement everywhere is the organised working class and peasantry, with whom the bourgeoisie has either to wage open battle on behalf of neo-colonialism, or with whom it joins in united-front struggle for real independence.

There thus arises in liberated Africa today a real possibility of development and economic construction along non-capitalist lines, laying the groundwork for the advance to socialism in the future. In the long run, the battle against neo-colonialism is a battle for non-capitalist forms of development. For the menace of neo-colonialism can only be finally destroyed by the development of powerful states which carry the struggle against colonialism into the field of reconstruction along non-capitalist lines.

ON THE ECONOMIC FRONT

That there is a considerable measure of recognition of this fact in Africa today is revealed by the resolutions on economic matters taken by the Cairo Conference. That clear decision on this matter has not yet been reached, and that there are still contending viewpoints on this problem acting together and working together in the African liberation movements, is also revealed. Nevertheless, the balance is shifting. Life and experience in the field of economic construction is already teaching Africa the lessons which it must carry into its struggle against neo-colonialism. Thus, the resolution on "Economic Development" states forthrightly that the "principal objectives" of economic liberation are :

"Nationalisation of the main plantations, banks, transport and insurance companies, industrial enterprises which belong to organisations and imperialist agents . . .

"Diversification of foreign trade; trade with all countries . . . the import of machinery and equipment for industrialisation and not only of consumer goods.

"Effective control of currency . . . and especially of profits, and their reinvestment in the country itself.

"Diversification of production . . . guided towards the creation of a heavy industry . . .

"Agrarian reform to give the land to the farmers who cultivate

it and to limit the area to be owned by each farmer.

“Agricultural co-operation; lead the farmers to mutual help and then to agricultural co-operation.

“*A state sector holding the key positions of economy*”.

The preamble to this resolution draws attention to the fact that, while “some countries have achieved significant strides in the road of liquidating the economic conditions created by colonialism . . . in co-operation with friendly countries”, others have recovered the wealth produced by African toil only to find that “this wealth is taken over by foreigners”. It notes, too, that as African states have liberated themselves from the grip of “the colonialist and neo-colonialist powers, whether they are West European or North American, they have equally developed a fraternal co-operation with Afro-Asian, Latin American and Socialist countries”. The resolution also lays down the conditions in which the economic development programme can be realised, “apart from the achievement of real political independence, the respect of democratic freedom as well as the freedom of trade unions . . .”. These conditions are :

“The mobilisation of all internal resources for the achievement of . . .

Full employment — which means that a permanent job is available to everyone.

A peace and welfare policy — which means granting priority to productive investments to replace the armaments race.

An austerity policy aiming at reducing the State’s expenses and limiting the import of luxuries.

A real plan . . . of concrete tasks to be accomplished in a limited period in the field of production and transport . . .”

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION

An equally remarkable resolution on economic aspects of co-operation between nations follows out the same general line of policy. It declares that the conditions in which economic co-operation between nations is possible are :

“respect of our national sovereignty which does not allow any imported political or military conditions.

“the granting of long-term loans at a low rate of interest payable in the national currency and goods, instead of hard currency.

“the financing of development schemes chosen by us, including

heavy industry schemes, hydro-electric dams, irrigation schemes, mechanical factories etc.”.

“the use of foreign investments in enterprises entirely owned by Africans . . . with no imperialist joint proprietors.

“the carrying out of development schemes with the formation . . . of local organisations for all posts including those of management.

“commerce with those who buy from us and sell us the goods we want . . . while accepting payment in our national currencies or in kind”.

All who have studied the general pattern of aid to former colonial countries will recognise immediately which countries can and do enter into relations with them which meet the above requirements—and which do not. It is precisely the imperialist USA and its NATO partners, former masters of the colonial lands, who fail to respect national sovereignty and attach conditions to their “aid”, whose capitalists seek short-term investments at high interest rates, who seek to dictate the pattern of development schemes, especially along the lines of light industry and processing plants, in order to stifle competition, who seek to establish “joint” companies, with nominal African directors, whose real control resides in New York, Paris, London, Bonn or Brussels, who try to staff African companies with all top posts held by imported Europeans, and who lay down all sorts of conditions regarding payment in dollars or sterling.

