

# IKWEZI

A JOURNAL OF SOUTH AFRICAN AND SOUTHERN  
AFRICAN POLITICAL ANALYSIS

Number 3

August 1976

VOL. II NO. III

AUGUST 1976



**THIS ISSUE DEDICATED TO  
HEROES OF SOWETO IN  
AZANIA (S.A.) & TO SASO &  
BCP THAT LED THE STRUGGLE**

**ALSO: Is Mozambique our Socialist  
Hope or will Russians hijack it.**

**How Russia started War of  
Intervention in Angola**

**The New Black in Azania.**

**Crisis in Zimbabwe Revolution, etc.**

**25p**



# **SOWETO - NOT JUST ANOTHER SHARPEVILLE - End of Detente?**

The dramatic events of Soweto Township, a sprawling shantytown on the outskirts of Johannesburg, inhabited by about 1½ million Africans housed in hovels and tin-boxes is not new in the history of the oppressed peoples of Azania. The spontaneous mass upsurges, which spread throughout the country, has occurred periodically in the history of the country. It is the frustrated explosion of the leaderless oppressed. But what Soweto highlights is the new mood of defiance and protest that has gripped the people, a state that has been building up over the years and that is in step with the revolutionary developments not only in the new situation in Southern Africa but with what is happening all over the Third World. This is not just another Sharpeville. It is much more in its intensity of defiance and its politics of total rejection of the institutions of the white oppressors. The imperialist mass media, which has attempted to play down the atmosphere of defiance in its interests of detente focussed on the protest against the Afrikaans language by the African schoolchildren. But that particular protest was symbolic. If the symbol of oppression seized upon was the Afrikaans language this is because in recent years the student elements have been in the forefront of the struggle against apartheid. This has centred mainly around the heroic student organisation, SASO, and the BCP (Black Peoples Convention) the organisation that it had spawned for Black people throughout the country'.

## **NEW SPIRIT OF DEFIANCE AMONGST BLACKS**

In its mass protest the upsurge has been more widespread. 150 have been reported killed and over 1000 injured. What the imperialist Press has attempted to hide is the actual massacres that the fascist police have perpetrated against an unarmed people. The large number killed and injured is not the result of reckless riotings in the townships, which is the impression that the mass media has been attempting to give. It is the result of the meaningful protest and defiance of the military might of the South African police and army who were boldly defied by an angry people. Unlike Sharpeville the masses were not marching in peaceful protest. They fought back with whatever they had, stoning policemen and cars, burning down the buildings of white oppression, the buses which are symbols not of the freedom of movement but of their physical enslavement as they are shuttled from the townships to their place of work and back.

The uprising differs from Sharpeville too, in that it occurs in the circumstances of a very different psychological mood among the oppressed Black masses. During Sharpeville the protest element was still limited to notions of multi-racial democracy. But under SASO's leadership the idea of begging for equality with the whites has been seriously challenged. The cry now is: "We are concerned with Black liberation, we are Africans, not Boers." This mood of total rejection of the whites and their racist institutions is a healthy new development in the Azanian situation. It is symbolised also by the fact that SASO and BCP leaders give militant Black Power salutes when they appear in Court. So different indeed from the days of the South African Communist Party, from the days of multi-racialism, when the arrested would deny that they were militants or meant to overthrow the fascist state. Those who wished to take a firmer stand in Court would be dissuaded and discouraged.

The Soweto events show that the Azanian revolution has begun in earnest. Given the new internal situation in the country where the morale of the Blacks are high and that of the whites considerably diminished, there will be no turning back. There is not going to be anything like a post-Sharpeville relapse here. Even if the repressive machine is tightened up the people will be fighting back in all sorts of ways. From amongst the black masses and the youth a new, determined and militant leadership will emerge. This leadership will not be constrained by the non-racial democracy nonsense that characterised the old guard leaderships of the ANC-CP. It will be concerned with the liberation of the Black man in Azania (see our article on the New Black that follows). It will not be sidetracked into discussing racial harmony and such nonsense that the so-called white progressives have been preaching to us for so long, and derailing our revolution by equating our militancy and rejection of whites as racist. (Those handful of Indians and Coloureds are still under the banner of the South African Communist Party should abandon this non-racial democracy nonsense and fall in line with the new Azania).

The leadership question is crucial to Azania. The South African oppressed Blacks have always lacked dynamic and statesmanlike leadership. The ANC always tailed behind the masses, and occasionally reacted to the government's fascist measures rather than moving ahead with the masses.

The current explosion was the result of the student protests that began many years ago in the Bantustan Universities. In the course of student militancy militant Black workers strikes also broke out. The strikes revealed the new found power of the Black proletariat who also began organising into trade unions.



## ANC-CP NO BASE IN THE COUNTRY

One of the more significant result of the upsurges is that it has revealed to the whole world that the ANC-CP has no base in the country. If they had even so much as a skeletal organisation they would have been able to give some lead and guidance. Nowhere did they figure in the mass upsurges. Their little gimmicks to con the international public with silly little explosions at railway stations has been exposed for the farce they are. Perhaps for this reason the ANC-CP abroad have not been too eager to play up the Soweto events. There is no doubt that the young elements from whom the new revolutionary Party and leadership will emerge have nothing in common with ANC-type politics.

The ANC-CP which has no base in the country has always tended to condemn SASO and BCP as racist organisations. In Botswana they even tried to split SASO.

While the balance of forces have swung in favour of the oppressed Black masses, sooner or later the people are going to find more effective methods of struggle. The hamlet like situations of the townships will be no obstacle. Sooner or later the masses are going to master urban guerilla warfare and combine this with struggle in the countryside where the Bantustans themselves might become base areas for the struggle. This is a possibility that must be exploited. Despite the fact that we are totally against the fragmentation of Azania into Bantustans and the imposition of a conservative, collaborationist leadership upon our peoples, we must also realise that the Bantustans are in grave contradiction with the Government and the leaders of the Bantustans are bound sooner or later to move along a more radical road, as some are already doing, just as the tribal Universities became the foci of radical student organisation.

We must not be carried away by hysteria on the question of the Bantustans. We must approach it soberly from the point of view of our revolutionary strategy. Condemn the concept of the Bantustan, totally reject it, but at the same time let us try to use them as bases for our revolutionary ends.

The real battle for South Africa will begin with the total liberation of Zimbabwe and Namibia. By which time South Africa will be standing out as a sore thumb and the international world on the basis of a of a common consensus can concentrate on dismantling the apartheid state. But this will depend on the struggle inside the country. Instead of dancing around over ludicrous campaigns not to buy oranges or peaches we should go for something more meaningful like an Arab oil boycott.

Already imperialism has realised that the old order must come to an end and has reconciled itself to the fact that Black majority rule is desirable and inevitable - that is from the point of view of its own interests. The recent Kissinger visit was meant to underline this. Imperialism realises that it also has to contend with Russian social-imperialism in the area, and given the international climate against South Africa - so clearly shown in the case of Angola - Russian troops can move into Namibia and Zimbabwe with impunity and even the acclaim of the world. This is not something that we support because we believe that a nation must and can liberate itself. But given the situation of superpower contention which has been introduced into the Southern African situation with the physical presence of the Russians in Angola, Western Imperialism realises that it has a great deal to lose and must change its former position about Black liberation.

But the super powers not only compete they also collude. It is in this sense we must understand the present attempts of the Russians to bring Mozambique within its heel and to control the Zimbabwean struggle through the Joint Military Command set up by the four front-line Presidents. (See the article, "Crisis in the Zimbabwean Revolution").

The Russians might be deterred by the possibility of going to war with Imperialism in Southern Africa (see the quote from Peregrine Worthstone of the "Sunday Telegraph" elsewhere) but they at least will want to put themselves in a position where they can bargain with the West and place themselves in a favourable and strong position. This is the local meaning of detente between Western imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism as it applies to Southern Africa. This is why the ANC-CP even though it does not have a base in the country still represents a force in that it is heavily backed by the Soviet Union and is its direct agent in the area.

Internally the Vorster regime is attempting to create a collaborationist middle class. But this will not save them either. Nor will their dreams of controlling Africa upto Central Africa succeed. Black Africa will never accept such a white domination however much it might be prettified.

For South African revolutionaries it is necessary for them to grasp how important it is to carry out a thorough-going revolution in Azania, one that will put a complete end to the class rule of the white racialists, not only in the interests of their own workers and peasants but of the people of the whole of Southern Africa who for a long while will feel throttled by the industrial and military might of the South African state. The South African proletarian revolution will send vibrations throughout the African continent.

**WE MUST SEIZE THE MOMENT, SEIZE THE TIME.**



# THE NEW BLACK IN AZANIA

## Black Definition of Liberation

BY BENNIE KHAOPA

When your SRC President invited me to come here and talk to you, I replied that I did not feel it a great priority of mine to do so, for I belong to a group of people who are seeing increasingly the futility of devoting a major portion of their time to talking and intellectualising about things that prove unhelpful to both sides because we see things differently.

Your President did not agree with me and he argued that there is some value in getting white students at least to be aware of some of the things that make people (black and white) in this country see things differently and he assured me that white students at this University would benefit something from what I have to say.

I finally agreed to come here today and talk to you with the full understanding that I do not believe that what I say here is necessarily going to be useful for the group I am most concerned about, that is, black people.....

Very often the viewpoint of the so-called militant black has been so badly misunderstood that it becomes necessary to explain it for the benefit of those who are interested in understanding it sincerely. I will attempt to do this now, and in doing so I will start first of all by looking at two concepts which have bedevilled this country for many years. These concepts I refer to are integration and separation.

Very often, it is assumed that if a person is not an 'integrationist' in South Africa, he is therefore a 'separatist', and that because an increasing number of black people are rejecting 'integration' as a national goal, they are therefore separatist, i.e. they make the permanent separation of races a national goal. This is nonsense. The black people who have been accused of being separatist are in fact not separatist but *liberationists*.

Central to both separation and integration is the white man. Blacks must either move towards or away from him. But his presence is nearly not so crucial for those who pursue a course of 'liberation'. Ideally they do whatever they conceive they must do as if whites did not exist at all. At the very least the minds of the 'new black' are liberated from the patterns programmed there by a society built on the alleged aesthetic, moral and intellectual superiority of the white man.

Liberationists contend that integration is 'irrelevant' to a people who are powerless. For them the equitable distribution of decision-making power is far more important than physical proximity to white people.

This means complete emancipation of blacks from white oppression by whatever means blacks deem necessary, including, when expedient, integration or separation.

That the new black man is talking about is liberation by any means necessary and this does not depend on the question of whether blacks should integrate or separate.

The fundamental question is not integration or separation but liberation.

We will use the word 'regroupment' to refer to that necessary process of development every oppressed group must travel en route to emancipation.

What people usually call separation in the black community is not separation but regroupment. It is not separation for blacks to come together on matters of common policy.

I would now like to explain why the liberationist gets irritated by the constant accusation that he should either be for separation or integration or otherwise be a fraud.

First the either/or thing is irrelevant and immaterial:

*because it confuses means and ends, strategy and tactics, it makes a fetish out of mere words and offers a pre-determined response for every time and place. What is to be done? - that*

*Depends on what? - on what advances the cause of black liberation.*

The question of the presence or absence of white people is a tactical matter which can only be answered in a concrete situation by reference to the long term and short term interests of blacks.

The tactics will depend on the situation and will flow naturally from the situation if people will only remember that the aim is not to separate or integrate but to *triumph*.

The second reason why I say this either/or proposition is irrelevant is because it is based on false premises. It assumes that blacks are free to choose... This assumption does not do full justice to the complexity and tragedy of the black man's situation..... But the essence of the situation at this moment is that we can neither integrate or separate. We are caught just now in an impossible historical situation, and that fact, which terrifies some, and leads others to despair, gives our struggle a grandeur, a nobility and a certain tragedy which makes it of moment to the world.

The philosophy of liberation..... suggests that we use history as a tool of appraisal and analysis.



It points out that all movements for liberation in the black community, whether integration or separation, have failed, and asks why? What mistakes were made and what can we learn from the mistakes? Another evasion of the situation is to assume that blacks can integrate unilaterally, and from this assumption it is but one step to the pernicious idea that blacks are polarising the country. That is the same old policy of giving a white disease a black name (the Native Problem) and blaming the oppressed for the oppressor's aggression. It is not separatism of blacks but the separatism of whites which threatens the country. The decision is in the hands of the whites. If they want transformation, let them give up their separate neighbourhoods and institutions and organisations and come out in the open. Until then blacks must organise and use their group strength to wrest control of every organisation and institution within reach

.....A man's power depends ultimately on the power of his group. This means that the oppressed individuals must recognise their common interests and create a group. The oppressor creates a situation from which the oppressed can only extricate themselves by a regroupment.

*From this sketch, it is clear that the oppressor and oppressed must clash. Some men try to avoid the exigencies of the situation by preaching universal brotherhood. But it is a mystification to preach universal brotherhood in a situation of oppression.*

*Indeed we shall earn the right to love all men by struggling against some, we shall earn the right to hold hands with all men by refusing to hold hands with all men who stand in the way of all men holding hands with all men.*

*Here, as elsewhere, the devil must be driven out first. It is too soon to love everybody.*

*This brings us to the paradox of integration, to the fact that blacks must sing black and black together before they can sing black and white together, to the fact that black integration must precede black and white integration, to the fact that blacks must unite before they can separate and must separate before they can unite.*

There is nothing ominous or subversive about this principle. It is simply an exigency of the situation.....The either/or proposition does not explicate the dialectics of development in which negation is necessary for a synthesis. The stress on Black nationalism and Black separatism in white media is ideological; its function is to keep blacks unorganised and powerless.

Whites have organised racially oriented

*businesses, unions, churches, newspapers, resorts, country clubs, youth camps, welfare agencies, ethnic studies departments, colleges, universities, unmarried mothers agencies, vacation associations, war veteran groups, professional associations, employment services, theatres, encyclopedias, funeral homes, homes for the aged, agricultural societies, boards, tourist agencies.*

But, whites are always telling blacks that organisation on a national basis is a no-no. It is especially naughty for blacks to form organisations without white members and white officers..... Both integration and separation are responses and largely emotional responses at that to white oppression.

Neither integration nor separatism deals with the question, for both remain on the level defined by whites. Both integrationists and separatists are excessively preoccupied with the question of sitting down beside the white man; the separatist is excessively preoccupied with the question of not sitting down beside the white man. The liberationist says that the presence or absence of the white man is irrelevant. What obsesses him is the liberation of black people, and the white man is free to aid that liberation by contributing information, sweat, money and blood, but he is not free to join that struggle or lead it. Preoccupation with the white man leads to blunders, confusion in the ranks and demoralisation; it obscures the issues. It is possible for example to be free, creative and happy without being in the presence of white people. It is also possible to be free, creative and happy in groups which are not all black. Neither separation nor integration confronts the system in its totality for both share the same root postulates. In one way or another both deplore the fact that white people do not love black people. But love is irrelevant. History is a struggle, not an orgy. Men decide matters of fundamental interest not on the basis of goodwill but on the basis of social necessity - on the basis of what they conceive to be in their interests. Men do not and cannot love each other if their material interests conflict. As long as institutions, particularly economic institutions, make it necessary for one group to hate another in order to maximise its position, then integration is impossible.

It is not necessary to argue the either/or question of whether racism is basically economic or basically ideological. What is certain is that racial problems can only be solved in a climate of economic equality. One side ignores it by calling for 'integration' of the blackman into the economic status quo. But the prerequisite for integration, i.e. transformation, is the integration of the economic order..... The liberationist concedes the power of the integrationist's dream but points out that black power is necessary to accomplish it.

A philosophy of liberation requires a frank appraisal of the institutions and policies of the white communities. A philosophy of liberation also requires an advanced programme of economic democracy. Racial integration means economic integration.....

A philosophy of liberation requires a re-appraisal of the policies and institutions of the Black Community. We must re-evaluate everything we are doing and saying. We must rise now to the level of



conceiving the black interest as the universal interest. Too many people think that blackness means withdrawing and tightening the circle. On the contrary, blackness means expanding, and widening the circle, absorbing and integrating instead of being absorbed and integrated and from that perspective, it is easy to see that a philosophy of liberation requires black people to cast their light not over one thing but over everything. We must rise now to the level of black hegemony, the idea that blacks must establish moral and cultural authority over the whole. A philosophy of liberation requires transformation. It says that everything must be made anew, but we recognise that blackness, as so many people have said is necessary but not sufficient. Being black is not enough. One must be black and ready together.

A philosophy of liberation requires unity. Black unity in turn requires black organisation.

For the New Black this is a preparatory stage. The means are not now available for entering the final road. Our task therefore is to prepare for 10, 15 and 40 years. The only question now is whether black people are made of such stuff as histories are made of, and black people must answer that question in the presence of the world and in the presence of the black living, the black dead and the black unborn.

## **FROM THE HORSE'S MOUTH - WHAT SOUTH AFRICA MEANS TO WESTERN IMPERIALISM AND WHAT THEY WILL DO TO KEEP IT**

**Peregrine Worthstone, of the "Sunday Telegraph", is a well known Marxist. But his Marxism is of a different variety. His Marxism does not serve revolutionary changes in the interests of the exploited. On the contrary it is meant to preserve ruling class interests. Here are extracts from an article by him in the "Sunday Telegraph" on June 20 1976 commenting on the strategic interest of South Africa to the West.**

**"At a moment like this certain truths need to be re-asserted very firmly. South Africa is so important to the Western world, economically and strategically, that violent revolution there is quite as much against western interests as it is against the interests of the indigenous whites.**

**" Ideally the West would like to see a controlled and orderly progression towards multi-racial democracy, but if the choice is between revolutionary change and no change at all, then the West will, and must, come to terms with the latter than risk aiding and abetting the former. It follows from this that neither black Africa nor the Soviet Union should be left in any possible doubt that the United States will not tolerate external support for the cause of black revolution.**

**"On this point - the absolute determination - of the United States to prevent revolutionary change in South Africa - Washington should be as intransigently unequivocal as Moscow is about preventing the West from promoting revolutionary changes in Eastern Europe. Just as the West had to renounce the opportunities of fomenting revolution behind the Iron Curtain, for fear of provoking world war so must the Russians be made to realise that they would run the same order of risk by interfering in South Africa".**

## **When Ho Chi Minh Received the SACP Delegation**

Some few years before his tragic death, the great Ho Chi Minh received a delegation from the South African Communist Party comprising of Joe Slovo, Yusuf Dadoo, the late Michael Harmel, Joe Matthews (now a Bantustan supporting renegade) and one other, an Indian.

Ho, who had himself engaged in a struggle against the chauvinism of the French Communist Party during his days in France whilst a leading member of the Party, inquired of the delegation about the composition of the SACP. Told in the course of the reply about the leading role played by several white communists in the Party, and probably aware himself of their disproportionate representation in the Party leadership, wanted to know why Africans were not more in the leadership of the Party.

Is not the African proletariat capable of throwing up its own leadership, he is reported to have remarked.

Ho must himself have shrewdly have guessed that the composition of the delegation was indicative of the nature and composition of the SACP.

### **A QUOTE FROM HO CHI MINH**

**"It is well known that the black race is the most oppressed and most exploited of the human family".**



# Ho's Fight Against European Chauvinism

In his early years while he was in France doing all sorts of menial jobs the great Ho Chi Minh also participated in the political activities of the French Communist Party. His interest lay mainly in the liberation of his beloved Vietnam groaning under French colonialism, and equally in the oppression of the peoples in the colonies. He himself has stated in his writings that his initial interest in Lenin was aroused because of the manner in which Lenin had explained and understood the colonial question.

**"What I wanted to know most was: which International sided with the peoples of the colonial countries." (The Path which led me to Leninism).**

**"He was the first to denounce resolutely all the prejudices which still persisted in the minds of many European and American revolutionaries. Everyone knows the thesis of the Communist International on the colonial question. (Lenin and the Colonial Peoples).**

He was scathing with the European Communist Parties that did not resolutely support the struggles of the peoples in the colonies, and as his writings show, he persistently challenged them to slough off their chauvinism towards the struggles of the colonial peoples.