And, conversely, it is precisely the Soviet Union, China and other countries of the socialist world which hitherto have been the only ones to meet the demands for normal relations set out in the resolution. The reason is not far to seek. Unlike the imperialists, the socialist countries have no class of capitalists, eager to use the former colonies as fields for the export of capital and the extraction of super-profits. They do not seek to dump surplus consumer goods or obsolete military equipment on African states. They are not out to use grants and hand-outs as bargaining counters to influence the internal policy of African states, or to “buy” them as pawns in the cold war.

On the contrary, the lands of socialism have given innumerable practical proofs of their genuine readiness to extend real brotherly aid to the peoples who, yesterday, were slaves of the colonialists; to enable them rapidly to modernise and industrialise

their economies and raise the living standards of their workers and peasants.

The reason for this diametrically different approach is not far to seek, nor difficult to understand. Imperialism seeks to perpetuate backwardness and dependence in the former colonies — that is its sources of power and profits. Socialism is a non-exploitative system. Its leaders seek to liquidate as rapidly as possible the poverty and backwardness, the heritage of imperialism, first because, true internationalists, they regard the workers and peasants of the world as “their own people”; second, because the speedy liquidation of the consequences of colonialism will sap the strength of aggressive international imperialism; strengthen the forces of peace and progress; thus, fortify the security and safeguard the peoples of the socialist countries themselves.

The resolution calls for co-operation between African states, and outlines steps towards the formation of an African monetary zone and a future common market. It states specifically that it “does not condemn co-operation” with imperialist countries and international bodies but warns against the use of economic co-operation with such circles “. . . to enslave our countries, imposing upon its military treaties and bases and preventing our industrialisation and preventing us from raising the standards of living”. It calls specifically for struggle against the European Common Market scheme, and against imperial preferences, such as those already existing between African countries and the British Commonwealth and the French Community, as well as for

“merciless struggle against the use in Africa of guerilla corps and the so-called ‘voluntary corps for peace’ set up by the American government to reconquer and economically dominate Africa”.

THE WAY FORWARD

This article has concentrated mainly on the economic matters considered by the Conference. But, in the end, the effectiveness of the fine principles so boldly put forward will depend on fundamental political decisions being carried out in practice.

It is clear that such considerations were also present in the minds of delegates. Towards the very end a resolution was passed indicating that the peoples of Africa and their leaders are steadily

moving towards democratic and socialist solutions to the problems before them.

“Conference calls”, it said, “upon the independent countries to orientate themselves firmly towards the democratisation of the political and social structures, which alone can accelerate the achievement of the material and moral conditions of the African people”.

How is this to be accomplished ?

By *redivision* of the national resources, “in the interests of the masses”, said Conference. By proper *planning* of the national economy.

Very true, indeed. But *who* is to carry out this redivision and planning ? Due to their class interests and outlook the African capitalists and those intellectuals associated with them — though they may be persuaded, in the national interest, to accept certain measures of a socialist nature — cannot be expected to take the lead in enthusiastically initiating and implementing such measures. The *lead* must be taken by those classes of the African people which have everything to gain from a clean break with imperialism and the advance to socialism — namely, the workers and peasants.

Africa’s struggle for freedom has entered a new stage. On the whole the perspectives for victory in this stage have been correctly assessed by the Cairo Conference, which marks a great landmark in the history of our Continent. Having proclaimed the correct goals, however, does not in itself ensure victory. That depends on taking the proper organisational and practical steps to achieve those goals.

The most important step in that direction is the building in each African territory of organisations of African workers and peasants, as independent but integral and leading detachments of the national front, organisations which absorb and carry out in practice the principles of the only correct socialist theory — the theory of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism.

SERIES ON MARXIST THEORY

Jalang Kwena’s series of articles on Marxist-Leninist theory will be resumed in our next issue.

Socialism for Africa

by A SOCIALIST

Can Africa pass straight on to socialism? Or must it first go through a capitalist stage?

THESE questions are on the order of the day, now that the greater part of the continent has liberated itself from imperialist domination. Our future lies in our own hands and there is no more important question that we are called on to decide.

In making our choice, we must take note of existing conditions and possibilities, as well as define our aims for the future. We have to build on the present society, which is a product of our traditional culture as well as of imperialist rule. In particular we should bear in mind the following features:

1. Africa is a continent of small peasants.
2. Machine-driven industry is in its infancy, except in South Africa, Rhodesia, the Congo and Kenya.
3. The urban and industrial working class is small in most countries.
4. Where political power has passed from colonial rulers to Africans, the great majority of people have not as yet felt much economic benefit.
5. Adult suffrage, such as exists in most of liberated Africa, will stimulate a powerful demand among the mass of the people for better living standards, education, and health services.
6. This demand cannot be met without a social revolution, which must be based on the peasantry because they form the great bulk of the population.

These are not the classic conditions for a socialist revolution. None of the existing socialist countries had to start with such a poor industrial basis or depend so wholly on a peasantry as Africa will have to do if it chooses the path of socialism. What is there in Marxist theory that will help to guide us?

MARXISM AND THE PEASANTS

Marxism is an historical theory. Marx and Engels held that socialism would develop out of capitalism, as capitalism itself had

developed out of feudalism, because economic conditions were ripe for it, and because a great social class, the industrial proletariat, had grown up which was capable of leading the struggle for a new society.

In this they differed from “utopian” socialists, who thought that socialism could develop out of pre-capitalist societies (feudal and others) without traversing the historical path of more developed nations. This argument took a sharp form in Russia and other East European countries, where the peasants cultivated most of the land and far exceeded the industrial working class in number.

Early Russian revolutionaries, known as the Narodniks (Populists), argued that the peasant commune (resembling in important respects the tribal system of land tenure) could be developed into a socialist society without passing through capitalism.

A controversy grew between the Populists and socialists who argued that only workers, or at least a movement lead by them, could bring about the change to socialism. Marx and Engels were asked to give their opinion about the issue at stake. What they said is of great interest to us in Africa.

Firstly, it should be noted that they rejected unilineal theories of historical development. Similar events in different circumstances led to totally different results. Therefore, they said, different peoples would not necessarily take the same course in moving to socialism.

As to the special problem raised by the Populists, Marx and Engels wrote in a preface to the Russian edition of the *Manifesto* in 1882 :

“The question is now whether the Russian village commune — a form of primitive collective communal property which has indeed already to a large extent been destroyed — can pass immediately into the highest communist form of landed property or whether, on the contrary, it must go through from the beginning the same process of disintegration as that which determined the historical development of the West. The only possible answer to this question today is as follows : If the Russian revolution becomes the signal for

the workers' revolution in the West, so that one supplements the other, then the present form of land ownership in Russia may be the starting-point of a new social development".

In short, they thought that Russia could achieve socialism without first passing through a capitalist stage but only if she were supported by socialist societies elsewhere.

Fifteen years later, Engels came to the conclusion that there was little prospect of saving Russia from 'the necessity of passing through the torments of the capitalistic regime'. The West had failed to achieve a socialist revolution, capitalism was taking root in Russia, and the commune was fading away. He could only hope that the change to socialism in the West would come soon enough to save the commune in some parts of Russia and use it as a starting point for a new kind of society.

The argument between Populists and Marxists continued and the issues raised were so important that Lenin devoted his first major work, *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* (1899), to the effects of capitalist forms of production on the peasantry.