**"Thus it is no exaggeration to say that so long as the French and the British Communist Parties do not apply a really active policy with regard to the colonies, their vast programme will remain ineffective, and this, because they go counter to Leninism. Let me explain what I mean. In his speech on Lenin and the National Question Comrade Stalin said that the reformists and the leaders of the Second International dared not put the white and the coloured people on the same footing, that Lenin had rejected that inequality and smashed the obstacle separating the civilised slaves of imperialism from the uncivilised ones."**

**"According to Lenin, the victory of the revolution in Western Europe depends on its close contact with the national-liberation movements against imperialism in the colonies and dependent countries; the national question as Lenin taught us, forms a part of the general problems of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship."**

"Later, Comrade Stalin condemned the counter-revolutionary viewpoint which held that the European proletariat could achieve success without a direct alliance with the liberation movement in the colonies.

"However if we base our theoretical examination on facts, we are entitled to say that our major proletarian parties, except the Russian Party, still hold to the above-mentioned viewpoint because they are doing nothing in the matter.

".....They have crammed the heads of the people of the metropolitan countries with colonialist ideas through speeches, films, newspapers, exhibitions - to mention only the more important means - while dangling before their eyes pictures of the easy, honourable and rich life which is said to await them in the colonies.

**"As for our Communist Parties in Great Britain, Holland and Belgium and other countries whose bourgeoisie have invaded the colonies, what have they done? What have they done in order to educate the proletariat of their countries in the spirit of genuine proletarian internationalism and close contact with the toiling masses in the colonies. What our Parties have done in this domain amounts to almost nothing. As for me, born in a French colony and a member of the French Communist Party, I am sorry to say that our Party has done very little for the colonies."**

Little wonder that Ho Chi Minh understood so well the nature of the SACP.

## LEADING MEMBER OF SACP JOINS BANTUSTANS - AND SOME OTHER RENEGADES

In a recent document attacking the 8 expelled from the African National Congress of South Africa, a slander was made "that this ultra-black faction has made contacts with Bantustan leaders with the aim of going back and working under the Bantustan leaders."

This was untrue because in their statement of reply the 8 took a resolution condemning the Bantustans.

What is interesting is that recently Joe Matthews, a leading member of the ANC and member of the Central Committee of the South African Communist Party, decided to go to his homeland in the Transkei and enjoy independence there. Joe also called for the abandonment of armed struggle and



said that the mistake the ANC had made was to pressurise the white liberals instead of trying to wring concessions from the Afrikaaner Nationalist Party!

In Botswana where "Comrade" Joe was working as an attorney, SASO students demonstrated against him with placards saying "BLack skins, White masks", which undoubtedly can be applied to many members of the defunct Congress Alliance Black members. We however, are still awaiting a condemnation of Joe from both the ANC and the SACP, although we know that the one write the statements of the other.

Even more interesting is that in a recent issue of the "African Communist" there was an article condemning certain members of the PAC who had turned out to be spies and informers. It was an attempt to slander the PAC as a rival organisation.

But we would like to remind the SACP of some of their former members who acted a similar role - and a few of them were in leading positions in the Party too.

Take the case of Pieter Beyleveld who was National Chairman of the Congress of Democrats and National Secretary of the Textile Workers Union. He used to be held up as the Boer who came over to join the Black liberation forces. The whites were always plugging this line, of how you could not condemn all the whites because there were some who were so good.

Beyleveld was picked up at midday and by the evening on the same day he was released. As a result hundreds languish in prison as he sang like a canary. He was the star witness against Bram Fischer. Nothing of course happened to Beyleveld. He has now joined his wife's lucrative secretarial business.

Then the case of Gerald Ludi. He went to Moscow and China. Even though the SACP tried to defend itself by saying that Ludi became a spy after he joined the Party (some Party indeed) he himself said that he was a spy before he joined the Party. He gave hundreds away and wrote a book about it too.

Again the case of Arthur Goldreich. His is the romantic story about the escape from prison - to go to Israel where he joined the Israeli Army to practise baaskap against the Arabs. The Party never condemned him. And there are many questions to ask about his escape too.

Then Rex Visser, who even after it was proven that he was an agent, was kept in the Party.

A. Hoffman was of course the classic. He came straight out of a Zionist organisation, the Habonim, to join the Party. He was in the movement for about four months before he was giving scores away. He sent George Peake, a heroic Azanian freedom fighter, away for three years in Robben Island.

We wonder how many BOSS agents there still are in the top echelons of the Party. The history of people being picked up before they can even start aspect of revolutionary struggle is too consistent for us to be deceived anymore. The list is too long for us to detail here.

# CLASS STRUGGLE IN SWAZILAND

BY SIMON NGWENYA

On September 25, 1975, King Sobuhza II removed his nephew, Prince Makhosini Dlamini, from the office of Prince Minister. Prince Dlamini had previously been one of the King's most powerful supporters in Swaziland. However, increasing pressure, both internal and external, over the year eventually forced King Sobuhza to relieve the Prime Minister and several other Cabinet Ministers of their duties. The pressure came from two major sources; the newly established People's Republic of Mozambique and the increasingly militant workers of Swaziland. In Mozambique, FRELIMO has denounced many of the old ruling order in Swaziland for openly siding with the Portuguese in the anti-colonial struggle. It is absolutely true that many FRELIMO militants who had sought refuge in Swaziland from the Portuguese were turned over by the Swazi government. Therefore, FRELIMO has set certain just conditions in order that the government of Mozambique could establish friendly relations with Swaziland. The removal of government ministers, such as Prince Makhosini Dlamini, and the weakening of relations with South Africa were among the measures that the Swazi government were expected to take. Subsequently, King Sobuhza valued relations with Mozambique to such an extent that he decided to take dramatic action.

The opportunity for such action arose as the image of the Swazi government fell. With the establishment of the dictatorship of the royal family two years ago and with the worsening economic situation the militancy of the workers of Swaziland increased. In the past two years, there have been ten strikes. There have been far more militant action since strikes were banned than before the "state of emergency".

cont. on Page 9



# DEATH OF TAUFIE BARDIEN

## AZANIAN FREEDOM FIGHTER

On March 9 1976 the South African liberation movement suffered a grievous loss; after a brief illness Mogamat Taufie Bardien passed away. He was in his fifties. He was buried the following day after a ceremony that had to be conducted on a playing field because the local mosque was not large enough to accomodate all who wished to attend. An estimated 10,000 people joined the funeral procession; many weeping openly as the body of a man whose name had become synonymous with defiance of South Africa's fascist rulers was borne to its last resting place.

IKWEZI extends profound sympathy to his widow and six surviving children; may they be consoled in the fact that he did not die in vain.

His untimely death at 52 occurred a week after fifteen years of banning orders and the week-end and nightly house-arrest had been lifted.

Taufie, as he was affectionately known by wide sections of the population had for thirty years devoted his life to the cause of freedom from 'baaskap'. He opposed the jackboot of oppressive white minority rule with tenacity and consistency seldom equalled. He will long be remembered as an example of the uncompromising and dedicated revolutionary by all who were privileged to work alongside of him in the many political campaigns he engaged himself in.

Joining the Non-European Unity Movement in 1947 after serving in North Africa in World War II, Taufie soon injected a much needed militancy into the fight for better housing, schools, health facilities in Kensington, the cinderella suburb of Cape Town where he lived for most of his life.

He was founder member of the Cape Taxi Owners Association and fought against taxi apartheid. When taxi apartheid became law he refused to the end to display a Blacks only sign on his taxi. For his implacable stand he rightfully earned the name 'South Africa's most restricted taxi driver'. He was not permitted to take fares to the docks where it was lucrative to ply his occupation, neither was he permitted outside of the magisterial area of Cape Town. Although this restriction reduced him and his family to near penury he scornfully rejected many offers to migrate to a 'better life' as a refeugee ins Britain, maintaining that all revolutionary rhetic in the safety of Trafalgar Square and other places could never be equal to one day suffering and living among the people he sought to help emancipate.

Very much the practical man Taufie resigned from the NEUM during the late fifties and joined the South African Coloured Peoples Congress and was soon elected to is Executive Committee. In 1965 he was party to the resolution to dissolve the SACPC when a majority of the EC voted to break away from the domination exerted by the South African Communist Party.

Much more space than is available in IKWEZI would be required to write more fully about Taufie. However, an insight to the uncompromising nature of the man as a revolutionary is well illustrated by the following incident.

During the state of emergency declared after Sharpeville 1960 Taufie was among those detained in Worcester prison. African detainees were grossly discriminated against there; their meals consisted of mealie pap three times a day and they were forced to sleep on thin rope mats on the concrete floor while their Asian and coloured comrades slept on spring beds and were provided with meals far superior prepared in the prison officers kitchen. In rejecting the privileged position enjoyed by Asian and coloureds Taufie slung his bed out of the communal cell and refused to accept the superior diet while exhorting his cell mates to do the same. The response to his individual act of defiance was met with negative response, and so was the opportunity to make a reality out of theoretical mouthings lost.

**FREEDOM FIGHTERS EVERYWHERE SALUTE YOU TAUFIE; WHEN OUR REVOLUTION IS MADE IT WILL HAVE BEEN MADE BY PEOPLE WITH MINDS AND IDEAS LIKE YOURS.**



In August and September 1975, workers in and around the Swazi capital of Mbabane walked out of work. The workers made not only economic demands, but also demanded the removal of the current regime. In its place, the workers wanted a people's government, headed by an honest man, such as Dr. A.P.Zwane. The Deputy Prime Minister and also the Minister of Labour, Zonke Khumalo, attempted to quiet the workers by calling them before the King-in-Council. In response, the workers took a vote of no-confidence in Khumalo and rejected "his solutions" to their grievances. When called before the King, the workers boldly denounced Khumalo and once again presented their just demands. All the King could do was to bring up technical matters of representation. He also told riddles to attempt to confuse the workers. However, the workers would have no part of King Sobuhza's trickery and walked out of the meeting. Consequently, the King announced the sacking of the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, and other Cabinet Ministers.

For the first time, the people of Swaziland are aggressively challenging authority. It is quite common now to see people chanting anti-government slogans on the streets of Mbabane and Manzini. They are oblivious to the police force and to the possibility of arrest and intimidation. The people of Swaziland are standing up!

The current situation in Swaziland is, indeed, ripe for action. However, the people and their pan-Afrikanist leaders have been forced to the brink of revolt by the long record of the oppression of the country's rulers. Swaziland can be compared to such neo-colonial and neo-fascist countries as Haile Selassie's Ethiopia.

The Organisation of African Unity should never have admitted such a feudal collaborator with South Africa as Swaziland. While white interests are forced to do business freely in Swaziland, the average Swazi has been forced to his knees by exploitation and the denial of political rights. No wonder the people of Swaziland may soon be up in arms!

The most significant quality of the ruling order in Swaziland is the amazing nepotism of the Dlamini royal family. Until the most recent purge, fifteen out of nineteen top ministerial positions were held by Dlamini family relations. These government officials take full advantage of their positions by plundering the wealth of the country. By making deals with big investors such as Lornho, Anglo-American and other big South African concerns, these bandits throw away Swaziland's resources in exchange for a piece of the cake. Swazi officials use their positions to engage in a monopoly of small business and of land speculation. Yet another mark of their corruption can be seen in their immoral and adulterous practices against the women of Swaziland. It is a common story that when male subordinates are sent abroad, Swazi officials take advantage of their wives. However, this immoral behaviour is far from the worst committed by the ruling order. Perhaps the most vile conduct is the continued performance of ritual murder in Swaziland, including the royal family itself as the guilty. Ritual murder has been maintained by the Swazi ruling order for the purpose of terrorising the population into submission. When a member of the royal family can escape punishment for performing ritual murder, not on animals, but on humans, a clear demonstration of the power and invincibility of the ruling order is made. The King's cousin, Mateu Samedze was not only freed without trial, but eight prisoners, jailed for felonious assault, were executed in his place. This case shocked most of Swaziland and served as a warning to the masses.

Another source of power for the ruling order can be found in the ownership of the land. Almost 45% of the land is controlled by white farmers or South African corporations. Their partners in the plundering of Swaziland - the royal family and chiefs loyal to the King - control virtually the remainder of the land. Since over 70% of the population depends on agricultural production, the ruling order has a strong weapon in its monopoly of land. Whenever a Swazi peasant creates trouble, he is subject to the worst possible fate - ostracism and the loss of land to till. This situation has had a tremendous impact upon the political development of Swaziland.

While other groups and parties have existed in Swaziland, the only one to come out for a democratic, Pan-Afrikanist solution to Swaziland's problems, especially the problem of oppression, is the Ngwane National Liberatory Congress (NNLC). The NNLC emerged in 1960, with inspiration drawn from Kwame Nkrumah and other Pan-Afrikanist leaders who were then leading their people against colonialism and neo-colonialism. In 1962, the NNLC, along with members of the Pan-Afrikanist Congress of Azania (PAC) led a very effective general strike. The workers demanded a union, an end to racial discrimination, better wages and working conditions, and political independence. Anglo-American, Havelock, and the High Commission responded by calling in the Gordon's Rifles from Kenya and police from Botswana to suppress the strike. However, the British and the South Africans were greatly shocked by the strike, by the militancy of the Swazis, and by the expertise of the Ghanian-trained NNLC cadres. However, the NNLC has been prevented from leading the people into power. The British, the South Africans, and the royal family united to make certain that the transfer of political power at independence would not threaten their interests.

While the political system of oppression and exploitation has been maintained, a political party the Imbokodvo National Movement (INM) - was formed to sweep the parliamentary elections in favour of the ruling order. In order to ensure "complete success", the head of state - the King - openly endorsed the INM; the people were pressurised and terrorised to support the only "Swazi party"; and NNLC supporters were deported. Of course the King and the INM had "natural" advantages in the



vulnerability of the Swazi peasant and the high rate of illiteracy that contributed to the generally low level of political consciousness.

In April 1973, the King felt threatened by NNLC popularity and militancy, as well as by his own legal system. He took it upon himself to throw away the constitution, declare an end to political activity, and called up his newly South African trained and equipped army. He detained or deported several NNLC leaders, including Chairman Dr. A.P. Zwane. However, the increased repression has bothered neither the NNLC nor the people of Swaziland. Since the declaration there have been ten or more strikes, protesting against the repression of the ruling order and against the rapidly worsening economic situation. The rural areas have been hardest hit, and the peasants are beginning to openly challenge the chief, the induna and the ungijimi. The NNLC has taken full advantage of this situation by organising committees of youth and workers, as well as other underground organisations. The people are prepared for a popular, democratic Pan-Africanist Swaziland. The only obstacle remaining is the widely revered King Sobuhza II.

The crisis over relations with Mozambique has exhibited how bankrupt most of the corrupt lackeys surrounding King Sobuhza really are. The FRELIMO government recognised the fact that the ruling order supported white settler colonialism and deported many fleeing Zimbabwean, Azanian, and Mozambiquan fighters into the hands of the racist authorities. The FRELIMO government also knows of the popular discontent of the people of Swaziland against the ruling order. Therefore, FRELIMO posed just demands which the King could not reject. Promises have been made that the Swazi government will be more progressive. In light of criticism of Swaziland's support of detente, particularly by the Basutoland Congress Party (BCP) headed by Ntsu Mokhehle, the government is reviewing its foreign policy. The King has considered appointing his nephew, Dumisa Dlamini - once a trade unionist and NNLC member - as Prime Minister. Political activity may be permitted to resume openly. A procedure has been set up for transferring Azanian refugees to Mozambique.

These measures and promises have satisfied FRELIMO sufficiently to warrant the establishment of diplomatic relations between Swaziland and the People's Republic of Mozambique. However, the people of Swaziland cannot be satisfied until they and their African brothers are completely liberated from the oppression of the white settler colonialists and their hangers-on.

The number of days for the settler colonialists are almost up in Africa. Especially when the U.S. imperialists show that their defeat in Vietnam has made them reluctant to intervene in Southern Africa. We shall soon witness another Mozambique in South Africa, where massive construction projects and large mansions remain haunted.

The struggles continue. The path is narrow and thorny. But victory is inevitable. It is ours!!!

**LONG LIVE BLACK AFRICA!  
LONG LIVE THE WINDS OF CHANGE!**

## **VIVA AZANIA!**

### **VIVA AZANIA!**

That was the slogan that the youthful leaders of the uprising in South Africa cried out.

**AZANIA** (meaning Black man's land) is a name that the Black oppressed are beginning to accept. It symbolises the need for a new South Africa where the Black man will be free.

**IKWEZI's** Editorial Board has decided that the name, introduced by the PAC (Pan-Africanist Congress) will be used to describe South Africa from henceforth

## **DISPUTE WITHIN ANC OF SOUTH AFRICA**

The South African Communist Party in a document called "Enemy under the Same Colour" replied to the document of the 8 expelled. They likened the 8 to the Savimbis and Holden of Angola and attempted to give the reasons for the expulsions an ideological cover. Strange coming from revisionists who like their Soviet masters have long ago sold out on the proletarian revolution in Azania.

The expelled 8, who call themselves ANC (African Nationalists) are preparing a reply. What is odd is that the South African Communist Party should reply for the ANC of South Africa! In the next issue of **IKWEZI** we will carry both documents with our comment.

**IN OUR FORTHCOMING ISSUE WE WILL CARRY A FULL ANALYSIS OF THE STRUGGLE IN IN ANGOLA. WE WILL LOOK AT THE WAR THAT TOOK PLACE THERE FROM VARIOUS ASPECTS. FOR REASONS OF SPACE (AND LACK OF MONEY) WE HAD TO LEAVE OUT IN THIS ISSUE SEVERAL DOCUMENTS RELATING TO MPLA, FNLA, UNITA THAT WOULD HAVE THROWN MORE LIGHT ON WHAT HAPPENED THERE.**



# CRISIS IN ZIMBABWEAN REVOLUTION

The Zimbabwean struggle, the current focus of the Southern African revolution is facing a deep crisis of political leadership.

The issue is whether the Zimbabweans themselves are going to conduct the armed struggle or whether the political and military leadership is to be imposed upon them by the four front-line Presidents - Kaunda, Nyerere, Machel and Khama. This issue is complicated by a number of forces at work in the Zimbabwean situation.

But this is an extremely important issue because foreign control can only aggravate the problems of the Zimbabwean struggle rather than offer a solution to the question of a unified political leadership, based upon the support of the Zimbabwean masses, cutting across tribal lines, and leading to the successful consummation of the armed struggle. The political sovereignty of the Zimbabwean people to determine their political leadership is a matter of firm political principle, not to be infringed by the most friendly African state however much help they might give to the Zimbabwean struggle.

In the long run it also involves the question as to whether this control retards or accelerates the Zimbabwean revolution in the most radical direction.

The Zimbabwean struggle can best be understood in terms of the various forces at work in the situation and the various interests they represent. These forces are:

- (a) The ANC and the positions of the former ZAPU and ZANU in it
- (b) Western Imperialism and its agent, South Africa, and their policies of detente.
- (c) Detente and the front-line states of Tanzania, Mozambique, Zambia and Botswana and the Joint Military Command they have set up
- (d) Russian social-imperialism

These forces are inter-linked and make up the components of a counter-revolutionary and revolutionary positions.

Central to the whole issue is the question of detente. We will examine them singly.

## FORCES AT WORK IN ZIMBABWEAN SITUATION

(1) *The former ZANU* - ZANU always represented a more militant brand of nationalism in the Zimbabwean struggle. Its militancy resulted in it launching an armed struggle that reached a pretty high level and that forced Smith to open up negotiations. Because ZANU's militant brand of nationalism co-incided with mass feelings it quickly established itself as the majority organisation in the country. ZANU was coerced by the four frontline Presidents to unite with Nkomo and to agree with negotiation talks with Smith. ZANU had to agree because it could not be seen as a disuniting factor to the Zimbabwean masses who were sick and tired of the old ZANU-ZAPU differences.

But ZANU also had its own internal problems, the correct solution to which can either purify ZANU or draw it further into a petit bourgeois morass. The greatest indication of the crisis within ZANU has been the incidents surrounding the Chitepo murder and the 400 cadres in the camps. This has something to do with a certain degeneration within the ZANU leadership. It consequently gave birth to tribalism whose real content was petit bourgeois politics. It was on the basis of the internal conflicts within ZANU and rivalries between the liberation organisations that the front-line Presidents attempted to impose the Joint Military Command upon them.

But the difficulties within ZANU is typical of the conflict in all the Southern African liberation movements between an exiled leadership and the cadres in the battlefield. The guerilla cadres want the exiled leadership to be in their midst instead of jauntings around the world with plenty of pocket money.

Currently of course ZANU as an organisation does not exist. It has merged itself into the ANC, a unity forged by the Four Presidents.