He found that capitalism dominated the economy, that it had destroyed the traditional basis of the peasant society, and that it played a progressive role by raising the productivity of labour and releasing peasants from feudal and semi-feudal restrictions. Russia did therefore pass through a stage of capitalism before changing over to socialism.

But Lenin by no means dismissed the role of the peasants as necessarily negative or conservative in the struggle for socialism. In all his main works, he conducted a sharp theoretical struggle against those so-called "Marxists" who declared that the peasants necessarily constituted a reserve for capitalism, and that, therefore, it was impossible to build socialism in a predominantly peasant country like Russia. On the contrary, as is well known, Lenin and the Russian Communists rallied the peasants and predominantly-peasant oppressed nationalities as firm allies of the working class in the building of the world's first socialist society.

SOCIALISM IN CHINA

Marx and Engels, as we have seen, agreed that a peasant country could advance in one move to socialism, provided it had

the support of a socialist revolution in an industrialised country. That provision has been remarkably confirmed by events in the Soviet Asian Republics, and more strikingly in our times by the revolutions in China, Viet Nam and Korea. When China experienced her socialist revolution, she was predominantly agricultural with a vast peasant population.

Writing in 1932 (*Land and Labour in China*) Tawney estimated that some 70 million farmers and their families were engaged in agriculture. There was no landed aristocracy. Small absentee landlords were numerous in parts, but large landlords were few. Perhaps one-half of the peasants owned their farms.

Handicrafts produced the great bulk of manufactured goods and absorbed about ten million workers, as compared with only one million employed in modern factories, mines and transport. Tawney wrote: 'The Industrial Revolution in China, if half a dozen cities be omitted, has at present hardly more than begun'.

Starting with an essentially agrarian, peasant economy the Chinese have definitely entered on the path of socialism. They have therefore proved that a peasant society can advance directly to socialism. This achievement is of great historical importance. It is bound to make an enormous impact on peasant societies throughout Asia, South America and Africa.

In China, as in Africa, agriculture forms the broad base of the economy. But there is a difference. Landlordism dominated the countryside in pre-revolutionary China. According to Adler (*The Chinese Economy*, 1957) landlords and rich peasants with their dependants constituted 10% of the rural population and owned 70% of the cultivated land.

Inequality in land holdings and its attendant evils — rack-renting, rural indebtedness, taxation and poverty — were both major causes of social unrest and economic backwardness. Chinese Communists had gained vast experience of land reforms in the regions which they controlled since 1928. Within a few months of their establishment on an all-China basis, the People's Government extended the reforms throughout the country. The following extracts from Adler stress the importance of their agrarian policy.

“The land problem was fundamental. Without its solution no regime could achieve stability and no meaningful programme

of economic development and modernisation could be adopted. It was not merely a technical question but one which went to the very roots of Chinese society . . . It is generally agreed that the most important single factor responsible for the Chinese Communists' success was their handling of the land problem. At least since the period when Mao Tse-tung established his leadership, they have given top priority to the cause of the peasants, whose political, economic and military support could not otherwise have been enlisted and mobilised. Once mobilised, this elemental force was irresistible. Land reform was a most powerful engine of social change as well as of economic and technical progress”.

Reform began with a redistribution of the land according to the principle : “Land to the tiller”. In 1950-52, over 115 million acres were transferred to more than 300 million peasant families who had no or little land.

The next stage came with the introduction of producers' co-operatives which practised collective labour but retained private ownership of land, implements and animals. The reasons for this policy were explained in a statement issued by the Communist Party in December, 1953 :

“The development of the productive forces in agriculture . . . is hampered by the existing isolated, scattered, conservative and backward individual small-peasant economy. The growing contradictions between the individual small-peasant economy and socialist industrialisation have come more and more to the fore”.

The movement succeeded beyond expectations. Not only did the number of peasant households in co-operatives reach 110 million by June, 1956, but the majority had socialised their means of production and retained only small garden lots in private ownership.

There followed the unique and spontaneous growth of individual co-operatives into large communes in 1958. A commune generally consists of about 2,000 families but may be much larger. It does away with all private ownership in land, animals and implements, organises all forms of husbandry, and also undertakes the manufacture of industrial goods, such as iron, steel and

textiles. In addition, it provides schools, hospitals, communal feeding and other social services.

In the special conditions of China, with its huge, concentrated population, the People's Communes afford a remarkable example of the constructive application of Marxist-Leninist thought to the solution of practical problems. They have raised productivity, effectively organised millions of unorganised people, and freed the peasant from the endless toil and insecurity that has been his lot through the ages. Yet, they have left him in his familiar setting and retained the vital links with his traditional culture and enriched it by giving him access to the best features of an urban, industrialised society.

AVOIDING THE EVILS OF CAPITALISM

In today's world, where socialism has already become a world system embracing a third of humanity, not only can a peasant society avoid capitalism, but also, by passing directly on to socialism, it can obtain all the benefits of modern science and technology, yet retain the best of its traditional culture.

Is this not precisely what African thinkers have in mind when they aspire to the realisation of an "African Personality?" We want to raise ourselves to the level of the most advanced nations both in spiritual values and material goods, and yet remain truly Africa.

We cannot remain true to ourselves and our traditions if we allow capitalism to take root, and this for a number of reasons.

Firstly, capitalism stimulates economic growth, but only by destroying the basis of the peasant society. To obtain the surplus needed for investment it exploits ruthlessly the mass of the people. The effects of unbridled capitalism in Southern Africa are surely a grim warning to the rest of Africa.

Capitalism can grow only by creating a vast army of landless wage earners and a reserve of unemployed. This it does by forcing peasants off the land, consolidating small holdings into big farms, and compelling the uprooted people to live in slums in large, shapeless industrial towns.

Capitalism divides people into classes: exploiters and exploited, employers and employees, masters and servants, rich

and poor. Class divisions and extreme inequalities of wealth and privilege were unknown to our traditional society. If we allow them to develop—as they must do under capitalism—the African Personality will not take shape.

An agrarian revolution and industrial revolution such as those that took place in Europe and America will not be possible in Africa. The European workers and peasants before the end of the last century did not have the vote and could not easily protect themselves against capitalist exploitation.

Our African people in the countries of self-rule do exercise the vote and will use their political power to prevent themselves from being exploited. If we are going to avoid class conflict and unstable political conditions we must avoid capitalism like the plague. It is worse than all the diseases of Africa, for they can be prevented and cured by means of modern science.

All that has been said about capitalism here can be summarised in another passage from Engels, written in 1893 :

“No doubt the passage from primitive agrarian communism to capitalistic industrialism cannot take place without terrible dislocation of society, without the disappearance of whole classes and their transformation into other classes; and what enormous suffering, and waste of human lives and productive forces that necessarily implies, we have seen — on a smaller scale — in Western Europe”.

To this one further comment must be added. Africa cannot embrace capitalism without enslaving herself to imperialism. South America shows many examples of countries that while politically sovereign are yet shackled to the investors and industrialists of an imperialist state. Cuba, on the other hand, proves that emancipation from Dollar Imperialism can be achieved only by socialisation of the means of production.

WE MUST CHANGE

While rejecting capitalism, we recognise that there is a great and urgent need to modernise our way of life in order to grow to full stature.

Ours is a continent of small peasants. Few of them practise a wholly subsistence economy. Nearly always the peasant family

buys some of the goods it needs, and pays for them with money obtained from the sale of its products or of the labour of its members. But the great majority of families are largely self-sufficient. They consume most of what they produce, market only a small proportion, and buy little on the market.

The vast majority of Africans have very low incomes. National incomes per capita range from £25 a year in Sierra Leone to £65 in Ghana and in East Africa from £16 in Tanganyika to £26 in Kenya.

Not all farmers are poor. About 35% of cocoa farmers in Ghana have incomes that exceed £200 and 6% reach the level of £575. Such relatively high income levels are however uncommon and where obtained they are often accompanied by much landlordism and rural indebtedness, the inevitable companions of farming by capitalistic methods.