(2) *The former ZAPU* - ZAPU is mainly the mouthpiece of Joshua Nkomo, the arch neo-colonialist element in Zimbabwe. His principal backer is Kaunda who is quite determined to see him as the leader of the new Zimbabwe. This is based on an old friendship between the two. It was Kaunda and Vorster who began negotiations and who tried to bring the various liberation movements together so that they could speak with one voice at the negotiating table. Within this unity Kaunda tried to promote Nkomo as the leader, knowing full well that he was the one person he could rely upon to abandon armed struggle and pursue negotiations with Smith on terms that were not too stringent. Nkomo was not so much interested in real and genuine unity of the various liberation forces as in manipulating the ANC to his own interest. He carried out negotiations with Smith against the wishes of the rest of the leadership and for this he was expelled from the ANC. Nkomo does not have much support among the Zimbabwean



masses. His strength comes from the support he gets from the front-line Presidents, especially Kaunda, and from the Soviet Union who have adopted him as their man as they pursue their big power politics in Southern Africa. But there is also rank and file resistance to Nkomo within ZAPU, particularly amongst the guerilla cadres.

(3) *Western Imperialism and South Africa's Detente* - Western Imperialism (and particularly British Imperialism) has enormous investments in this part of Southern Africa. Western Imperialism led by the United States does not wish to be involved in a peoples war in the post Vietnam situation. Vietnam has taught it the historic lesson that it cannot win a peoples war. For this reason it quickly withdrew from the Portuguese territories, realising also that a genuine peoples war based on mass support gives rise to the most revolutionary leadership. Its new tactic is to put into power neo-colonial governments pliable to imperialist interests. South Africa the watchdog of imperialism in the area realises that it must make as many friends as possible in Africa in an effort to hold back the revolutionary tide of the oppressed Black masses there. It aims to achieve this through detente.

(4) *Russian social-imperialism* - Russia as an imperialist superpower is exploiting the situation not to bring about revolutionary transformations in the country so much as to pursue its own interests. It has always interfered in the internal affairs of the Southern African liberation movements, supporting one against another. In the case of South Africa it has always supported the white-led CP dominated ANC against the PAC, and has even labelled the latter organisation racist. In Zimbabwe it has always supported ZAPU against ZANU, even though the latter is the majority organisation and more radical. In the present crisis the Soviet Union has heavily armed ZAPU for conventional type warfare. The Russians are just as afraid as imperialism of the revolutionary implications of peoples war.

The chief agents of the Russians in the Southern African region is the African National Congress of South Africa allied to the South African Communist Party, now in exile in London, from where it pursues its machinations. ZAPU's first military venture was undertaken with the ANC-CP of South Africa. The ANC-CP's involvement was a thoroughly opportunistic one. A number of cadres trained in guerilla warfare were rotting and becoming restless in the camps in Tanzania. In an effort to stem this restlessness the ANC put forward the ridiculous idea to suit its opportunistic purposes, that the liberation of Southern Africa must be undertaken country by country. Obviously under this ridiculous scheme Rhodesia came before South Africa. This also suited ZANU who wanted to do something as a counter to ZANU since the latter had launched an armed struggle in the North-East. The ANC-CP abortive Wankie campaign, as it later came to be called, also suited its fund-raising campaign so that they could go round to sympathetic countries and movements and on the basis of their over-inflated propaganda fill their coffers when they had no intention to initiate a serious armed struggle in South Africa.

In this way also the ANC-CP of South Africa was aiding the Soviet Union to penetrate the Zimbabwean liberation movement, and thereby preventing the unity of the liberation forces. (Up to this day the ANC-CP of South Africa does not support ZANU; in the recent Angolan struggle the ANC sent a token force there).

It is with these complicating forces that the Zimbabwean revolution must contend.

The key issue is detente and the different interests represented by it. involves the risks and problems that the front-line Presidents must face in their support for the Zimbabwean struggle. For all of them a prolonged war imposes great economic hardships, especially for Kaunda. There is even the possibility that if things get out of hand of an attack from South Africa. Vorster is also afraid of a prolonged war since it could disrupt his detente policies and strengthen the hand of the die hard elements in his Party.

## MACHEL'S DILEMMA

Samora Machel is placed in an equally invidious position. Whilst he is quite eager to see a protracted peoples war in Zimbabwe based on self-reliance from which will eventually emerge a genuinely socialist-type political and military leadership, yet he feels hamstrung because he is in the firing line of South African power. Through sheer economic necessity he has to tolerate South Africa: South Africa runs her railways and even manages the port of Maputo. The number of Mozambiquans working in South African mines has increased since independence since he needs the levies he gains from this exported labour. He was even forced to negotiate with South Africa on the use of the Cabora Bassa Dam. Machel is also aware that if the armed struggle escalates he might have to face the real possibility of a South African attack. This could induce him to succumb to a Soviet naval presence in Maputo. This explains his visit to the Soviet Union recently. Machel must also contend with pro-Soviet elements in his own Party. It is a known fact that the occasion of Machel's visit to the Soviet Union was the cause of a bitter debate in the Mozambiquan cabinet.

(In this sense there is a two-line struggle in FRELIMO running parallel to the Sino-Soviet dispute. But it concerns basically the two roads to socialism that China and Russia represents: the Chinese one based on self-reliance and the mass line and the Russian based on the productive forces theory).

It is these pressures that have forced the front-line Presidents to settle for a negotiated settlement, and to get Nkomo to assume leadership of the ANC in the early stages of its formation since he was the best man for this. ZANU on the other hand always wished to pursue the armed struggle and not to abandon it. This is the reason also why the Joint Military Command or the so-called Third Force was set up



## WHAT IS THE JOINT MILITARY COMMAND

What exactly is the JMC.

Set up by the four Presidents it has no real base because it was not elected or sanctioned by any political party. It does not have the support of the cadres in the camps and at the OAU Liberation Committee meeting on June 4, a delegation from the cadres spoke out against it. On the other hand the ANC enjoys the support of the cadres and the Zimbabwean masses.

The JMC does not represent unity amongst the liberation forces since this unity can only be first and foremost a political unity. The JMC represents sectarianism and tribalism. The ZAPU and ZANU elements that compose it represent tribalism. The ZANU section come from the same Military High Command that was responsible for the murder of Chitepo and 400 other cadres. The ZANU faction of the JMC have only denounced Sithole and Muzorewa and not the DARE political leadership. The ZAPU elements have refused to denounce Nkomo. Recently there have been clashes between the ZAPU and ZANU elements resulting in the death of cadres.

The JMC, precisely because it is based on foreign soil is not dependent on the Zimbabwean masses and is vulnerable to blackmail. This suits the front-line Presidents who can control the military struggle in the interests of detente.

The ZAPU section is also committed to dominate the JMC, and for them to be able to do this, they have to rely heavily upon the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has always wanted to supply arms directly to ZAPU and to by-pass the OAU Liberation Committee. But Nyerere took a stand against this. He said that if this was the case he would not support the JMC. But this might be a temporary respite. A pro-Nkomo Kaunda and an increasingly pro-Soviet Machel might turn things in the other direction. (i.e. if the pro-Soviet elements get the upper hands in the FRELIMO Cabinet).

But from recent reports the JMC appears to have collapsed and FRELIMO commanders are actually in charge of the struggle.

Thus we see how the big power politics of the Soviet Union co-incides with that of the policies of detente. For this reason the Soviet Union would like to see a conventional type warfare where it can bring into play its heavy type armaments and make the countries dependent upon it. At the same time the Soviet Union can use its military muscle to bargain with the imperialist West. Thus the superpower policies of contention and collusion is promoted and the destiny of the Zimbabwean revolution is taken out of the hands of the indigenous peoples.

This situation will last too as long as the Zimbabwean revolutionaries do not have their main bases inside the country. It is interesting to note that the more revolutionary elements want the struggle to be based inside the country.

It is noteworthy that the Chinese who are responsible for the actual training of the guerilla cadres in the camps do not interfere in the internal affairs of the liberation movements. They leave that to the revolutionary struggle to sort out.

## ANC's APPEAL TO NYERERE

We can no longer remain silent, Your Excellency. To do so would be an act of gross irresponsibility on our part. We have to state in clear and no uncertain terms that the way some of the Heads of Front-Line states and the O.A.U. Liberation Committee Ex. Secretary have been handling the affairs of the fighting people of Zimbabwe and their leaders, clearly because their country is not yet independent, is incorrect and wrong: Incorrect because a considerable number of vital national decisions concerning Zimbabwe have been and continue to be taken over and above the heads of the Zimbabwean people and their leaders by leaders of other nations who have no direct experience with or knowledge of the concrete conditions and situation in our country, an anomaly which is everyday proving costly to our people and country at this phase of our historical development. Wrong because the people of Zimbabwe are now being deprived of their fundamental right to have the leaders they want and the basic right to be their own liberators. Self-determination, liberation, independence, and freedom are swiftly losing meaning for us even before we get our country from the enemy. We hold that so long as there are nation states in this world, so long as there are national interests, the people of various nations should be the ones to determine their own affairs and their own leaders.

In this vein, we would like to point out that what is going on is a gross violation of the O.A.U. principles of respect for the sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of member states and liberation movements recognised by it, enshrined and reflected in its charter and resolutions.

For some time now there has been and continues to be intolerable interference in the internal affairs of our liberation movement and this has been coupled with unspeakable blackmail.



For all practical purposes some of the front-line states and the O.A.U. Liberation Committee Executive Secretary, Colonel Mbita, have taken it upon themselves to be decision-makers, the planners the organisers and the spokesman of the Zimbabwe liberation struggle. They have taken it upon themselves to decide when, where, how and what for talks or armed struggle should be organised, launched and prosecuted. In this game we have at every turn been presented with a fait accompli. For instance; (i) the processing and placing of recruits in training camps without consulting us; (ii) the formation of the so-called third force new high command by the Minister of Defence of Mozambique, Comrade Chipande and Comrade Mbita, and its announcement to the world; preparations for and the launching of the armed struggle on January 7, 1976, which was only communicated to us at the Qualimane Summit in February, 1976.

Other elements of such interference are declarations by President Machel that Mr. J. Nkomo and Bishop Abel Muzorewa only represent themselves and that the liberation war must be delayed to change the political mentality of Zimbabwe; blockading the ANC leadership from physical contact with the cadres and recruits in the camps and cutting out the ANC leadership from directly delivering supplies to the recruits and the cadres; the fact that cadres and recruits who are openly loyal to the ANC leadership are being tortured and liquidated without this being brought to the knowledge of the ANC leadership and that other such cadres and recruits and being sent to labour or refugee camps; publicisation of the strategy of the Zimbabwean fighting forces to the world; secretly flying Mr. J' Nkomo all the way from Rhodesia to Mozambique in mid-April with a view to imposing him as the leader, contrary to the latest condition by all four heads of state that the camps cannot be visited by the ANC leadership unless all leaders of former organisations are part of the visiting missions; the Ex. Secretary's decision to channel funds and supplies to the ANC cadres and recruits by-passing the authentic leadership contrary to OAU principles, procedures and practice; the Executive Secretary's assumption of the prerogative of determining the priorities of our struggle and the kind of aid we need; Zimbabwean leaders now live under the dark cloud of everyday being castigated for ineptitude and ingratitude and under the danger of being deported or character assassinated if they choose not to conform with the viewpoints or politics of some of the Heads of States.

There has been a deliberate subversion and sabotage of our determined efforts to consolidate unity and build a national army. These obstructive activities have been carried out through:

(a) The Pretoria Agreement which was concluded and signed behind our backs. The Pretoria Agreement brought on to the scene two distinct lines standing in sharp contrast and opposition, that is, armed struggle as opposed to talks with Smith. This gave Mr. J' Nkomo the pretext and occasion for breaking away from the ANC and go out to openly hobnob and rub shoulders with Mr. Ian Smith in pursuance of their secret deal. (b) The abetting and aiding of Mr. J' Nkomo's congress campaign and his talks with Mr. Ian Smith. Mr. Nkomo continued to get outside moral, technical and manpower assistance for his talks even after the four heads of State had agreed among themselves and with us at the September 1975 Summit in Lusaka that all talks with the enemy stop and that armed struggle be taken up as the course of action to liberate our country.. (c) The creation of the so-called Third Force or New High Command. Nobody can tell us that those behind the creation of the "new high command" did not know that the ring-leaders of the 45 cadres who were made to meet in President Samora Machel's Palace by Comrades Chipande and Mbita are diehard opponents of the Zimbabwe Unity Agreement. Nobody can tell us that those behind the formation of the so-called Third Force did not know that the aim of some of the ring-leaders of the 45 cadres was to strike a tactical alliance, to contract a marriage of convenience, for fighting and smashing the ANC and after that restore the former political organisation. Nobody can tell us that those behind the setting up of the "Third Force" did not know that the ring-leaders of the 45 cadres had as aim to supplant the ANC leadership as constituted on December 7, 1974 as a way to kill the Zimbabwe Unity Accord and revert to the banners of ZANU and ZAPU.

In short the aiding and abetting of the Nkomo breakaway and the creation of the so-called third force cannot be taken as anything else but deliberate acts meant to undermine the unity of the Zimbabwe people and the ANC.

There has been blatant deceit and bluff and flagrant distortion of truth. It is simply not true that we have refused to go to the camps and lead the struggle from there, for instance. Here is the true picture.

.....The story going around that the leadership has 4 times refused to go to the camps to explain things to the cadres and give them direction and guidance is not true. Rather the ANC leadership has been refused access to the camps.

At the Summit Meeting of the Frontline states held in Lusaka in September, 1975, we were assured by President Machel that we could come to Mozambique and embark on concrete preparations for waging armed struggle. Immediately after the Summit the ANC President in the company of two members of our Defence Council members put forward a programme of action. But were told that the time was not yet ripe for the ANC leadership to go into the camps and our two men were requested to go back to Lusaka.



In mid-October 1975 the ANC President and top members of the ANC Defence Council and High Command moved to Tanzania for the purpose of going to the camps and making arrangements for moving our cadres to Mozambique. The team could not get to the camps. It was told by Col. Mbita that the mission was impossible because "the spirit in the camps is sour". We have since discovered that Col. Mbita did not want us to go there at that point in time because he was already in the process of setting up the "Third Force" high command with dissident elements.

Dissident cadres opposed to unity from the beginning, some of whom are criminals are allowed free access to the camps in Tanzania and Mozambique and were having free run all over the camps to preach the the gospel of disunity and cultivate a hostile attitude against the ANC and its leadership, against unity as constituted on December 7, 1974, in preparation for the "inauguration" of the "Third Force". The ring-leaders of those dissident cadres included Rex Nhongo, also known as Solomon Mususwa Nhongo. He is the one became the chief commander in the "Third Force". Rex Nhongo was involved in the murder of H. Chitepo. The Report on the Assassination of Chitepo says Rex Nhongo is the one who supplied the bomb that killed the ex-Zanu Chairman. Other ring-leaders of the 'dissident cadres such as Dzinashé Machingura (who became "Third Force" Deputy Army Political Commisar), Elias Hondo (who became Deputy of Security and Intelligence) were like Nhgongo members of the former ZANU High Command which on the evidence of the revelations made by Tongogara (ex-Zanu Chief of Defence) to the Mozambiquan authorities, was, together with the DARE, responsible for the death of Chitepo.

Other ring-leaders of the dissident cadres were Alfred "Nikita" Mangena (who became Chief Army Political Commissar of the "Third Force") and Clement Nunyani (who became "Third Force" Chief of Security and Intelligence). These two are hard-core Nkomo boys who do not accept the ANC leadership as constituted on December 7, 1974.

What is hardest to swallow is that while the dissidents were allowed to do anything they wanted in the camps the authentic ANC High Command Chiefs (John Gwindingwi, the Chief Commander, and Grey Mtemasango, the Chief Political Commissar) were being deliberately kept away from the cadres and the recruits.

In November the ANC leadership decided to send an advance party consisting of ANC Defence Council and High Command members to Mozambique. On arriving in Tete the advance party had all the supplies it came with taken away to be given to the "Third Force". In Maputo instead of being allowed to go into the camps our advance team was sent for isolation in a place in the country's province of Gazaland. In Maputo our team was surprised to see Rex Nhgongo and Alfred Mangena and their lieutenants in conference. Their presence and the nature of their business was not officially told to the ANC advance team .

The attempts of Muzorewa and Sithole to join the advance team for a long time encountered official delays and only at the end of December they got in touch with the team. Even after this they were denied access to the camps, in spite of their daily requests to go there.

It was only at the Qualimane Summit in February, 1976 that the ANC leadership was told that the question of whether the ANC leadership had any role to play in the Zimbabwe armed struggle was a matter for the President of the People's Republic of Mozambique to decide and that in any case the armed struggle had been launched on January 7, 1976. It was argued that the ANC was not united and Nkomo should not have been expelled. We therefore ask that the ANC as an organisation with its leadership and High Command be taken in practice as an independent, sovereign liberation movement by all the Frontline states and indeed the entire O.A.U. The authority of the ANC as a Party be allowed to function by the host Frontline countries without undue interference in its internal affairs and without blackmail on its leadership.

## **HOW ZANU WAS BROUGHT INTO ANC**

**At the time that the four front-line Presidents were attempting to bring the various Zimbabwean liberation movements together to facilitate negotiations with Ian Smith, the former ZANU was in a leading position in terms of the armed struggle in Zimbabwe. It was very much opposed to an unprincipled unity, and did not wish to interrupt the armed struggle. To clarify its position at the time the former ZANU sent out a circular to all its branches in Zimbabwe and elsewhere explaining its position regarding the unity talks. We reproduce an abridged version of the document as it throws light on a number of issues. ....In essence the Presidents, Kaunda, Nyerere and Khama told the leaders of the Zimbabwean organisations that they felt a new situation was developing in Southern Africa in which Smith was willing to sit at a conference table with representatives of the African people of Zimbabwe to discuss and agree on the political future of Zimbabwe.**

**In the view of the three Presidents it was a situation in which advantage should be taken to the full and it was necessary that the Zimbabwean people should be united and speak with one voice. The greater part of the meeting was thus used in discussing unity, merger, a united approach, united front or a common front.**



This was ZANU's view in particular (of what had led to the new situation. Nobody denied that the success and continuing of the armed struggle was one of the most vital factors leading to it-Ed).

ZANU said that without the armed struggle Smith and Vorster would have concentrated on relations with Mozambique and Africa and ignored any question of talking to us. ZANU therefore argued that whatever form of unity is worked out, it must not dilute, weaken, disrupt or destroy the armed struggle. The armed struggle was not being waged in order to get Ian Smith at the Conference. It was being waged in order to achieve one man one vote. Until that objective is achieved its military machine which has been to a large extent responsible for the 'new situation' must remain effective and armed struggle must go on.

Because ANC has no freedom fighters, ZAPU's freedom fighters strength is very small, and FROLIZI has next to nothing there was a tendency among these organisations to underplay the importance of armed struggle, and to exaggerate unity even at the expense of armed struggle. In pursuance of its aim to preserve the African peoples trump card, the armed struggle, ZANU proposed that a United Common Front be achieved, first through a co-ordinating committee headed by one person to be elected and to include representatives from ZANU, ZAPU and ANC. This was rejected by the three Presidents as not sufficient. The ANC President then offered the ANC as the vehicle through which unity could be achieved. It was from this point that the whole effort of the Presidents was to get ZANU and ZAPU into the ANC, and thus achieve unity. ZANU saw problems about the maintenance of armed struggle if this were done because the ANC has an anti armed policy; it has no machinery to absorb armed struggle and related matters. These problems could be avoided if a United Front approach was adopted presenting a common approach politically and leaving the parties which have controlled and developed armed struggle in full control of the armed struggle. After considerable pressure and debate ZANU and others agreed to form a United Front in the ANC. This ZANU interpreted as a United Front in which some degree of the identity of each of the parties was retained - especially so as to continue the armed struggle; it therefore agreed to the formulation. The Three Presidents then proceeded to arrange for Joshua Nkomo to head the United Front, Sithole to be Secretary General and Muzorewa Vice President. This was done without consulting the leadership of Zimbabwe gathered at the State House. Joshua Nkomo then proceeded to interpret this agreement as amounting to dissolution of ZANU and ZAPU, and that he was now the head of a new organisation. This was quite contrary to what ZANU had agreed to. ZANU therefore informed the three Presidents that it adhered to the United Front idea but rejects the Nkomo interpretation.