In most peasant countries the larger proportion of labour is expended on food crops which are consumed by the producing families directly. Industrial crops such as cocoa, groundnuts, palm oil and sisal are grown mainly for export.

Manufacturing activities are at a low level. Traditional handicrafts are practised usually as part of farming activities. In most countries secondary industries are mainly concerned in the processing of primary products, mainly for export.

Because of low productivity and lack of specialization, most countries have a very small surplus available for investment in machinery and other capital goods. The great bulk of manufactured goods is imported and paid for by exported raw materials and commercial crops. When, as is the position today, the prices of agricultural commodities tend to fall and the prices of manufactured goods rise, the peasant is caught in a "scissors-squeeze" which depresses his whole economy.

To escape from this vicious circle, farmers must be assisted to produce far more than they do now. Their living standards must be raised while at the same time a surplus is created and drawn off for investment in industrial undertakings.

This great task *can* be carried out without disintegrating society, but only under socialism.

What our readers write

SINCE *The African Communist* has published the address of its London agent, letters have been sent to us from readers in many corners of our Continent. Many of these letters are indeed inspiring and moving; they bear out fully what was written in our first issue: "Africa needs Communist thought as dry and thirsty soil needs rain".

"I am very grateful for the copies of *The African Communist*", writes a reader in *Conakry, Guinea*. "The articles in it I found most useful and pertinent . . . With my earnest hope for the success of this important publishing venture".

The same reader makes a most important suggestion. "Has there been any thought given to a French edition of the journal?" he asks. "I am sure it would find a wide and interested audience here in Guinea and in other French-speaking areas of Africa. And it is most surely needed in places such as Senegal and Ivory Coast". We can assure this reader that serious thought indeed has been given to his most valuable idea; the editorial board is now working on plans to put it into practice.

A *Nigerian* reader writes: "I thank you immensely for the copies you have been sending me. Really it is very interesting indeed". And from *South-West Africa* a reader writes: "I am a regular reader of *The African Communist* and am profoundly interested. My interest has not been limited to myself. I have discussed the idea with my fellow men and we have formed a Marxist study group . . . In my country, as you know, Communism has been declared illegal by the South African fascist government, and it is difficult to obtain any objective facts about Communism".

An African peasant in *South Africa* explains that he is unable at present to send his subscription. "As we rely on land here I have been without work ploughing; that is why I look for job now. I am very interested in politics and have been trying hard to preach it. Although it is very dangerous because the government here is

persecuting everybody who takes an interest in politics — so long as he or she is a “Native”. With kind regards . . .”

From *Kenya* a local branch secretary of KANU writes : “I found that this magazine awakens me and tells me what I cannot know for myself. It even reveals most things that happen in East Africa . . . I am indeed interested in Marxism and Lenin’s teachings, but things out here are such that we are not given a chance . . . There is too much of colonialism and imperialism in East Africa, but we are doing all we can to eradicate them”.

Another African reader states “unequivocally” that the articles in *The African Communist* are “an inspiration for us who are still labouring under a White minority rule. I am quite aware of the risks that I undertake. There can be no suppression of ideas. My political philosophy and conviction will never be eradicated. I stand for socialism universally, as the only goal by which mankind could rid itself from exploitation of man by man, social discrimination and racial oppression. As an unemployed person I believe that you will receive with a warm heart my meagre sum of 6s.”. (We do, indeed).

From *Northern Rhodesia* a reader expresses his appreciation of the “noble and just course” pursued by our magazine. “I have read little about Marx and Mao. I need a lot of education in the whole philosophy, so do expedite in sending literature”.

NEWS FROM BAROTSELAND

A reader from *Barotseland* (N. Rhodesia) thanks us “very much for the very informative and educational” copies of our magazine. “The Statement and Appeal from the November, 1960 meeting is more like a textbook than a mere pamphlet to me. The fourth issue of the publication is, like all the others, a treasury of knowledge”.

The same reader sends some most interesting news about the campaign of the Barotse Anti-Secession Movement against the plan of the imperialists to separate Barotseland from the rest of Northern Rhodesia in the event of the Africans in the colony winning self-government.

“Barotseland at present comes under the same Central Government administration just like all the other parts of Northern

Rhodesia although, of course, it has a Resident Commissioner who helps the feudal Paramount Chief, Sir Mwanawina, to rule that Province. The Province is poor, without industries of any kind, no reliable roads and no markets at all. From political and economic considerations, secession would be detrimental to the people of the Province. The people oppose secession, but their dictator, Sir Mwanawina, pays no attention to reason and public opinion. It is feared that some skilful imperialist hand is behind this scheme, so that loss of the rest of Northern Rhodesia would be somewhat counterbalanced by imperialist exploitation of Barotseland”.

We wish to thank all the readers who have written to the *African Communist*; we only regret that lack of space prevents us printing all their letters. But we can assure readers that every letter is carefully considered and treasured by us. It is our aim to spread information and the truth about the Communist movement throughout Africa, through this magazine; we shall do our best to assist readers to improve their knowledge. However, it should not be forgotten that the South African Communist Party, which publishes this magazine, is itself a workers’ organisation, working under conditions of great hardship and illegality created by the fascistic Verwoerd Government. Many of you have, until now, been receiving free copies of this magazine, but we must appeal to all to pay for their copies, so lightening the burden we have to carry, as well as ensuring that you receive the magazine regularly in future.

CAPITALISM OR SOCIALISM ?

“Capitalism or Socialism ? The question becomes more acute with the growing successes of the U.S.S.R. and the growing disintegration of capitalism. In all capitalist countries power is in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Whatever the form of government, it invariably covers the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie”.

— Study Group Forum in the *Evening News*, Accra, March 2, 1961.

MARX ON NATIONAL OPPRESSION

“A people which enslaves another people forges its own chains”.

— Kari Marx.

(From a resolution drafted by Marx on the Irish Question, for the International Workingmen’s Association in 1869).

SELECTED WORKS
OF
MAO TSE-TUNG

Volume IV

(English Edition)

460 pages

Cloth Binding Price 8s. 9d.

22.2 × 15.2 cm.

Paper Binding Price 5s. 9d.

Published by: FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS

Peking, China

Distributed by: GUOZI SHUDIAN

P.O. Box 399, Peking, China

FUNDAMENTALS OF MARXISM-LENINISM

ed. **O. Kuusinen**

An up-to-date textbook of political theory. Its scope is indicated by the headings of its five parts: *Philosophical Foundations; The Materialist Conception of History; Political Economy of Capitalism; Theory and Tactics of the International Communist Movement; Socialism and Communism.*

15s.

Cut here and send coupon

.....

Central Books

37 Grays Inn Road, London, W.C.1

*I enclose £.....:.....s. for.....copies of
Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism.*

NAME

ADDRESS

AC.....

Subscribe to
THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST

(Published by the South African Communist Party)

Make sure of getting copies of THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST (four issues a year) by filling in the form below and sending it together with a British postal order.

Name

Address

.....

.....

I enclose 6 shillings (or 15 shillings by airmail) for one year's subscription beginning from issue.

Please Post to the London Agent

Mr. Ellis Bowles

52 Palmerston Road, East Sheen, London, S.W.14.

Copies of THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST will be sent to any part of Africa for one shilling and six pence (British Postal Order) each, or ten shillings a dozen. The subscription rate is six shillings a year (four issues) or fifteen shillings by airmail. Send British Postal Order to our London agent : —

**Mr. Ellis Bowles,
52 Palmerston Road,
East Sheen,
London, S.W.14.**

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

As our Party is illegal, all correspondence must be sent to our London Agent, whose address appears above.