At this point the talks about unity broke down. ANC was silent on the Nkomo interpretation; ZAPU and FROLIZI welcomed it. Strong words were addressed by the three Presidents, especially against ZANU's so-called intransigence. In fact ZANU was described as an enemy of African unity. It was clear to us that ZANU would suffer and the armed struggle would be imperilled if this view was taken. ZANU therefore took the initiative to call a full meeting of all representatives from Zimbabwe in the absence of all non-Zimbabweans. It was then that the attached agreement was reached (not included herein-Ed). Its essence is that neither Nkomo nor Sithole is leader even of the Interim Executive. The right of the people of Zimbabwe to choose their leaders at a fully convened congress is asserted. Until that time the three organisations continue to exist while they take steps to merge their organs and structures into those of the ANC.

### **The Picture in Southern Africa**

The events in Lusaka must be seen against the background of a huge international capitalist conspiracy to blunt the armed struggle, turn the struggle constitutionalist, and find a leader in Zimbabwe whom they feel could be accommodating to their interests. Men in arms, a party spearheading a victorious armed struggle, is not likely to provide such a leader. Hence the colossal onslaught on ZANU as the evil Party.....

The objective of frustrating the armed struggle, is in our view the prime objective of the Rhodesian; South African and imperialist interests.....ZANU has not declared a cease-fire; we will cease-fire only in exchange for majority rule.

ZANU genuinely and honestly put the signature of its President Sithole to the Lusaka Unity Meeting. It will abide by it. When the enlarged ANC Executive has set up the organs and structures of the new ANC, ZANU will merge its organs and structures into those of the ANC.

There is therefore no reason for us to be alarmed. ZANLA is still in the hands of ZANU and politically there is no reason why our brand of politics, policy, principles and ideology should not emerge on top.

## **TANZANIAN STATEMENT TO OAU SUPPORTING ANC AS ONLY LEGITIMATE MOVEMENT OF ZIMBABWEAN STRUGGLE**

As Distinguished Delegates are well aware, the Heads of State of Botswana, Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia, have clearly stated that they support the armed struggle of Zimbabwe waged by the freedom fighters of the ANC. The OAU recognises the ANC as the only authentic and legitimate liberation movement of Zimbabwe, has endorsed the current armed struggle in Zimbabwe waged by the freedom fighters of the ANC. The four heads of state have always recognised the freedom fighters as members of the ANC.



# Tribalism & Petit Buorgeois Politics

The inquiry into the murder of Herbert Chitepo by the Zambian Government was made public in a document published recently. The inquiry team came to the conclusion that Chitepo's murder was due to tribalism within ZANU.

The document gave an account of the events leading to the murder of Chitepo and gave the arguments of the two sides involved i.e. the Nhari guerilla cadres from the camps and the DARE/High Command

But the weakness of the document lay in that it did not look into the roots of the tribalism nor did it comment on the issues involved, especially on the grievances of the Nhari rebels who had earlier made known their grievances in a document called "Criticism and Self-Criticism", criticising the DARE political leadership for being away from the front-line of the struggle and not responding to it like sincere revolutionaries. So we got the impression that the murder was the result of a lust for power by people acting in an irresponsible way.

The fact that the Inquiry only looked into the murder of Chitepo limited its scope, although it could be argued that an investigation into Chitepo's murder would lay bare many more sores within ZANU. But it would have been more logical and honest for the Inquiry to have looked into the murder of the 400 cadres from the camps and in the front by the ZANLA Military High Command. For after all Chitepo's life cannot be more important than that of 400 others.

For us the roots of the tribalism lay in the petit buorgeois politics in the structures and organs of ZANU.

What had occurred within ZANU was that the DARE political leadership and the Military High Command bureaucrats had become alienated from the guerillas fighting in the front. The guerilla cadres were disgusted with the life-style of the exiled leadership. As the Report points out the exile leadership was cut off from the front (Tongogara, the Chief of Staff, had never been to the front), and was impervious to the needs and difficulties of the guerillas. It was only natural that they would revolt against the bureaucratized leadership.

As the exiled leadership came under increasing criticism from the guerillas in the front the former discovered that the only way in which they could protect themselves was by becoming tribalised. Trust could only, for them, be based on group loyalty. This is what all opportunistic petit buorgeois tendencies resort to in the long run when they are attacked and when they feel that they are going to lose their positions and power. Both the DARE and the Military High Command had a petit buorgeois leadership.

The recommendations of the Report do not reflect the objective needs of the Zimbabwean struggle. Precisely because it overlooks the class nature of the problems within ZANU it does not realise that they can occur again.

## Sithole on Chitepo's Murder

(Statement by Sithole, leader of the ANC of Zimbabwe, on the assassination of Herbert Chitepo and the current situation in ZANU. Sithole also comments on the nature of the Third Force set up by the front-line Presidents. The weakness of his analysis lay in the fact that he does not see the connection between the tragic tribalism that arose in ZANU and its petit buorgeois contents. This problem will recur while the leadership of the ANC remains petit-buorgeois, until the revolutionary struggle itself brings class politics to the ANC. The following are excerpts from his statement.

".....the main thesis of my letter is that ZANU became constantly subjected to a process of tribalisation or regionalisation with the result that unprecedented killings and kidnappings within ZANU took place and culminated in the assassination of Chitepo.

(Sithole then goes on to show how this tribalisation occurred after the ZANU Central Committee in detention had delegated power to the DARE in Lusaka to prosecute the armed struggle).

".....even a superficial examination of the ZANU Military High Command shows a corresponding process of tribalisation or regionalisation. (Then Sithole shows how this took place so that by 1975 it was almost taken over by Karangas as with the DARE.

"The present High Command which was formed without consulting and involving the ANC leadership consists of 9 ex-ZANU and 9 ex-ZAPU officers. All the ex-ZANU officers have connections with the tribalised DARE and belonged to the tribalised High Command of the former ZANU.

"The so-called Third Force which has unfortunately been projected as a rival of the ANC(Z) has had the effect of resuscitating the tribalised DARE and High Command which have already resulted



in armed conflict since the majority of cadres are utterly opposed to the whole idea of the Third Force.

“Those who have essayed to justify the killings have put forward a punitive thesis which is not acceptable. The fundamental question then arises: Why did the DARE have to take such an extreme action when the Central Committee from which they derived their power was free to attend such matters? The answer is self-evident. With the tribalisation of ZANU the Central Committee had ceased to exist in the minds of the tribalised DARE and the High Command and DARE had, by a process of usurpation become the Central Committee to the exclusion of the real ZANU Central Committee.

A new orientation had already been introduced in ZANU that the gun commands the Party, and not the Party the gun. The present High Command which was formed without consulting and involving the ANC leadership is in fact a continuation of this new and foreign thesis that the gun commands the Party”

## **ANC POLICY**

**These are excerpts from the Statement of Basic Policy of the African National Council of Zimbabwe. We have culled out sections referring to the social and economic policies as conceived in a liberated Zimbabwe. Of course the socialist policies advocated can be mere demagogy, but ZANU (and we believe they were responsible for these policies of the ANC) has always been a radical petit bourgeois organisation strongly against capitalism and imperialism.**

The fascist regime of Rhodesia is a product and a special form of capitalism and world imperialism whereby Britain, the arch-enemy of the people of Zimbabwe, granted a licence for white dictatorship.

Settler colonialism in Zimbabwe is in fact sustained by a vast imperialist partnership which includes Britain, the United States of America, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, other Nato countries, Japan, South Africa and Switzerland.

The chief character of Rhodesia's settler colonial society is capitalism whereby the means of production are owned by a numerically insignificant white settler community (2000,000) while the rest of the population (6,000,000 Blacks) is, except for a handful of petty-bourgeois elements, a proletariat made up of workers, peasants and squatters who own nothing but create by their labour incommensurable incomes for the capitalists and their settler class.

The Party upholds the continuation of revolutionary armed struggle as the only means of overthrowing oppression and establishing a people's democratic and socialist rule in Zimbabwe.

The Party foreign policy shall be determined by two cardinal principles: to fight against imperialism and neo-colonialism, and to unite with the revolutionary and progressive forces of the world.

The Party seeks to change totally and completely the existing social and political system and establish a new society altogether which is not based on private ownership of the means of production, a socialist society in which, naturally, the democratic process is to be exercised in such a way that the most exploited masses have control of political power, since they alone can go furthest in establishing proper rights and liberties for all.

The Party stands for a society in which all classes and all prejudices or privileges shall be combatted and weeded out.

The economic system in Zimbabwe today is geared to benefit the settlers and capitalists, and internationalism capitalism. The economy of a socialist Zimbabwe shall be designed to meet the basic needs of each worker and peasant in accordance with living standards, and to develop abilities to the full.

All means of production, distribution, exchange, and communications shall be placed fully in the hands of the people of Zimbabwe as a whole. The economy shall provide for the greatest dominance of worker-peasant interests throughout the system.

Labour, which is the greatest asset of Zimbabwe, shall be used for the fulfillment of the personality of every Zimbabwean, enabling him or her to lead a decent life.

Exploitation and privileges shall not be allowed by and among the free citizens of Zimbabwe. Property as a commercial and exploitative factor shall be abolished.

Economic development shall be determined by the state using socialist methods and techniques of planning. Incomes shall accrue in accordance with the amount of labour each one contributes to society.

All the natural resources of Zimbabwe - the land, minerals, water, flora and fauna - belong to the people of Zimbabwe, and shall be administered by the State. There shall be no private ownership of land or natural resources. There shall be land reform and an agrarian revolution geared to meet the needs of the peasants - co-operatives, and collective and communal programmes at every stage of development in the nation.



# Is Mozambique Our Socialist Hope or Will Russian's Hijack it

## THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION IN MOZAMBIQUE AND THE STRUGGLE TO TURN FRELIMO INTO A MARXIST-LENINIST PARTY

The Mozambiquan Revolution is at the moment at the crossroads. A Revolution that drastically altered the situation in Southern Africa after 14 long years of peoples war, it is also the one that gives the greatest hope of moving in a socialist direction. But the issue is not as simple as that. There are also other pressures upon Mozambique to turn it in the other direction, not least that of the Soviet Union.

The author of this article who had spent sometime in Mozambique and who is sympathetic to the aims and objectives of the Mozambiquan Revolution examines some of the problems that FRELIMO has to face in its self-proclaimed march towards socialism. He discusses here the particular problem of FRELIMO converting itself into a vanguard Marxist-Leninist Party based on self-reliance and the mass line so that it can carry the national democratic revolution onto its socialist phase. This is a problem that is peculiar to some Third World countries where the national struggle has been led by a multi-class national party, but whose leading elements embrace Marxist-Leninist ideology as the correct road forward for the revolution.

He shows also how FRELIMO must choose between the two roads defined by the Chinese and Russian type revolutions, the one based on the mass line and self-reliance, and the other on the productice forces theory. This is a crucial choice for FRELIMO to make and already in the FRELIMO Cabinet there is a fierce controversy on the road forward. On this choice will depend whether Mozambique will become the socialist hope of Africa, or go down the drain like Cuba.

The armed struggle for the national liberation of Mozambique was victoriously concluded fifteen months ago. Since the signing of the Lusaka Accords on September 7, 1974, the Front for the Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO) has been consolidating the people's state power in the country. As was the case during the national liberation struggle, the obstacles that FRELIMO must surmount in order the progress towards socialism is logistically tremendous. The social and economic backwardness of Mozambique and the potential political opposition within the country present FRELIMO with a Herculean task. The struggle to establish the people's national democratic dictatorship and the subsequent advance towards socialism will be a dialectical process, suffering various reports and articles written by FRELIMO sympathisers tended to describe the struggle as a unilear process. FRELIMO did not develop from an externally-based grouping of intellectuals and militants into a mass-based liberation front without experiencing disruption; numerous purges were executed within FRELIMO to maintain organisational and ideological correctness. FRELIMO did not methodically eliminate the Portuguese colonialists in the course of the liberation struggle; the liberation forces withdrew and achieved breakthroughs. Since the last shot was fired against the colonial forces, FRELIMO has not easily established popular political control within Mozambique; opposition elements have constantly emerged, even within FRELIMO'S own ranks. Therefore, those FRELIMO supporters who profess that, with an effective socialist programme, the people of Mozambique will methodically progress in the struggle to develop are neglecting the fundamental role of dialectics in the process. *It is the analytical approach of revisionism, not Marxism, that asserts that incremental progression leads to qualitative change or revolution.* FRELIMO has generally realised that socialism can only be established as elsewhere, through persistent struggle and revolution. From this realisation is derived FRELIMO's clarion call: A LUTA CONTINUA.

FRELIMO has for the past decade demonstrated that the people of Africa can be mobilised to fight a people's war. Through successfully promoting a mass line among the people, it can be asserted that FRELIMO has achieved the best prospects for socialism in Africa. Although Mozambique does not have the resources of a Nigeria or an Algeria, the country has politically -motivated human resources that are the most basic requirement for the achievement of socialism. The supposedly backward peasantry of Mozambique again exploded the myth of peasant passivity by bearing the brunt of the revolutionary struggle. Through the correct guidance of FRELIMO, the mobilised masses of Mozambique came to realise the opportunity to collectively eliminate the oppression and poverty that had plagued Mozambique for several centuries. The people of Mozambique became conscious of the fact that, by liberating themselves from the national oppression of Portuguese colonialism the constraints would be removed from African direction of economic and political development. The rural masses came to see that, by overturning the dominance of "feudalistic" tribal chiefs, the large landowners, and other collaborators with the ruling order, collective development for a majority of the population would become possible. Also, the establishment of mass organisations under FRELIMO's leadership and the introduction of democracy in Mozambique have been indications of the revolutionary potential of the people of



Mozambique and the relatively propitious prospects for socialism in the country.

The triumph of the national liberation struggle in Mozambique has brought to the fore the question of prospects for socialism in the country. Many observers have expressed scepticism that a backward, Third World country such as Mozambique could have the potential to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat and to build a socialist economy. There appears to many to be a definite lack of a politically conscious proletariat and an economic base suitable for the achievement of a socialist Mozambique. However, many of these observers and their colleagues have made similar comments as to the prospects for socialism in other Third World countries, such as China. Many also doubted the capability of the people of Mozambique to liberate themselves from colonial oppression. Basically, in Mozambique there is a situation that could lead to the contradiction of assumptions that the people are incapable of achieving socialism. Throughout a major portion of the country, the population remains mobilised, and FRELIMO is now attempting to extend and deepen the politicisation of the masses. This process of raising political consciousness will continue to engender the development of FRELIMO as a Marxist-Leninist organisation. It is vital that this cyclical process of political development should be continued and directed by a leadership that is dedicated to establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat and the poor peasantry. Especially during the course of the struggle since 1970, FRELIMO has forged a Marxist-Leninist ideology and leadership. Through constant work with the masses, FRELIMO has come to recognise the class nature of their struggle and the need to rely upon mass initiative to achieve success. The various crises that FRELIMO has overcome have demonstrated the need for organisation along Marxist-Leninist lines. However, only with the development of sufficiently conscious cadres and leadership and a proper mode of operation can FRELIMO be prepared to maintain the dictatorship of the the proletariat and to lead in the construction of a socialist Mozambique. The various elements involved in an evaluation of the prospects for socialism will be analysed further in here.

## SELF RELIANCE

The thirteen year history of the struggle, led by FRELIMO, for the liberation of Mozambique presents an excellent indication as to the progress of the people of Mozambique and their vanguard organisation towards self-reliant, socialist development. In developing a policy of self-reliance, FRELIMO has acquired the ability to deal with various sources of international support. From 1962 to 1969, while under the leadership of President Eduardo Mondlane, FRELIMO, maintained its existence through a wide range of contacts with foreign governments and organisations. After 1969, support from FRELIMO from various church groups and Western governments withered away partly because of the death of Mondlane who was widely respected and because FRELIMO became committed to a more socialist line. By the 1970 Congress, FRELIMO had developed into a self-reliant organisation through the conduct of people's war. Its increasing Marxist-Leninist orientation led FRELIMO to look more exclusively for aid from Eastern European states and Russia, as well as from the People's Republic of China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Eventually by 1973, as Samora Machel and indigenous gained ascendancy in Frelimo, the self-reliant, mass line became predominant. And after delegations returned from China and Korea having observed the Marxist-Leninist line creatively applied, FRELIMO subsequently developed its most fraternal relations with these two socialist Asian countries. This relationship is evident, because two of the largest aid packages received by Mozambique came from China and Korea.

The development of organisational standards has been an area in which FRELIMO has advanced considerably over the past thirteen years. When FRELIMO was founded in 1962 it contained both groups and individuals whose political and class orientations were disparate and contradictory. Originally the approach of FRELIMO to the liberation of Mozambique was not uniform. While many FRELIMO militants supported armed struggle others sought an accomodation with the Portuguese. Controversy arose over whether or not to rely upon certain classes in the national liberation struggle. Questions were raised over the dependability of chiefs and the petty buorgeois assimiladoes in the course of the struggle. Eventually FRELIMO came to stress the worker-peasant alliance, with contributions permitted from most all patriotic elements. However, this policy did not prevent FRELIMO from leading the struggle against exploitation of African by African.

During the period of 1962 to 1972, there were persistent conflicts among leaders and cadres to determine the political line and the organisational character of FRELIMO. While the late President Mondlane was cognisant of the internal struggles within FRELIMO, there was little that could be done at the nascent stage of the organisation. Disagreements constantly arose between those who were fighting for the mere independence of Mozambique and those who envisioned a popular democratic and self-reliant country. There were disputes whether cadres should be drawn from the black African masses, from the educated, multi-racial, radical elite or from traditional sources of leadership i.e. chiefs, professionals, etc.). In addition, divisions of the theatres of guerilla warfare caused further conflicts to arise. Besides these problems, FRELIMO had to deal with those who merely sought personal power and prestige. The Reverend Uria Simango, an ex-Vice-President of FRELIMO, was one of those who were expelled for a political line and style of operation that undermined the national liberation struggle.



In the midst of internal dissension, steps were taken to modify the situation. In March of 1968 several teachers at the Mozambique Inst. who favoured the teaching of English instead of Portuguese were expelled for actively contradicting FRELIMO policy. Later in 1968, a very important FRELIMO Congress laid down organisational guidelines based upon democratic centralism. By rooting itself in the masses through the Congress and other democratic means and by centralising its political and military command, FRELIMO proceeded to direct the national liberation struggle in a well-defined manner. The groundwork was laid in 1968 for an intensification of armed struggle, the recruitment of large numbers of cadres and soldiers, and the cleansing of the FRELIMO leadership of divisive elements. Since then the lesson of proper organisation and uniform execution has been absorbed; and it has been applied to raise the level of FRELIMO as an organisation eventually to that of a party, as the consciousness of the cadres increases. As President Machel said:

“When a major part of our cadres and our people has reached such consciousness that it places them as being transforming elements of society, then we can have a party, a vanguard party to orientate the country, to orientate the government to promote development, establish priorities and define tasks for the people.”

The most useful and important lessons that FRELIMO acquired resulted from the process of conducting a people's war. It was during the ten years of armed struggle that FRELIMO acquired the knowledge and the ability to defeat the Portuguese military, mainly through the development of a proper approach to the masses. During the first two years of FRELIMO's existence, emphasis was placed on non-violent action by the most politically advanced elements of the African labouring population. The brutal suppression of this movement convinced FRELIMO even more that armed struggle was the only means of achieving national liberation. However, it was not until 25 September 1964 that sufficient cadres and soldiers were recruited and trained to commence the armed struggle. Yet, even after the first three years of armed struggle the necessary coordination with and organisation of the masses had not been attained sufficiently to establish definite “liberated zones”. Certainly, FRELIMO fighters found it initially difficult to melt away into the population to avoid selective liquidation. This susceptibility was not wholly eliminated, as is evidenced during Operation Gordian Knot in 1970 through 1972. Portuguese forces (including a large number of Africans) were able to root out many areas of FRELIMO control and scatter the liberation forces, through the strategy of population manipulation used in Vietnam. Fortunately, FRELIMO had developed to such an extent in the five years before the Portuguese operation to be able to counteract the measures against them and go on the offensive. In 1968 FRELIMO had used the influx of foreign money and equipment, coupled with work among the masses, to add numerous cadres and soldiers. In 1970 a clear line, committed to the development of socialism, emerged as FRELIMO consolidated after Mondlane's death. And in 1971, FRELIMO had organised sufficiently in other areas of the country to mount an offensive in Tete Province and western Mozambique that succeeded in diverting the attention of the Portuguese colonialists from the North. This campaign was carried into Manica and Sofala provinces of central Mozambique in 1973, thereby outflanking the Portuguese forces and causing considerably more damage to colonialism than in areas where the settler presence was not as pronounced. In the North, although large numbers of people were herded into aldeamentos to be “pacified”, FRELIMO influence remained strong because of its well-cultivated relationship with the masses and because of its superior grasp of the technique of war required in Niassa and Cabo Delgado Provinces.

What have been some concrete manifestations of the mass line had for the development of FRELIMO? Samora Machel has emphasised the primary importance of working with the masses in order to achieve increasing effectiveness as a conscious, vanguard organisation:

“The seed of knowledge only grows when it is buried in the soil of production of struggle. If we have already so greatly transformed our country, if we have won so many successes in production, education, health and combat, it is because we are always with the masses. We consistently apply what we know to production, correct our mistakes and enrich our knowledge”.

## MASS LINE

Machel has correctly attributed FRELIMO's victories not only in the field of combat to a close working orientation with the masses. After having liberated a considerable area of the Northern Provinces by 1967, FRELIMO augmented its initial organisational activities with large-scale campaigns for political education, literacy, health care, and agricultural services. It helped to re-organise production and encouraged the peasantry to rid itself of parasitical chiefs and Portuguese.

The 1968 FRELIMO Congress institutionalised the mass line by promoting representation in the Congress and other leadership bodies by mass organisations, established under the guidance of FRELIMO. Organisations of peasants and youth continually sprang up in areas of FRELIMO influence. Most significant has been the women's organisation under the national umbrella of the Organisation



of Mozambique Women (OMM). Even in the most "progressive" African countries, it is difficult to find similar emphasis on the woman's role in the liberation struggle or such involvement by women.

In addition most every village under FRELIMO control formed Grupos Dynamizadores that were responsible for political education and guidance. As the struggle for the liberation of Mozambique intensified, these organisations played a greater role in shaping the strategy and tactics of FRELIMO. Accordingly, FRELIMO has become increasingly cognisant of the need of properly organising the masses and became very capable of doing so. Eventually, the people's consciousness was raised to such an extent that FRELIMO was able to transfer some of the burden of armed struggle from the standing Forces for the Popular Liberation of Mozambique (FPLM) to local militias from whom FPLM contingents were drawn. The successful execution of a people's war against the Portuguese colonialists conclusively has demonstrated that FRELIMO has progressed greatly as an organisation by firmly rooting itself in the African masses.

FRELIMO underwent a learning process during the struggle for national liberation, as did the people of Mozambique. However, with the coup in Portugal and subsequent events, the colonialist forces that had already been demoralised during Operation Gordian Knot, were rendered ineffectual. Thus, FRELIMO was suddenly confronted with the reality of peace and power. With the termination of the conflict through the Lusaka Agreements of 7 September 1974, FRELIMO could no longer rely on the menacing adversary of violent Portuguese oppression to rally the masses. Though victory was joyously welcomed, much of the country had not been mobilised during the heat of the struggle. In addition, the liberation war had just begun to affect the Portuguese settlers.

The corroding structure of Portuguese colonialism - the plantations, the ultramarine firms, and the central administration - remained virtually intact to the south of Beira. Considerable numbers of reactionary Portuguese had immigrated to Mozambique after 1960. The white population had increased by 140,000 from 85,000 in the space of a decade, leaving a largely hostile element for FRELIMO to manage. Immediately after the signing of the Lusaka Accords, a fascist insurrection broke out in Lourenco Marques to prevent FRELIMO from taking power. In league with Portuguese peace-keeping forces the African population of Mozambique rose up to defeat the Portuguese fascist attempt to declare UDI. Instrumental in the struggle were the politically-conscious working class of Lourenco Marques who had been organised to firmly support FRELIMO. Significant manifestations of solidarity with the national liberation struggle, taking place hundreds of miles to the north, were carried out by the workers of Lourenco Marques and Beira, most particularly on 25 April 1974. With great vigilance the workers of Lourenco Marques led the African population in defeating the rebellion of 7 September and driving large numbers of Portuguese into South Africa. They helped to extinguish a similar insurrection of 21 October, thus protecting the transfer of power to FRELIMO and providing a very important element of support for the securing of national independence in Mozambique.

The anti-fascist, anti-colonial struggle in the months following the Lusaka Accords was a positive factor in overcoming the lack of politicisation in southern Mozambique. However, considerable problems still remained for FRELIMO after the rapid arrival of peace and national independence in the country. FRELIMO had to oversee the establishment of a political and economic administration that would be both competent and popular. Elements opposing the establishment of the people's democratic dictatorship were still widespread in the country. People whose consciousness had not been raised in the anti-colonial struggle required political education. Production had to be organised on lands and in firms expropriated from the Portuguese colonialists. Greater problems persisted in areas surrounding the aldeias into which large numbers of peasants had been herded. Besides merely maintaining political power and the people's livelihood, FRELIMO was confronted with a country impoverished by the especially oppressive and backward character of Portuguese colonialism. Despite these enormous obstacles to development, FRELIMO called for an advance towards socialism, relying upon little more than the power of the workers and peasants of Mozambique, organised and mobilised in the course of the struggle.

The backward and oppressive character of Portuguese colonialism has left Mozambique impoverished and little-developed, moreso than most African states. Portugal, itself an underdeveloped country dominated by foreign capital, could do little but offer easy access by monopoly corporations to Mozambique's land, minerals, and - labours for capital accumulation. Even that task proved an interminable strain upon the Portuguese economy.

Subsequently, the people of Mozambique, while in contact with "civilising Europe", remained without the most fundamental requirements for democratic participation in a more advanced society. 85% of the population was estimated to be "illiterate", and 14% merely brushed with "education" in attending less than six grades of school. The majority of educational facilities were located in and around the major cities of Mozambique, where only 20% of the population resides. In rural areas that were visited close to Beira, it was actually difficult to find people who spoke Portuguese. It was widely commented that Portuguese is a language spoken by a minority and read by an urbanised elite. Thus, there have been continual questions concerning the use of Portuguese as the official language of Mozambique.



In the area of health, the people of Mozambique have been left in an even worse position than they were in education. Health was deemed by the Portuguese colonial authorities to be a service that the African population could do without. Even in the past decade, when the Portuguese undertook campaigns to appease small sections of the population, health care was still deplorably absent. Among the large concentrations of the Portuguese population in Maputo and Beira, there was most recently a total of no more than 96 doctors for a combined population of 165,000 or one doctor per every 20,000 people. Of course, the doctor's treatment remained confined to the Portuguese population and to the African assimilated. In the shanty towns around Beira and Maputo and throughout the rest of the country, not even sanitation and preventive health care was visible. Outside of the two major cities, there was an average of only approx. one doctor for 350,000. The obvious failures of the Portuguese authorities to provide even the pretense of health care among other services is a most striking example of the parasitism to which the people of Mozambique were subjected. The leading cadres of FRELIMO made the provision of health care and other services a high priority in the development of the revolutionary struggle for a people's democratic Mozambique. However, with the exodus of many Portuguese doctors and technicians with the rest of the colonialists, FRELIMO is faced with a lack of professional expertise. Yet, as in other phases of the struggle, FRELIMO has learned how to rely on the initiative of the masses to overcome such a lack of technical sophistication.

Agriculture represents the far most important sector of the economy of Mozambique and clearly demonstrates once again the parasitic manner in which Portuguese colonialism operated. In a country with fertile agricultural land in abundance, only a quarter of the arable lands was cultivated. Of the cultivated land, more than half was owned by 1% of the population. While the Portuguese and monopoly firms formed large plantations, the African people of Mozambique were scattered on small impoverished "machambas" of family plots, or they worked for the colonialists. Because 90% of the population is in agriculture, Frelimo has been faced with the enormous problem of providing sufficient organisational changes, credit, implements, and seed to raise the country from a bleak state of poverty. Although many Portuguese peasants and plantations-owners have left the country, many of the large monopoly firms remain. While nationalising all land and relying on the organised enthusiasm of the peasantry, FRELIMO must still rely a great deal upon plantation production of cash export crops in order to maintain a sufficient inflow of foreign exchange. Only after much struggle on both the political and productive fronts will the people of Mozambique be able to feed and clothe themselves adequately to proceed to industrialisation.

## SOME OTHER PROBLEMS

On the whole, the economy of Mozambique is in a shambles, reflecting the general condition of the entire country. In bearing the brunt of a decade of war, especially the highly-expensive "Operation Gordian Knot", Mozambique has accumulated a foreign debt of close to 700 million dollars. However FRELIMO implemented several measures to shore up foreign reserves during the period of the transitional government. The departure of most of the Portuguese population has meant that FRELIMO no longer has to cater for extravagant, European tastes, thereby cutting back imports. However, Mozambique will miss the expertise of Portuguese in certain areas of business and industry through many multi-national corporations remain, augmented by the arrival of foreign assistance from Eastern Europe, China, etc. Yet, while both multi-national corporations remain, augmented by the arrival of foreign advisors should fill a vital gap in Mozambique's development plans, FRELIMO will have to closely watch the activities of both in the country. An even more necessary evil appears to be the continued export of contract labour to S.Africa, a practice FRELIMO promised to end at their Second Congress of 1968. Over 100,000 workers are employed in South Africa's mines and approximately 200,000 seek work there altogether. If Mozambique were to suspend this practice, the country would lose a large portion of its foreign exchange earnings and would be saddled with unemployment greater than the total employed for industry inside Mozambique. Therefore, FRELIMO must resort to certain undoctinaire practices in order to maintain economic viability.

Other major problems have continued to confront FRELIMO. As the country developed unevenly both during the national liberation struggle and before, FRELIMO has to administrate and mobilise people in regions of Mozambique with widely varying characteristics. In the south of the country, large Portuguese plantations contained a large tenant population and farm labour. In the center huge concessions were made to colonial companies. In the north and in western Tete Province, persisted the small-holding African peasant population, divided into tribal groupings, yet mobilised during the war for independence. In such a large, elongated country, differences have persisted between tribal groups, between provinces, between town and country, and between mobilised and non-mobilised. Complicating matters is the fact that FRELIMO is short of competent administrators who must provide the necessary guidance, and co-ordination for the country. During the war of independence, FRELIMO managed to administer to the people's affairs quite adequately, without alienating the local population. However, those cadres who took such care to work with the people have, in many cases, moved on to



different areas and higher positions. The large number of provincial, district, and local administrators that were required after FRELIMO inherited Mozambique were drawn from either the ill-equipped local population, "militants" trained in Lourenco Marques or Portugal, or from the assimilado population. Therefore many problems have arisen in diverse areas of Mozambique during the first year of the FRELIMO-led government. Administrators have proven to be incapable of efficiently supplying basic services and needs nor communicating with the local population. In one area the district commissioner had come from Lourenco Marques, could not speak the local language, and had been greatly influenced by his close contact with Portuguese culture and ideas. Although he was termed to be a FRELIMO "militant", he freely availed himself of all the comforts of the old Portuguese commissioner and did not appear to put himself at the service of the African people. This first-hand experience was confirmed by other accounts of widespread dissatisfaction with government officials especially in Tete Province. In that western province, the people had demanded the removal of the governor from Lourenco Marques and the return of the former Portuguese governor. Whether for reasons of regional bias or of incompetence, the removal of high officials from their positions has confronted FRELIMO with difficult contradictions. Only with the development of the political consciousness and organisation of the people in diverse areas of Mozambique can the problems of administration and regional differences be overcome. The continued training and practice of cadres and officials, under the guiding influence of the "mass line" of FRELIMO, will also contribute to the development of a state and party that will serve the people. Of course, the development of a common language - whether it be Portuguese, English, or Swahili - and a common revolutionary culture will contribute greatly to the destruction of barriers between people in the country.

In addition to domestic problems, FRELIMO recognises that Mozambique is located in a region of the continent that features a virulent form of white settler colonialism. The development of South Africa and Rhodesia at the end of the 19th and during the 20th century added an edifying dimension to the colony of Mozambique; it became the port and labour pool for the plantations and mines of its neighbours. The liberation of Mozambique has left an enormous cavity in Southern Africa that has caused considerable disconcert in Salisbury and Johannesburg. However, the Vorster and Smith regimes have not directly intervened in Mozambique, because the country seemed impotent after a decade of war and since the governments of South Africa and Rhodesia were preoccupied in controlling their own African population.

However, as the militancy of FRELIMO has not only succeeded in mobilising the people of Mozambique, but it has visibly inspired the struggle of oppressed people across its boundaries. With the increasing instability of the Southern African situation, South Africa may reconsider its policy of peaceful coexistence with Mozambique. Therefore, FRELIMO has placed special emphasis on maintaining strong, vigilant forces and people's militias. While replenishing its supplies of arms and inheriting Port. military equipment, the most important of its measures to strengthen Mozambique's defenses have been political in nature. The political line of FRELIMO has been applied to the leadership of the armed forces; in August 1975 more than ten officers were purged because of an incorrect style of leadership of FRELIMO has been a notable feature as the organisation developed in the course of the struggle. It has tended to make FRELIMO a more effective organisation. With the tasks of peacetime reconstruction and defense as prime functions of the armed forces, those whose vigilance and attitudes have slackened at the end of armed struggle have been removed. The consciousness and vigilance of the people have been heightened through the publicising of FRELIMO purges and through other methods.

## **FRELIMO'S FOREIGN POLICY**

As FRELIMO has developed a conceptualisation of itself as a revolutionary organisation and of Mozambique as a country requiring revolution, it has developed an appropriate foreign policy. While diplomatically controlling its hostility against the white settler regimes on its borders, FRELIMO has actively supported liberation groups. During the offensive in the Tete Province, FRELIMO and ZANU developed an especially close relationship in the execution of people's war against the Rhodesian and Portuguese colonialists. Although the international positions of FRELIMO and ZANU differed initially they have been drawn together through the Chinese-style struggle that they both have undertaken. With the intensification of the conflict in Zimbabwe, FRELIMO has assisted the people's armed forces by setting up camps for Zimbabwean freedom fighters along its long border. In the recent conflict between the capitulationist clique, led by Joshua Nkomo, and the African National Council, FRELIMO has supported Muzorewa, Sithole, and Chikerema. In the African Liberation Committee's meeting, recently held in Lourenco Marques in January 1976 the seating of the legitimately, majority-supported ANC was upheld by Samora Machel and the other delegates. The futility of further negotiations was stressed, and the call for intensified armed struggle was raised.

In the case of the Azanian freedom struggle, the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Africanist Congress (PAC) are both supported. The PAC and the ANC have recently opened offices in Lourenco Marques, and both attended the Organisation of African Unity's ALC meeting in the Mozambiquan capital.



The most controversial aspect of the foreign policy of Mozambique concerns Angola. FRELIMO has pointedly ignored the warnings of its Chinese and Marxist-Leninist friends about Angola. Instead FRELIMO has mistakenly perceived massive Russian and Cuban intervention as "fraternal assistance" from "our natural allies". Thus, the FRELIMO leadership has failed to make the important dialectical analysis of Russia as a superpower, leaving tremendous questions about FRELIMO's potential as a Marxist-Leninist Party. FRELIMO has also papered over the fact that the MPLA is employing militarist methods to gain control over the major part of Angola. FRELIMO disregards the fact that UNITA has already successfully mobilised 60% of Angola's population, mostly peasants, in the process of fighting a people's war. While achieving commendable successes among urban populations, the MPLA has performed pitifully with respect to Angola's peasantry. FRELIMO's leadership should re-examine FRELIMO's history as a liberation movement in order to discover its mistakes in relation to Angola.

The position of FRELIMO on Angola is based upon the long-standing commitment of the leadership towards other liberation organisations. In 1961, the present vice-President of Mozambique, Marcelino dos Santos, was instrumental in the establishment of the Conference of Nationalist Organisations of the Portuguese Colonies (CONCP) of which both FRELIMO and the MPLA were members. Dos Santos became the secretary general of the permanent secretariat of CONCP. Most CONCP delegates including Dos Santos and MPLA leader, Dr. Agostinho Neto, were heavily inclined towards Russia, and member organisations received a large proportion of their aid through Moscow; In 1969, FRELIMO and CONCP were prominent in the Russian-backed Khartoum Conference. The Conference represented an attempt to supersede the OAU Liberation Committee (ALC) that also supported organisations not in favour with Moscow.

Since 1969, the international position of FRELIMO has diverged from that of its CONCP counterparts. With increasing contacts with Peking for material and moral support, most of the FRELIMO leadership has become most associative with China and other Asian socialist countries. However through certain individuals FRELIMO maintains close relations still with CONCP, as well as Russia, Eastern European countries, and Cuba. FRELIMO still refers to the Sino-Soviet split as "unfortunate" for the "socialist countries". However, FRELIMO recognises that it would not be advantageous at present to alienate a large source of foreign assistance, as well as a section of FRELIMO cadres. Of course, FRELIMO has not yet begun to experience the excessive demands that have been made by Russia and its allies towards their other Third World clients.

In the future, FRELIMO plans to form a Marxist-Leninist Party to lead in the establishment and construction of socialism in Mozambique. At that time, its international position on such issues as Angola and Russian social-imperialism will be of paramount importance. Currently, the Marxist-Leninist movement is in the midst of a heated debate over revisionism and social-imperialism. A widely supported notion has been raised that as long as Marxist-Leninist Party or a liberation organisation combats revisionism in its own ranks, its international position is not of major importance. These proponents point to a socialist country like Vietnam to demonstrate their point. However, past experience does not uphold this position. While endeavouring to combat revisionism within its ranks, the social democratic Second International's international position on the First World War contributed to the movement's rapid demise. Also, the approach of the various Communist Party leaderships to the Third International's United Front against War and Fascism was a major determinant of the strength of their adherence to Marxism-Leninism. Therefore, a much stronger contention can be made that a party or movement's international position is an integral part of its character. If the Vietnam Worker's Party has not yet denounced revisionism and social imperialism one must question the VWP's line and its leadership.

The same holds true for FRELIMO one must question the ability of FRELIMO to lead in the building of a Marxist-Leninist Party and socialism in Mozambique, if it throws its international support behind powers and movements that suppress the masses and prove to be anti-popular, while at the same time proclaiming "socialist principles".

In attempting to establish a Marxist-Leninist Party and move towards socialism, FRELIMO finds itself in a unique historical position, compared to the socialist countries. In China or Albania, the Marxist-Leninist party was formed and was the leading force in the liberation movement well before the national democratic revolution was victorious. Most M-L parties brought long experience to the tasks of building socialism and maintaining the dictatorship of the proletariat. The working masses in the socialist countries subsequently were highly prepared and properly guided by tested Marxist-Leninist parties. In Mozambique, it is obvious that the workers and peasants of the new People's Republic have not been accommodated to such an extent. While FRELIMO has many cadres, experienced both in theory and practice, it still must train and rectify more. Also, FRELIMO must become tested in practice as an organisation before it can become a Marxist-Leninist Party.

Other countries, mainly in the Third World, have attempted to organise a Marxist-Leninist party for an advance towards socialism after the completion of the national liberation struggle. Cuba was one of the first to attempt what FRELIMO is endeavouring to accomplish now. By now it appears evident why Cuba's attempt failed. Policies and positions that alienated potentially-valuable class allies; a neo-colonial dependence on the Soviet Union; and the formation of a party that contained



mostly petit-bourgeois radicals and hopeless revisionists were among the prominent mistakes made in Cuba. FRELIMO must absorb the lesson that has been produced through the negative example of Cuba: practice self-reliance, depend on mass initiative, and advance in a dialectical and concerted manner.

Since the "winds of change" swept across Africa and parts of the Middle East in the 1960s, numerous countries have attempted to traverse the path upon which FRELIMO has embarked. In 1964, a group of military officers, intellectuals, and workers formed the National Movement of the Revolution (MNR) to safeguard the victory, in 1963, of the people of Congo-Brazzaville against neo-colonialism.

## TURNING FRELIMO INTO A M-L PARTY

After five years of preparation and struggle, the Party of Labour of the Congo (PTC) was founded as was the People's Republic of the Congo, on December 31, 1969. The PTC was declared to be based upon "scientific socialism". Since that time, the PTC has done much to lead the people of the Congo towards the building of socialism. The Congo's wealth and natural resources have been nationalised. A National Democratic Conference was held in July 1972 for the purpose of discussion and criticism of the PTC. In July 1975, the first national development plan was announced, with the intention of placing the economy under strict popular control and state control. Finally, the PTC has held two Congresses to edify itself and to define the directions that the party and the country should take in the current popular democratic stage of the revolution. All totalled the People's Republic has advanced farther towards socialism in six years than the Cuban Revolution has in 18. However, many serious obstacles remain for the Congo, especially the task of achieving self-reliance and the necessity to stand firm against the two superpowers.

The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen is another excellent example for FRELIMO to follow in the building of both the Marxist-Leninist Party and socialism from the seed of a national liberation movement. After achieving independence from Britain in 1967, Yemen has developed similarly to the People's Republic of the Congo with two major differences. The United Political Organisation - National Front of Yemen has stressed the class struggle (of poor peasants against landlords, for example) more apparently than the PTC. On the other hand, the PTC has engendered democracy within the Congo and within the party, while the UPO-NF has not held an election within the DPR of Yemen.

Therefore, in constructing both the M-L Party and a socialist Mozambique, Frelimo has predecessors in other countries. Thus far, FRELIMO has generally been emulate correct examples and to guard against incorrect ones. In moving towards socialism, FRELIMO has paid constant attention to promoting the mass organisation and initiative of the people of Mozambique. In the area of agriculture, FRELIMO has not only campaigned for the re-allocation of "land to the tiller", but has also promoted cooperation and mutual aid among the peasantry. Concerted action amongst the peasantry in a traditional practice and has become a valuable instrument for FRELIMO to lead in the reorganisation of agriculture.

The two major forms of cooperative and collective organisation are the collective machambas and the aldeias comunais. The collective machambas are usually combinations of small clusters of peasants whose numbers amount to between 200 and 500 people. The collective machambas have proven very effective in concentrating and increasing production, in encouraging cooperation, and in the raising of political consciousness. In 1975, FRELIMO embarked on a campaign to raise rural organisation to a higher plane by introducing the aldeias comunais. These represent an effort to begin the widespread collectivisation of agriculture and the creation of a new "rural man". Originally the aldeias comunais have spread throughout the country, as several collective machambas combine their efforts. Thus far, FRELIMO has quite quite successfully moved the peasantry towards an equivalent of the "Great Leap Forward" that triumphed in China. Although collectivisation of agriculture may take years to complete, the people of Mozambique and the cadres of FRELIMO can claim to have outpaced their Tanzanian counterparts by far.

As previously mentioned, the organisation of the masses has affected the entire country. The Organisation of Mozambiquan Women (OMM) has already been noted for its longevity and effectiveness, relative relative to the rest of Africa. A concerted effort has been made since the end of 1974 to organise and strengthen the working class in trade unions. Besides engaging in political and economic activity, the trade unions have begun to marshall training courses and facilities for the workers. Youth organisations also emphasise the educational aspect in the hands of the now-enthusiastic masses, great strides have already been made. Not only have schools been built and a popular curriculum devised, but literacy campaign have sprung up throughout the country. In the area of health, Korea, China and other foreign donors have helped to fill the gap by sending doctors, medicine and expertise. However, FRELIMO has followed the Chinese example by emphasising preventive medicine. Campaign against specific diseases were an early feature of FRELIMO policy, ebbing away as the danger of serious epidemics decreased. Currently, a campaign to provide every household with a latrine is sweeping the country.

The various forms of activity among the masses enhances solidarity around FRELIMO and the advance towards socialism. However, the raising of political consciousness of the people remains the most important form of activity. The long-established consciousness raising organisations, the Grupos Dynamizadores have been now established throughout the country; The G'D's are located at the level of the machamba and aldeia, the factory, and the local community. Besides helping to raise the political



consciousness of the people, the G.D.s are instrumental in producing both an understanding and the implementation of FRELIMO policy. G.D's. aid in the mobilisation of people to form mass organisations and carry out the revolution. Through the G.D's. the people question and then apply directives in their own creative manner. In this way the G.D's perform a most basic and vital democratic function.

However the development of the G.D.s throughout the country has been most uneven. In areas where the anti-colonial struggle was most fierce, the G.D's have been progressing well. In the areas, I visited, such as Beira, the G.D's leave much to be desired. It appeared that noth class and national struggle had not gained much in intensity and that FRELIMO was experiencing a difficult time in organising and mobilising the populace. Also, even in the most militant areas, if political work and struggle does not continue, mass enthusiasm begins to wane. This trend threatens the national democratic revolution in quite a few areas. Of course, there is the tendency for the people to become over-zealous or misled in their activities. thereby, mistakes have been committed in relation to the tolerance of religion, as well as to the treatment of the 50,000 Portuguese who chose to remain. It is the responsibility of the G'D's to undertake criticism and self-criticism in these matters. Only through the interweaving of practice with both theory and ideology can the G'D.s become effective agents of the revolution in Mozambique.

Although much work remains among the workers and peasants of Mozambique, FRELIMO has initiated the task of building the Marxist-Leninist Party. In July 1975, Samora Machel announced the commencement of Comites de Partido throughout the country and the establishment of a party school. The party committees are set up and coordinated by FRELIMO cadres in conjunction with the most militant and effective Grupos Dynamizadores. The party committees are responsible for the slection of the most advanced sections of the Mozambiquan working class and peasantry for training as FRELIMO party cadres.

They are also supposed to prepare the people for the eventual introduction of a Marxist-Leninist party. Thus far, the task continues of establishing effective party committees, but no credible conjecture can yet be made as to whether and when Mozambique will have a party.

The prospects for socialism in Mozambique remain as indeterminable as the possibility of creating a Marxist-Leninist Party. Too many obstacles still remain in the current, national democratic stage of the revolution for FRELIMO to become overly-concerned about the distant future. Recently, the FRELIMO leadership was faced with yet another revolt within the people's armed forces. Anti-popular elements have not been entirely expunged from positions of responsibility. Reactionaries and fascists posing as revolutionaries represent the greatest threat to FRELIMO and popular power. In addition, Portuguese who may have proven valuable to Mozambique have continued to leave the country. Many claim that they have been harassed by both black individuals and by the FRELIMO government. New measures, calling for the confiscation of all private real estates can only lead to the further emigration of the few Portuguese who are left. If FRELIMO is to build a self-reliant socialist state, it must dedicate itself to a long tortuous process of reconstruction and development. Instrumental in this process will be the the long-suffering workers and peasants of Mozambique who have started their own history with virtually nothing except a revolution.

# **WE ARE LEADING A CLASS STRUGGLE TO CREATE A NEW MAN**

**SAYS SAMORA MACHEL IN INTERVIEW WITH LE MONDE MAY 1976**

The leaders of Mozambique seem resolved to directly help the movements for the liberation of Southern Africa and to win over to the theory of violence certain of its neighbours who upto now supported talks. It is in this context that we must situate the recent declarations of Kaunda, President of Zambia (Le Monde 23 April), who, on the occasion of his visit to Maputo, called upon Africans to unite against the minority white regimes in Rhodesia and South Africa.

The visit to the Soviet Union of a mission led by M.A. Chipande, Mozambique's Minister of Defence, who has just been received by the Russian Minister of Defence, Marshall Gretchko, underlines the concern of the Mozambiquan government team to widen its sources of arms provisions. In fact during the colonial struggle, it was the Chinese who provided arms for the liberation of Mozambique. R Lefort asked Samora Machel, President of Mozambique how he defined his regime and what role he assigned to his country in the evolution taking place in southern Africa.



*On what force do you depend to govern Mozambique and what kind of resistance does your action come against?*

The strength of the revolutionary process rests, as we have always emphasised in the alliance between the workers and the peasants. It is a wide front of all the workers, who directly, or indirectly, as in science or in the services of the state, produce material wealth and possess nothing.

On the face of it there does not exist a national bourgeoisie. We have an internal bourgeoisie which includes first of all a 'colonial' bourgeoisie.

The colonial bourgeoisie accumulates a large fortune by brutal exploitation and a repressive system. It derived its existence from the colonial war from the PIDE (Portugal's Political Police) and from massacres. In crumbling, the colonial system dragged the bourgeoisie down with it. Discredited by its past attitudes, the majority of the bourgeoisie left the country, trying to leave its wealth to the leaders.

The petty and middle Mozambiquan bourgeoisie, 30,000 at the greatest is a recent creation. These appeared when Caetano, seeing that the colonial war was lost, tried demagogically to mix (Africans with the) colonial bourgeoisie to whom he distributed crumbs, the possibility of acquiring small houses. At the best they were described as becoming developed for they could not be anything else than intermediaries; if they had formed themselves into a national bourgeoisie they would have become opponents and competitors of the fascist colonial bourgeoisie which was used to governing.

There was only at that time two forces: FRELIMO and colonialism. In attempting to create this third force, Caetano, wished to create an opponent to FRELIMO to whom he was hoping to abandon power.

In essence the Mozambiquan bourgeoisie had no economic power. It didn't even have the possibility of possessing the smallest agricultural or industrial enterprise. It is only a bourgeoisie by its vocation which is to substitute itself for the boss. It admires the culture of the coloniser not knowing that we have our own culture. So it is a bourgeoisie without personality and in these conditions I wonder if it can resist

*So the struggle against the bourgeoisie therefore in the first place is ideological?*

Yes

*You still establish a difference between the previous liberated zones and the zones under Portuguese domination and between towns and country. Why?*

The liberated zones were liberated from colonial exploitation. But also from superstition and the alienation of men from supernatural forces. The most important quality of the revolution is, for us, the deep transformation of society and mentalities, the establishment of loving relations between men by two essential means.: the establishment of collective values and the liberation of the creative initiative. These revolutionary conquests we must transport all over the country and in particular into the towns.

*What sort of economic development does Mozambique hope to engage in.*

We have chosen agriculture as a base of this development because it requires only a little investment; because we possess an unquestionable amount of experience in this domain, acquired in the liberated areas and because we can in this way immediately get results which will resolve the immediate problems of the masses: food and clothing. but we consider industry the driving force. The elevation of agricultural productivity depends upon it. Heavy industry alone, by using the immediate natural resources of our country, can on its own, lay the foundations of our prosperity and guarantee our national independence.

*Do you hope to break away from Western economic circuits?*

It is a long process, but our essential task is to become non-dependent. We would like to establish co-operation with as many socialist countries as with western countries. We want to break the dependence which comes from aid.

*To reach these political and economic objectives which model of power do you want to establish?*

Imagine asking a peasant or grass roots fighter what he was fighting against: colonialism or capitalism. In ten years of armed fighting he has not differentiated between them. In rejecting colonialism, our people have rejected capitalism. We have defined people's democracy as the present stage in the setting up of the power of the workers-peasants alliance, which demands a society where the essential means of production are collectivised and where the working classes dominate the State, the economy, science and culture.

*And does this stage demand an iron hand from FRELIMO?*

There isn't a class which commits suicide as a class: it must be fought and destroyed. This fight demands of FRELIMO a constant slow, firm struggle, a purification to establish a break. There is



divorce, incompatibility and non co-existence between the exploiting class and the workers. This class struggle calls for the creation of a new man and the new man is to be born out of the fight. A battle of ideas, a constant battle to eliminate the old so that the new many survive. Through the constant liberation of creative initiative we will give birth to this new man who will liquidate the contradiction between the brain and the hand. There cannot be a break (a difference-Ed.) between the two.

*What can be the role of the Portuguese in Mozambique today?*

The Portuguese in Mozambique are not Mozambiquans. Mozambiquans in Portugal are not Portuguese. Now, the role of foreigners in Mozambique can be important, but must be secondary, because it must be Mozambiquans who play the decisive role. The friendship between the two peoples calls for the destruction of colonialism. But it calls for still more the destruction of the after-effects of colonialism.

The Portuguese in Mozambique must then accept that their privileges as colonials must cease and they abandon the idea that they are living under the old system/regime. As for those who think it is impossible for them to live in Mozambique today without their privileges their presence is undesirable. That is why we are witnessing the massive departure of Portuguese from Mozambique.

*You had declared that the destiny of the African revolution was being played in Angola. What conclusion do you draw from the victory of the MPLA?*

Firstly this victory consolidates the progressive forces in Africa and shows that imperialism can no longer intervene as it likes.

Secondly this victory consecrates the right of the people to choose freely the political, economic and social system which suits them. This choice is not under the jurisdiction of the imperial powers. Thirdly the victory revealed the aggressive and expansionist dimensions of South Africa and reduced to ashes the myth of its military superiority. South Africa itself creates the conditions for development of the struggle in Namibia, where it was stagnating. South Africa lit a fire in Angola. In her retreat to Namibia she brought the fire back with her. And if she continues to be aggressive towards other peoples the same thing will happen, she will be attacked from all quarters.

## **The War In Rhodesia Will be Long**

*What type of struggle must the Rhodesian nationalists lead in your eyes?*

A great confusion still reigns today as to the correct definition of the enemy. People still reason in terms of the whites who dominate the Blacks. Only a people's war is going to define the enemy, other than in terms of colour or races. All Rhodesians, Blacks and whites, will then discover that this fight is a class struggle which opposes the exploiters to the exploited, the oppressors to the oppressed, that this is a war of liberation which must not only free men but must also free minds.

The essential problem in Rhodesia is today one of mental decolonisation and the end of the superiority complex of the whites and the inferiority complex of the blacks. On the other hand the war of the people in unifying the masses and the fighters permits communal thinking to develop. From this communal thought is born a definition of the target and of the objectives and a team of leaders. Finally the liberated zones that the people's war is going to create will ensure the setting up of new foundations on which the future state will be built and the birth of a new kind of relationship between men. This war, because it will become a war of the people will be long.

*What sense is there in your politics of non-alignment?*

We conceive non-alignment as being the constitution by all states which are not members of military blocks, of a wide anti-imperialist front, a front of states, small and medium which unite themselves to impose equality in international relations and their right to use, to the profit of their labouring masses the resources of their countries. We want to achieve an active non-alignment.

*You have declared that FRELIMO has grown from crisis to crisis. Are other crises inevitable.*

The crisis is permanent. It alone permits us to go forward and to distinguish between what is correct and what is wrong. The struggle is between those who want to serve the people and to serve their personal interests. The class struggle is inevitable and permanent. It alone allows the old ways and traditionalism as much as anarchy, to be wiped out.

**ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO: IKWEZI, c/o BASEMENT,  
103 GOWER STREET, LONDON, W.C.1.**



## FRELIMO'S NATIONAL ANTHEM

Viva viva FRELIMO  
Guide to the Mozambiquan People  
Heroic People who, gun in hand  
toppled colonialism.

All the People united  
From the Rovuma to the Maputo  
Struggle against imperialism  
And continue and shall win

Viva Mozambique  
Viva our flag, symbol of the Nation,  
Viva Mozambique  
For thee your People will fight

United with the whole world  
Struggling against the bourgeoisie  
Our country will be the tomb  
Of capitalism and exploitation

The Mozambiquan People  
Workers and peasants  
Engaged in work  
Shall always produce wealth.

## How The Russians Started War of Intervention in Angola

Colin Legum's essay in the book, "After Angola - The War over Southern Africa", throws a great deal of light over what what actually occurred there, and certainly gives the lie to the Soviet Union's real role there. He examines the role of the various parties involved in the war, and all his material relates as to how the war of intervention started and who was really to be blamed. The starry-eyed Marxists who believe that the Soviet Union and Cuba went to help the "Marxist" MPLA from a South African invasion will find little consolation here. Legum comes to the conclusion that the main reason for the Soviet/Cuban intervention "was to undermine China's influence in Africa rather than to help the MPLA to win for its own sake, or even to weaken Western influence."

Correctly he points out that although all the groups were ethno-linguistically based in the country yet they all subscribed to modern nationalist loyalties.

Legum shows Russia's opportunist role in their attitude towards the various factions of the MPLA. "During one of MPLA's frequent internal crises - the result of the diversity of its membership and leadership, as well as the awkwardness of Neto's personality - the Russians suspended support to Neto for two years in 1972 and 1973 and transferred backing to Chippenda who brought SA into Angola. But when it became clear to the Russians that Chippenda's bid was going to fail they switched their support to Neto. They invited Neto to Moscow where they told him that their intelligence sources in Lusaka had discovered that Chippenda's men were planning to kill Neto. The truth of the allegations against Chippenda was never confirmed but Neto attacked Chippenda and his men." Legum adds: "Neto has reason to be grateful to the Russians but he knows from his own experience that the Russians are capable of shifting their own loyalty to suit their own particular purposes."

For those who have a firm belief in MPLA's Marxism would be interested to hear Neto's comment: "MPLA is not a Marxist-Leninist organisation," said Neto, "also our leadership is not Marxist-Leninist. Some of us have read Marx and Lenin but we don't consider ourselves Marxist-Leninists. We are a large organisation with various shades of opinion and different types of groups united solely under the flag of liberation. As a heterogenous group, it contains both Marxist and other points of view."

Legum also gives an example of MPLA's pragmatism, its secret understanding and deals with Gulf Oil at the time of the civil war. A British journalist who said that the MPLA intended to nationalise Gulf Oil was summarily expelled from Angola. The MPLA also established a direct relationship with Diamang, the powerful multi-national diamond corporation in which South Africa's Harrys Openheimer (Anglo-American Corporation) has a major stake.

Unita was the only organisation based inside the country and it never had much external support. It made an attempt to get Peking's support but failed. But China eventually agreed to help Unita in its revolutionary struggle against Soviet imperialism, except that MPLA's quick victories, along with MPLA-Soviet bloc worldwide propaganda projecting MPLA as the "party of the people" made Nyerere change

his mind about helping Unita. The four Presidents themselves had agreed about Savimbi's leadership qualities.

About the Katangese mercenaries that MPLA used Legum says: "The Katangese mercenaries had long been a source of suspicion to Mobutu. They were a well-trained force of between 3,500-6,000 men who had gone into exile after the defeat of their leader, Tshombe, the former Katanga's secessionist leader. The Portuguese colonial authorities had kept them intact as pre-emptive threat to Mobutu in case he pushed his support for the FNLA guerillas too far. Now the MPLA took over this old colonialist weapon-



with which to threaten Mobutu. Between 350-450 of the gendarmerie were killed in an engagement with the the FNLA in March 1975. The Katangese mercenaries collectively outnumbered the 1200 or so Portuguese, British, French, Greek, South African and American mercenaries who fought with FNLA and Unita. Neither Holden nor Savimbi denied the use of mercenaries although they claimed that they were necessary to offset the the Cuban, Russian and Katangese fighting with the MPLA”.

## SOVIET UNION DEFIES OAU

“In June the barely viable political situation collapsed entirely leaving the country divided into two armed camps. Responsibility for this further deterioration - and about this there can be no reasonable doubt- belongs to MPLA, which deliberately extended the armed struggle between itself and what it saw as Zaire’s proxy, FNLA, to include armed attacks on Unita as well. Unita thus had to declare war on MPLA.

When Holden authorised Chippenda to go to Namibia for talks with South Africa Savimbi was alarmed, as he feared that Holden would strengthen himself with South African support. Savimbi was against the fratricidal war and said: “When elephants fight the grass suffers. This is an old African proverb. Today in my country, rival liberation movements are at war, but a war against each other is not just a war between Angolans. Now it is elephants who battle and we, the Angolans, still suffer, using us as their gunbearers.”

Russia was the only major Power which refused to abide by the OAU decision that neither of the claimants should be recognised. It openly challenged the OAU Chairman to recognise MPLA - a request - it felt it could make because it supplied Amin with arms.

The Russians denied Amin’s allegation that the MPLA did not represent the majority of the Angolan people. They insisted that the MPLA was the only authentic movement and that the Portuguese helped Holden set up his armed forces to fight the genuine patriotic forces. The other organisations were splitters and there was no civil war in Angola.

Russian assistance to MPLA from 1960-1974 was a paltry £27 million - during the days of fighting Portuguese colonialism. But during the civil war it shot up to £200 million. As Savimbi said, it gave the MPLA enough weapons to wipe out every man, woman and child in Angola.

The first definite evidence of sizeable Russian and Yugoslav arms reaching Angola goes back to 25 March when 30 Russian cargo planes arrived in Brazzaville. In April 100 tons arrived by air in Dar-Es-Salaam. there was a steady flow arms to the MPLA during the first half of 1974. This flow became a flood from mid-October shortly before South Africa entered the war on the 23rd of that month. During this period Igor Ivanovich, a Tass “correspondent”, who is a leading member of the Soviet intelligence was active in the capital.

## CUBA’S ROLE

Cuban intervention was initially clandestine - the first mention of it to the Cuban people was made at the end of January 1976, more than six months after the troops had left. One can get some idea about this by reading Granma when there was no mention of troops from Cuba in Angola at a time when they were there.

Cuba said that it only came into Angola to combat South African troops in November and that it only arrived there in late October. But one Cuban prisoner gave details of his unit’s arrival from Brazzaville in August 1975, almost two months before the South African arrival. FNLA sources said that almost 50 Cubans arrived in Brazzaville on July 25 to assist in handling of Russian arms. The first Cubans actually seen in operation by Unita was in mid-August.

Legum says: “There is little doubt that the Cubans were first brought into Brazzaville before July 1975 and were later drafted into batches to Angola - their numbers increasing dramatically from the first unofficial US estimate of 1500 to 3000 (in mid-November) to the estimate of 12,000 in the first week of February 1976. The mobilization and transport of such large numbers would require at least six weeks from the time the decision was taken so it is reasonable to assume that the Moscow-Havana agreement was taken at least in May 1975. The evidence of the Cubans spearheading the fight is so overwhelming: this is hardly surprising in view of the sophisticated weapons that were used and which few MPLA troops had been trained to handle.”

China’s role was the cleanest. It supported the Angolan liberation struggle from the beginning and unlike Russia accepted the OAU’s decision that support should go to all three movements. From 1958 its only link with Angola was with the MPLA which it never stopped supporting, although no aid went after 1974. The Chinese never criticised the MPLA. They explain their policy of supporting all three liberation movements meaning that if they support all three sides, none should go to any single movement. Peking trained the FNLA at the request of the OAU in 1973, at the particular request of Nyerere.

Russia went to every extent to slander Peking’s role. Thus: “The Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Organisation (AAPSO) which plays an important role in supporting Moscow’s policies against Peking in the Third World, staged an international rally in Luanda in 1976. Its purpose was explicitly stated by one of its leading officials, Aleksandr Dsashov, the Deputy Chairman of the



Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee: "Developments in Angola reveal the unsavoury role of the Maoist leadership which seeks to wreck the whole process of decolonisation in the country."

American policy was hostile to MPLA, FNLA, Unita and as Kissinger said it did not matter whether a Marxist Government took power, as in Mozambique, but whether Russia acquired a major role in independent Angola (super power contention, indeed). Kissinger reacted in particular to Mobutu's distress signals. Mobutu did not have an easy relationship with the U.S. - he had twice expelled the U.S. ambassador.

## **KISSINGER SUGGESTS TO RUSSIA SUPERPOWERS KEEP OUT**

Kissinger's critics argue that it was his attempt to aid FNLA to the tune of 79 million dollars that started the arms race with Russia, but as Legum says, the first supply of money not of arms was made in early 1975 to FNLA, but by March the Russians had already begun their escalation of the arms race over and above what they had given throughout the liberation struggle, and from the middle of the year the Cubans were already involved.

But even before March 1975 on at least two occasions Kissinger had suggested to Moscow that both super-powers should stay out of Angola in the interests of detente. The Russian answer was to accelerate the arms flow. But whether Russia would have acted in this manner if the Congress had not voted otherwise is another question.

The CIA was also opposed to a larger military aid being funnelled through Zaire.

US military aid to FNLA and Unita since January 1975 was of the order of £31 million. It arose to this amount only after the escalation of Russian and Cuban supplies.

The OAU's fact-finding Committee of Inquiry reported that Unita had the most popular support, followed by FNLA with MPLA having the least.

When Amin wanted to send a peace-keeping force the MPLA opposed it. It would not meet Amin either at a meeting attended by Holden and Savimbi. Holden told Amin that he did not hate the Soviet Union "but what right did a European country have to send troops into Africa".

## **SOUTH AFRICA DID NOT WANT TO INTERVENE**

South Africa was no stranger to Angolan soil. Since the time of the Unholy Alliance with Smith and Vorster it was always in Angola pursuing and hounding Swapo guerillas. The Portuguese allowed South Africa to go 200 miles deep into Angola after Swapo. It initially intervened to destroy Swapo's guerillas and to protect the dam on the Cunene River. At this stage they clashed with Unita. It only massively intervened after October 25 and it was encouraged to do so by some African states. But, Legum points out, they never intended fighting without US support.

But the South African intervention played into the hands of the Russians. It gave them the excuse for a massive military build-up out of all proportions to what was necessary. It provided a credible justification for the Soviet/Cuban role. It caused countries like Nigeria and Ghana to abandon their support for Unita, although the Nigerian Cabinet was split on this question.

South Africa itself withdrew after assurances in London and Moscow that the Ruacana dam would be safe.

Legum concludes that Moscow's plans in Angola could not have been made at short notice, "this suggests that careful thought had gone into the planning operation some time before the Russians first showed their hand."

## **CONCLUSION-- SOVIET UNION STARTED WAR OF INTERVENTION**

"Two facts are clearly established. First the Russians were engaged in sending substantial military supplies to MPLA by March 1975 - six months before the first US arms shipment had begun to reach the FNLA through Zaire and two months after Kissinger had asked Congress to approve a limited military programme for this purpose. Secondly the scale of the Soviet/Cuban intervention increased sharply in early October, which was three weeks before the SA forces entered Angola in any size."

"The Russian and Cuban contention that their military intervention was the result of SA intervention is clearly a post facto rationalization, since they were seriously involved before March 1975, and and they had already put their aid programme into its second phase by the beginning of October, fully three weeks the SA army had crossed the frontier.

"The Chinese on the other hand had made their decision to opt for neutrality as between the three rival movements in July when they immediately supported the Kampala decisions and announced their intention of withdrawing their instructors from FNLA camps. They gave as their reason that since they were not able to deliver aid to MPLA, they would have been taking sides if they were left supporting only FNLA and Unita. The Russians continued to accuse them of clandestinely arming FNLA, but their evidence is unconvincing.....and the Russian/Cuban contribution did as much, or more, than anybody else's to make it a "war of intervention".



# Letter

Dear Comrade,

Let me first congratulate you on the appearance of IKWEZI which is a great step forward towards the inevitable emergence of a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist party from the peoples of Southern Africa. It also provides a fine forum and rallying point for all those who have become disillusioned and sickened by the South African Communist Party and its Soviet bosses who merely seek to replace imperialist racist domination with their own brand of far more sinister domination.

Your article on Angola in the last issue has been vindicated by recent developments. The MPLA is no closer to uniting the people of Angola than it ever was and is in danger of becoming an instrument of a small minority dependent on the backing of the puppet troops still based in Angola. Unfortunately, many people are still very confused and unable to distinguish between fraternal internationalist support and imperialist intervention. Without making this distinction, only half the truth is evident (that U.S. imperialism belatedly intervened via the South African invaders) and not the fact that Soviet social-imperialism has successfully intervened via its advisers and Cuban forces. To ignore the fact that Angola has been turned into an arena for superpower rivalry is to become a tool of that "friendly" and "socialist" imperialist power, the Soviet Union.

When the glorious Red Army crushed the Nazi invaders at Stalingrad, a turning point was reached in the war and signalled the advance of the heroic Soviet troops in liberating their socialist motherland and pursuing the enemy across several European countries to annihilate it in its lair. This was absolutely correct and timely. But when the war ended, it was the first time in history that the army of a socialist state was occupying countries beyond its borders. In the early years after the war, the presence of the Soviet army mainly allowed the revolutionary forces of the occupied countries to blossom, and it was not long before People's Republics were established by the peoples of those lands. But in later years, particularly after Stalin's death and the ascendancy of revisionism within the CPSU, this very same army became an instrument of Russian domination over what it came to regard as its East European satellites.

The blatant military intervention in Czechoslovakia in 1968 demonstrated that this army, once hailed as liberators, would now unhesitatingly be used by this gang of renegades from socialism, to crush any resistance to its hegemony in countries under its sway. No one can forget that this invasion was made under cover of a request for aid by a group of pliant Czechs and that it was claimed that the Russian tanks rolled into Czechoslovakia to save it from "imperialist intervention."

This was the same gangster logic used by U.S. imperialism when it "helped" Central and South American countries in their struggle against Spanish colonialism and when it "assisted" the Algerians and the Vietnamese against French colonialism. These were not examples of disinterested aid: they were examples of how U.S. imperialism expanded its empire at the expense of those weaker, older ones - all done under the guise of supporting "freedom" and "democracy".

Let no one be taken in by the leaders of the Soviet Union when they claim to defend socialism but brutally suppress the national aspirations of other peoples. Within the Soviet Union, the Russian language and culture are stiflingly imposed on the non-Russian people. In its relations with Eastern Europe, India, Egypt, and other countries of the Third World, its behaviour in the past few years has been no different to that of the Western imperialist powers. The fact that it hides its true intentions under a cloak of "socialism" and "support for national liberation movements" only makes it that much more sinister and treacherous.

The growing number of examples of the expansionism of Soviet social-imperialism should be noted by comrades. India's military adventures against China and in dismembering Pakistan occurred with the connivance of the Soviet Union. In the Middle East they pursued a policy of "no war, no peace" by trying to hold back the Palestinians in their struggle against Zionism and holding back arms supplies to Egypt during their war against aggression. They sided with the traitorous Lol Nol clique in Cambodia against the Khmer Rouge when it suited them and have been pushing themselves into Portugal. They have military bases in many parts of the world including some African states and on Japanese islands which are still occupied. At present they are shielding Syrian intervention in the Lebanon against Palestinian forces whilst reassuring Israel that her existence is not threatened.

A shining example of real internationalist aid occurred in 1951 when the Chinese People's Volunteers joined the Korean People's Army in repelling a massive and direct invasion of the Democratic Republic of Korea by U.S. troops. Within two years of the cessation of hostilities, all the Chinese forces had left Korea, despite the fact that large numbers of US troops were still stationed in South Korea!

There are seven points to keep in mind:

(1) National liberation can only be won by relying on the masses, by mobilising the masses in revolutionary armed struggle, not by relying on the technology of highly trained foreign troops. National unity will



never be achieved with foreign soldiers on Angolan soil.

(2) Since the Soviet intervention, unprecedented divisions have appeared in the anti-imperialist unity of the African states and among the liberation movements in Southern Africa.

(3) The South African invaders were not defeated in Angola. They retreated with the loss of only 25 men. The Angolan people themselves could have dealt them a far more crushing blow if the Soviet Union had not prevented the unity of all three liberation movements.

(4) A recent statement by the Cuban Minister of Defence that Angola was an exceptional case and that he did not foresee having to send troops to other countries. This is a clear indication that the Cubans are getting uneasy about their role as a pawn in the super-power rivalry.

(The Soviet Union uses military aid to interfere in the affairs of other countries. Arms supplied to Egypt were manipulated during the last Middle East War to make the Egyptian Government conform to Soviet foreign policy. Egypt was quite justifiably now expelled her Soviet advisers and has faced showers of abuse from the Soviet press.

(6) Soviet social-imperialism is trying its utmost to expand everywhere and replace U.S. imperialism. It poses a threat to the national independence of every Third World country and undermines the national liberation movements to serve its own interest. Because of its growing arrogance and aggressiveness it has become the main enemy of the world's peoples. In its contention with that other superpower it is likely to drag the world into another global war.

(7) "Countries want independence, nations want liberation, peoples want revolution". This slogan represents the main trend in the world today. Africa is no exception and it will surely not be long before the Angolan people shake off this new imperialist threat and forge national unity and revolutionary independence. A people who have so recently been victorious in the struggle against Portuguese

colonialism will not long be deceived by neo-colonialist bullies.

MAFIROFIRO.

## **RUSSIANS APPLY PRESSURE UPON SWAPO TO BREAKAWAY FROM CHINA**

"Meanwhile it is significant that the Russians appear to be putting exceptional pressures on Swapo leadership to give up their links with their Chinese military trainers in exchange for Cuban and Russian support. That pressure is being tantalisingly applied on Swapo leaders in Brazzaville, where the Russians can demonstrate the impressive scale of military operations they established to supply MPLA with arms and in arranging for the Cuban back-up." (COLIN LEGUM: AFTER ANGOLA).

## **KAUNDA ON CHINA'S DISINTERESTED HELP TO LIBERATION MOVEMENTS**

"Assistance to liberation movements must not be an excuse for establishing hegemony in Africa. In this respect, we should learn from the People's Republic of China. Among the socialist countries China is easily the leading source of material assistance in the liberation struggle. China's contribution is immense. The OAU asked the People's Republic of China for assistance, it gave it willingly, but China has not sought to impose its will on the peoples of Africa. It has not sought to twist the arm of Africa by any means. In this context we in Zambia deeply regret the untimely death of Premier Chou-en-Lai. We pay tribute to him for leaving behind a clean record. China helped the struggle in Angola, but it has no imperialist ambitions. It has therefore refused to be involved in the tragedy of the Angolan civil war."

KENNETH KAUNDA AT OAU MEETING ON ANGOLA

## **HOW CHINA HELPS LIBERATION MOVEMENTS - THE CASE OF PALESTINE**

The September 1975 issue of "Free Palestine" published in London carried an article on the "special relationship" between the Peoples Republic of China and the Palestinians with regard to the latter's liberation struggle and the disinterested and principled way in which China helps this struggle. We produce excerpts from it to show how China helps the anti-imperialist and anti-colonial struggles of the world without interfering in the internal affairs of liberation movements as the social-imperialist Soviet Union is wont to do.

In the article Hani Hassan, Fatah revolutionary council member says: "Neither we nor the Chinese talk about what they have given us. We, because we have grown used to it as a routine, and they because they regard it as their duty.

Commenting on Hassan's visit to China, the article says: "There is no special significance in the visit: it is part of a quiet and almost unnoticed process of frequent visits to Peking by Palestinian delegations, a process which has been going on for over ten years. China occupies a special place in Palestinian guerilla affections.



"It was the first country to open its doors to the Palestinian revolution in 1964, and the first non-Arab country over which the Palestinian flag flew," said Hani Hassan.

He recalled that at an early meeting with Chairman Mao the latter said: "I have studied your case at length, and found it very complicated. If you are able to open a people's war, you will give the world a new experiment in people's warfare. All the potentials of the Chinese people will be forthcoming for whatever Palestinian revolution you begin."

"Since that time," the article adds, "Chinese support has been an almost unchanging factor in the Palestinian guerilla struggle movement's external relations. There have been no dramatic crises, no spectacular developments one way or the other.

"The close bond between China and Fatah stems from our shared view of the Palestinian revolution and its future." He outlined four basic elements underlying this good working relationship:  
- China does not recognise Israel, and regards it (as does Fatah) as the embodiment of American imperialism in the area. Premier Chou-en-Lai once said: "We will never recognise Israel, not today, not tomorrow, nor after a hundred years."

- China helps the Palestinians to fight against Israel. "Every time we go there, we hear them saying: We are with you for as long as you carry weapons against the Zionists."

- China rejects the idea of patronage and believes in self-reliance. There has never been any attempt to direct or control," says Hassan. "It is this practical position at trying times, a position unaccompanied by fleecing or special demands which makes China a friend dear to the hearts of the Palestinians."

After the June 1967 war, Fatah faced two crises: a shortage of trained military manpower, and a lack of weapons. "At the height of the Cultural Revolution, China opened the Nanking military college to dozens of officers and cadres," Hassan added.

"Historians of the future will record that from 1967 to 1970 the Palestinians fought with Chinese weapons," Hassan said.

"Free Palestine" (June 1976) reports that Fatah gets 80% of its aid and weaponry free from China. "And beyond counselling the Palestinians against the 'false friendship' of Moscow, Peking's aid to Fatah has been entirely without political strings". On the other hand Moscow has been trying to coerce the PLO to agree to a Geneva Conference where they should "dispose of the Palestinian birthright in exchange for a mess of pottage - a tame Palestinian statelet on the Jordan's West Bank." "The Palestinian Rejection Front has complained that Moscow has been urging Fatah to suppress the rejectionist groups, which oppose any form of Middle East settlement with Israel."

## **New Debate on Nature of Russia in M-L Movement**

A new debate is occurring within the world Marxist-Leninist movement. It concerns the correct attitude to take towards the Soviet Union. Most Marxist-Leninist movements agree that the Soviet Union is revisionistic and that it has slid away from being a meaningful socialist society. They would agree too that the Soviet Union has compromised the world revolution and has engaged in many deals with U.S.-led Imperialism. But what they cannot accept is that the Soviet Union has degenerated into a capitalist society of a new type run by monopoly-capitalist bureaucrats of a new type. Nor is it easy for them to accept that the Soviet Union has become an imperialist Superpower wishing to bring countries under their imperialist domination as much as old type Imperialism does. Neither will they believe that the Soviet Union wishes to utilise its enormous military build-up of the past few years to pursue its hegemonistic ambitions, that its contention with U.S. Imperialism could lead to a new world war and that it is the aims and ambitions of the Soviet Union which could unleash this war.

The Soviet Union could not have degenerated that far they will argue. Certain things have gone wrong but it cannot be said to be an imperialist power more dangerous than the United States.

This for us is not an academic argument. For the Southern African revolutionaries the mighty Soviet military intervention in Angola has got to be correctly understood. The Soviet Union is now interfering in Zimbabwe where it is attempting to bring an Nkomo government into power. Its pressures upon Frelimo has created splits within the organisation. It is attempting a similar thing with Swapo, where it is attempting to bring a section of its leadership under its embrace and to tear it completely from any Chinese influence. No doubt having done this it will divide Swapo and try to bring it completely under its control.

"Those who control Angola, control the whole of Southern Africa", a colonialist officer once said. We have no doubts whatsoever that the totally unjustified intervention of the Soviet Union in



Angola was made from this strategic purpose. We already see what it is attempting to do in the other Southern African countries.

The Chinese Communist Party, which is the most experienced and advanced Party in the international movement and which has given such mature guidance to the world Marxist-Leninist movement over the past decades since its polemic with the Soviet Union, has been foremost in pointing this out to us. While we do not take a slavish attitude to all that the Peoples Republic of China does and says we cannot but agree with what they have to say about the nature of Soviet social-imperialism ("socialism in words and imperialism in deeds"). But an analysis of the international situation in itself will bear out that what the CCP has to say is correct.

The debate about the nature of the Soviet Union is a very important one from the point of view of world revolutionary strategy and tactics. For this reason it must be approached with the utmost seriousness. For we do not wish to kick out the Western Imperialist wolf through the front door only to see the Soviet social-imperialist tiger enter through the back door. The question of understanding the social-imperialism of the Soviet Union puts a new light on its aid and assistance given in the name of anti-imperialism, helping national liberation movements, etc.

The Soviet Union is attempting to make advances currently in Africa. This poses a tremendous danger to the freedom and unity of the African peoples, many of whom are under the leadership and domination of petit bourgeois governments who are only too ready to accept Soviet aid to keep them in power. It is a danger too in that the Marxist-Leninist movements on the African continent are weak and in many cases non-existent, and thereby liable to be deceived by the socialist phrases of the Soviet agents that are all over the continent. Many Africans (particularly students) who are making contact with Marxism for the first time, and who have no understanding of the Sino-Soviet ideological conflict, or how the Soviet Union degenerated into a capitalist country of a new type, easily succumb to Soviet blandishments. And the Soviet Union is hard at work amongst African students on the continent.

For this reason in this issue we hoped to carry a long article defining the nature of Soviet society internally and pointing out how the Soviet Union has been pursuing its hegemonistic interests recently. A number of examples could be given. But for lack of space, and because so many other things occurring in Southern Africa at the moment demanded priority, we shelved aside many articles on the Soviet Union. Instead we are carrying a few we feel will be relevant to our African readers in particular.

In the next issue we will pursue this again and give a much more detailed account on the nature of the Soviet Union, and its aims and ambitions in the world.

## **Russian Social-Imperialism in Nigeria**

FROM NIGERIAN VOICE, PUBLISHED BY STUDENTS AT THE NORTH-WEST POLY.

.....Then came the civil war. The government appealed to the Soviet Union to supply military wares. The latter supplied much of the arms and ammunitions particularly the heavy ones and supersonic war planes. Along with them came the Soviet technical experts and instructors who alone knew how the machines worked, how to service and use the equipments. This was the backdoor through which the Soviet Union was to enter Nigeria and firmly establish itself.

The attitude that greeted the Russian supply was reminiscent of that of a harlot. When Gowon visited the USSR in 1974 the "Nigerian Herald" said: ".....we have much to derive from Russia, like technology, and this is very important to our agricultural and industrial expansion. Yet our nation is a vast source of raw materials very advantageous to Soviet industrial power." Nigeria should become an accursed supplier of "raw materials" to Soviet industrial power! This cannot be the thinking of a patriot who wants Nigeria to develop on a self-reliant basis and to make use of its own raw materials. That sort of attitude would play into the hands of the Soviet leaders who believe in the principle of the "international division of labour" which means that advanced countries like the Soviet Union should play the world role of suppliers of industrial products while a developing country like Nigeria supplies cheap raw materials for these manufactures! Moscow opportunistically has since been exploiting the Nigerian economy. How is it doing this?

According to Nkhumah, in reference to imperialist aid, the conditions that hedge it around are "the conclusion of commerce and navigation treaties, agreements for economic co-operation, the right to meddle in internal finances including currency and foreign exchange, to lower trade barriers in favour of the donor country's goods and capital, to protect the interests of private investments, determination of how funds are to be used; forcing the recipient to set up counterpart funds, to supply raw materials to the donor, and use such funds - a majority of it in fact - to buy goods from the donor nation, all of which apply to industry, commerce, agriculture, shipping and insurance, apart from others which are political



and military. These to a large extent and other unfriendly behaviour apply to Soviet-Nigerian relations.

Soon after the commencement of the trade in arms "a top level Soviet trade mission toured Nigeria in November 1976 prior to the signing of an agreement on technical and economic co-operation. Among the projects envisaged under the agreement was an iron and steel complex at an estimated cost of £N100 million. Since then the iron and steel projects have not come off the ground. The unwarranted delay would serve the purpose of keeping the country dependent on steel imports and give more time for spying and collecting valuable data on our material resource.

Again through the signing of the 1970 technical and economic co-operation agreement, Russia won a contract to engage in an aerial magnetic survey of minerals in our country. Reliable information from the University of Ibadan geology students reveal that they were being kept on the sideline (the same story you hear from Nigerian engineers in the employ of western oil firms in the country), and that samples are usually sealed, classified and only to be analysed by the Russians themselves without the participation of the Nigerians.

In this way they said the Russians keep the knowledge of mineral resource of our country out of the reach of other foreign monopolies and so be able to manoeuvre to win mining contracts.

This is how our Soviet "friends" fight imperialism with imperialism.

Following the 1970 agreement a joint Soviet-Nigerian venture has "Soviet Experts" engaging in offshore oil exploration. This is no different from Nigerian-Gulf Oil collaboration.

Just as Shell-BP set up an oil industry training centre in Ughelli, so has the Soviet Union set up the same type of training centre in Warri in competition with other monopolies. Soviet training centres for metallurgical workers, geologists and builders were also in the offing in 1974.

Other areas of Soviet investments in Nigeria are in commerce. Vaaleko and Calteco are joint-stock companies (i.e. partly indigenised, partly Soviet). The former is a motor distributing company which is no different in kind from and competing with UAC's Niger Motors (also partly indigenised), Briscoe, etc. These businesses were considered to be "particularly successful" in 1974 by the Soviet Novosti News Agency. Novosti thus hints at good profits realised from these businesses, profits realised by the exploitation of the Nigerian working people. Being a partner, part of the profit accrues to the Soviet Union and some of this cannot be ploughed back into the Nigerian underdeveloped economy. Many of us know about the vehicles they sell us which start changing sounds after a few months of use.

It should be noted that whereas the last Soviet party congress supported on paper as "progressive" the "nationalisation of foreign enterprises to assure the young states" effective sovereignty over their natural resources, and formation of their own personnel", the fact that the Soviet Union seizes any opportunity to go into business partnership with the young states belie their words.

One other means of Soviet "economic imperialism" is the Eastern European Comecon International Investment Bank. Founded in 1970 by Bulgaria, Hungary, German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union with an initial capital of 1,000 roubles (transferable), it was reported to have started operation in 1974, giving loans to developing countries for construction, reconstruction and modernisation in industry, agriculture and other branches of the economy. Conditions for obtaining credit for a time varying for up to a maximum of 15 years is that there would be "agreement on deliveries of equipment and other material for projects which are to be built, using the means provided by the fund" (i.e. Comecon transportation) as well as an arrangement for "deliveries of commodities from borrowing countries." This means that the Soviet Union and its Eastern European allies would supply technology and we supply to them raw materials and cheap labour and hence encourage and perpetuate underdevelopment and dependence on them. This is the international division of labour in practice.

Exposing the exploitative nature of this policy on an Africa-wide scale, an official Albanian paper showed last year that Russia was taking advantage of the current economic problems of African countries to plunder their natural resources "behind the mask of interest-free aid..." It is estimated that a Russian jeep formerly exchanged for 14 bags of coffee now cost 43 bags and a ton of steel has gone up from one ton of bananas to three tons.

In trade, Moscow pulled a fast one in 1974. This was on the occasion of the "piracy of nearly £13 million worth of cement from a Russian naval vessel intercepted in Nigerian territorial waters. The "Daily Times" quoting the External Affairs Commissioner, Dr. Okoi Arikpo, as saying that the blame was on "faithless Russian sailors" entrusted with taking the cement to Lagos. The Commissioner said that the cement which was meant for the state-owned National Supply Company which was to sell it so as to undercut obnoxious high prices following acute shortages, was intercepted by unidentified Nigerian business "with foreign collaboration". Continuing the Commissioner said these businessmen offered a price above the original amount to the Russians who then sold the entire consignment to the former who transferred it to a waiting ship which unloaded it in Apapa. When questioned the Soviet embassy refused to comment.....

The Russians got a high price out of this unfriendly trade practice. The above shows how Russia cashes in on acute shortages, thereby aiding and abetting price inflation and increasing the burden on our people and our economy. (The Russians are notorious for buying cheap and selling dear. For instance, they sold the same natural gas they bought from Iran at three times the amount it was bought to West Germany).



Since their infiltration of aid in 1968 through military-technical "aid" they have not only tried to win economic influence by way of the public sector but also through the private sector. They have encouraged private accumulation. In the Soviet "know" some big guns "made it" while acting as middlemen for Soviet-Nigeria arms trade during the war. To "help" Nigeria cope with her medical problems, Moscow gave some medical doctor the capital with which his hospital was built. This hospital charges those who can afford it exorbitant fees. This doctor who happened to be the leader of the Socialist Workers and Farmers Party is then expected to expound the Soviet cause. This is what his party did and has gone on holiday with the other political parties since military rule erupted in 1966.

The "socialism" which the Soviet Union parades is no socialism at all. It is only socialism in words but naked imperialism in deeds. Because of the enormous economic and military resources and technical advance of the USSR (also great in area and population) it is not a mere imperialist but a super-power imperialist which has since the past two decades been competing with the other - United States.

Russian social imperialism is knocking at very backdoor which is not tightly locked. It is using its creeping tactics of first offering the bait of "aid" to make a country whose door is opened, no matter how slightly, swing it open even more widely or rip it off altogether only to have enter "Soviet industrial power." Wherever possible the Soviet Union has tried and to varying degrees succeeded in tying its military and technical aids to the acquisition of military bases and facilities for its own use from recipient countries. This is the case in Somalia where the government in return for aid has made Berbera "the centre of Soviet activity in the Indian Ocean, capable of accommodating most Soviet naval vessels and submarines. It also has a Barrack ship and is protected by Soviet surface-to-air missile batteries."

In Guinea, "West Africa" reported that Moscow was denying that it was pressurising the Guinean Government to allow it a base in an island off Conakry. That month The "Daily Telegraph" reported that Conakry had become an operational base for Russian Bear and Badger long range aircraft." In 1971 the Guinean President had rejected a similar request from the Soviet Union.

The Egyptian case is much more publicised. There it supplied arms at high prices for the Egyptian people to liberate their land from Israeli Zionist occupation. The supply of spare parts was inadequate (also a Sudanese and Ugandan experience) and used as a lever for economic and political extortion.

In Angola, before the Cuban Army entered the civil war, the MPLA had rejected an offer from the Soviet Union to deploy its forces (apart from the military personnel it already had there) to "protect" the ports of entry of war materials.

## **SINGAPORE:BASE FOR SOVIET ECONOMIC EXPANSION**

Until late last year, Moscow Narodny was the fastest-growing bank in Singapore. In 1973, it was ranked the top bank in Singapore in respect of its earning assets (loans and advances to customers, bills receivable, investments in Government securities, shares and properties and investments in and amounts due from subsidiaries). Many observers attribute Moscow Narodny's meteoric rise to the business acumen, ambition and connections of its Singapore manager and adviser, P.K. Teo. However, criticism of the bank was raised that it has not stuck to its publicised objective of promoting east-west trade and has gone heavily into property development financing, and that Moscow Narodny was being politically motivated in its expansion in Asia. The bank's eager involvement in companies related to property development would be understandable against the property orientated background of Teo and other Chinese bankers. Teo's answer to allegations that Moscow Narodny was being politically motivated in its expansion in Asia is: "When I did business for the Bank of America nobody said I was working for the CIA. Why this cry now?" Teo's associates rule out any political motivation underlying the bank's operations by pointing out the large number of friends he has in Singapore Government circles. Lee and Lee, a leading firm of solicitors in which Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew's wife and brother are the senior partners, are the legal advisers for the bank.

In Kuala Lumpur, there is some concern in official circles about Moscow Narodny extending finance to Malaysian companies and individuals. The concern is in relation to both methods and motives. Malaysia does not allow foreign State-owned banks to operate in the country. The Bank of China had to close its branches in Malaysia in the early 1960s. Some 10 years later, following the nationalisation of the Indian banks by Mrs. Indira Gandhi, these banks had to reconstitute themselves by offering majority shares to Malaysians. Moscow Narodny seems to be frustrating these policies by extending finance for operations in Malaysia against securities in Malaysia. Among Malaysian companies directly or indirectly associated with Moscow Narodny are Central Securities, Island Hotels and Properties, Kuala Lumpur Enterprises and Perak Carbide. One of the ways to avoid official attention is by an arrangement whereby the loans are obtained by companies incorporated in Hong Kong or Singapore and then transferred to Malaysia as inter-company transfers. It is through such operations that companies like Mosbert Berhad, South Johore Amalgamated Holdings, Malaysian Wood Wool Products, Benut Industries, Han City Industries and Sabah Quarry now find themselves indebted to Moscow Narodny. Moscow Narodny has obtained voting control of these companies. (SOURCE: FAR EASTERN ECONOMIC REVIEW: JANUARY 30, 1976)



# Revolutionary African Students Reject Detente

Revolutionary African students strongly challenged a resolution in essence relating to detente at a Symposium on Apartheid co-sponsored by the International Union of Students and Dar-Es-Salaam University. The Conference held late last year was another example of Soviet attempts to infiltrate African students through organisations like the IUS, a pro-Soviet body. The Resolutions connected with Apartheid in South Africa talked about "the relaxation of tension" - tell that to the people of Soweto. It described apartheid as an international crime (sic) and said that it had its roots in capitalism "which accentuated the gap between the haves and have nots and gave vent to war, colonialism and imperialism". Firstly apartheid is a product of imperialism and is shored up by imperialism. It is the result of the colonialist expansion of British imperialism. British Imperialism is still the major looter in Azania.

It spoke of "racialism as a colonial tool that helps imperialist and multi-national monopolies in intensifying exploitation of colonised peoples and lands". No, racialism is the direct product of imperialism. To smash racialism one has to smash imperialism. Racialism is one face imperialism can wear during a particular historical phase. In the epoch of neo-colonialism it can change its face but the essence of imperialist domination still remains.

The resolution in calling for equality between black and white said nothing about doing away totally with the economic basis of exploitation on which racialism is founded. As if doing away with racialism will suddenly give equality to the blacks, whereby they will be lifted up to the same level as the whites - all living in luxurious homes and driving around in posh cars. No, real equality for blacks will only result from doing away with all the economic, social and political structures of exploitation upon which racialism is based. The national struggle of the blacks for formal equality must be linked to the struggle for socialism which aims to put an end to the exploitation of man by man.

The resolution spoke about apartheid being able to "maintain its position only because of the political, economic and military support they receive from the developed capitalist countries, particularly U.S.A., Britain, France, west Germany and Japan". This is the old Anti-Apartheid, ANC-CP line of imperialism collaborating to keep apartheid alive in Azania. The fact is that imperialism itself is the enemy and is the stuff that apartheid is made of. Imperialism will not stop "collaborating", it will merely change its form - hence the Kissinger-Vorster meeting recently. And so on and so on, the resolution went.

There was no talk of the necessity to break the structures of apartheid through a revolutionary peoples war based in the masses with the workers and peasants as the leading force rallying around them all other progressive and democratic forces. No talk here that the state power upon which apartheid is based being smashed through armed struggle. But then detente does not deal with breaking the capitalists state power; it means deals and compromises with imperialism.

The revolutionary African students in condemning the Communique put out by the IUS said that the latter's communique is "full of fluid, idealistic and sentimental conceptions. It lacks a theory of imperialism."

The symposium condemned detente in Southern Africa but advocated detente between USSR and U.S. But what is the difference between the two. The whole IUS resolution was in formity with detente and therefore its condemnation of detente with South Africa was a lie. Its own resolution was wishy-washy liberalism.

The counter resolution of the African students said: "Kremlin and Washington at Helsinki (the concert of Europe re-enacted) over champagne, would want us to believe that over conference tables, they are resolving the major contradiction of the world today. They would want us to believe that disarmament and arms limitation are steps towards the abolition of war, and that they are making the world safe and reducing tension."

## HOW THE SACP SLANDERS CHINA

Below we re-produce an article from the "World Marxist Review", a pro-Soviet Journal published in Prague. One of the authors of the article belongs to the South African Communist Party, African National Congress of South Africa clique. This clique likes to fool the international public that they are disinterestedly serving the interests of the peoples of South Africa. But for a long time they have attached themselves to the Soviet Union, almost thoughtlessly. Nothing can shake them from



their slavish and unquestioning loyalty to the Soviet Union. For them the interests of the Soviet Union is inseparable from that of their own and that of socialism. For them world socialism can only be brought about by following the line laid down by the Soviet Union. It does not matter how contradictory it is, it will be blindly followed. Today they are the strongest advocates of detente because that is what the Soviet Union advocates. To-morrow it will be something else. But whatever it is they will follow it. For the South African Communist Party and the African National Congress of South Africa clique that belongs to it, there are very good reasons for this slavishness. It has very little to do with creating a genuinely communist society in South Africa - they do not have the creative ability to apply Marxism-Leninism to South African conditions, nor they they have the interest to do so. But what matters to them today is that it is the one way in which they be kept politically alive and hope one day to be the rulers of a new South Africa, free from apartheid fascist rule. The Soviet Union gives the ANC and SACP something like one million dollars a year - it is by far the richest liberation movement in the world. So the loyalty is firmly based in the material interests of both the Soviet Union and the ANC-CP.

What is perhaps most disgraceful is that the ANC-CP itself turned away from the Peoples Republic of China. Peoples China has never once attacked the ANC-CP. But the ANC-CP has always attacked and slandered it. At international conferences the Soviet Union can always rely upon the ANC-CP playing the role of the hatchet man for them. When the whole world condemned the invasion of Czechoslovakia and when Rumania at an international conference stood up to criticise the Soviet Union for its infringement of the territorial sovereignty of the country, who do you think would stand up to publicly criticise Rumania and actually rebuke the Prime Minister, Ceausescu. None other than the representatives of the SACP. And for that they were duly patted on their back by their masters. In numerous conferences the ANC-CP has attacked Peoples China on behalf of the Soviet Union, when greater and more important parties would not have the temerity to do so. That a liberation movement from one of the most oppressed countries of the world, should turn its back to assistance from a great Socialist country like China is shocking. It also reveals how much they really care about bringing liberation to the peoples of Azania.

It is even more shocking that a liberation movement from a Third World country should take up this sort of attitude towards another country belonging to the Third World, a great socialist country which has done more than any other country in our times to help the liberation struggles of the Third World and to help the general struggle of the Third World against imperialism.

The article re-produced below is nothing more than a repetition of the lies and slanders of the Soviet Union against great socialist China. Its aim is nothing more than to serve the interests of the Soviet Union.

The lies about China's position on Angola are repeated. These we have already refuted in our last issue. China's role in Angola was a principled one, as it has always been. China was one of the first countries to help the MPLA as it has done throughout its struggle against Portuguese colonialism. That all the leaders of the Angolan struggle themselves can testify to.

To speak about China penetrating Africa, as the SACP writer suggests here, is too ridiculous for words. China has always had the disinterested interests of Africa and other Third World countries at heart. Her aid programme, which is based on genuinely helping the countries of the Third World can testify to that. This year China has given more aid to Africa than either the Soviet Union or the United States. And the amount of her aid has also considerably increased. This from a country which is herself developing.

SWAPO as is well known has always been assisted by China. She has a policy of not interfering in the internal affairs of liberation movements, while aiding all the liberation movements in their struggle against colonialism and imperialism. China has not turned her back against any liberation movement in Southern Africa or any other part of the world.

The authors speak about China encouraging the splitters COREMO in Mozambique. But how is it that FRELIMO gives China most favoured nation treatment in Mozambique and that it was China which was given the privilege of presenting their credentials before the Soviet Union at the time of Mozambique's independence day. Is it not an insult to Samora Machel to say that China encouraged the splitters, COREMO.

China has certainly helped the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania, a recognised liberation movement all over the world. But it has never attempted to give it more favoured treatment to the ANC of South Africa. Indeed in the days before the polemic between the Soviet Union and China leading ANC men were trained in China, amongst them Wilton Mkayi and Raymond Mahashlaba of Umkhonto ki Sizwe. If anything the ANC of South Africa which turned its back on China. Even today if the ANC approached China for help she would receive it. But the ANC-CP would rather play the role of the Soviet Union's lackey than do that.

The other slanders here about China exploiting tribalist antagonisms is not even worth refuting.

But when the authors get on to the favourite theme of the Soviet Union that China advocates a racial war between the Third World and the white world, then they sink to the level of the gutters and reduce themselves to guttersnipes. China's position - a principled Marxist-Leninist one - that the



struggles of the national liberation movements against imperialism is the weak link in the imperialist chain has always been twisted by the Soviet Union. Only in China is a white man, Norman Bethune, the model of proletarian internationalist behaviour for the whole of the 800,000,000 Chinese people. Only in China are the national minorities given complete equality and their customs and traditions respected. This cannot be said about how national minorities are treated in the Soviet Union.

These are only some of the refutations we wish to make here. The others are so manifestly absurd that they are not worth refuting. It says more about the authors who write such rubbish than about great socialist China.

**HIS MASTER'S VOICE:** Text of the article by member of the ANC-CP clique slandering and abusing People's China. The South African Communist Party members who engage in this filthy work on behalf of their Soviet masters are well paid for it too - holidays in the Balkans, etc.

### *Maoism self-exposed in Africa*

AMATH DANSOKO, ESSOP PAHAD

**T**HE events in Angola speeded the growing, historically inevitable differentiation between the democratic, progressive forces and the reactionary, conservative and neo-colonialist forces of Africa. They greatly stimulated the anti-imperialist movement on the continent. The Angolan battlefield showed Africans their real friends and allies and their sworn enemies in the international arena. Illusions about certain international forces posing as fighters against imperialism, for the freedom of peoples were given up one after another. We mean primarily the Maoists. Their policy on the African continent, especially towards the events in Angola, revealed once again how very far Maoism has gone in betraying the cause of revolution and freedom.

Over ten years have passed since the mid-1960s, when Peking proclaimed the "five principles" of Chinese policy in Africa and declared in support of the anti-imperialist struggle, the movement for non-alignment and the African peoples' effort for unity and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means, promising at the same time to respect the sovereignty of African states. The time has come to take sober stock of how these principles are applied in practice.

The facts leave no room for doubt that the Maoist leadership has from the first regarded penetration into Africa as part of its policy of bringing certain areas of the world and whole continents under the influence of Peking. The Maoists used the strategy of setting up strongholds in Africa, singling out Zaire, Tanzania, Zambia and some other influential states. They effected their penetration into these and other African countries on the demagogic pretext of giving full support to the liberation movement. What this "support" meant in reality was shown as far back as the 1960s by Maoist activity in the Belgian Congo.

It is hard to assess the damage caused by Peking to the liberation forces of that sorely tried country. Following the tragic death of Patrice

countries. A strong progressive Africa does not suit a Peking obsessed by hegemonic ambitions. By provoking internal unrest in African countries and exploiting tribalist antagonisms, the Maoists encourage separatist sentiments and movements. Their support of the Biafra separatists in Nigeria is one of the more striking cases in point.

Lastly, contrary to its fiery protestations of an uncompromising stand on racialism, Peking has come to advocate in Africa a "racial war" between the "third world" and the "white world". The Maoists have openly assumed the role of proponents of the most reactionary, most obscurantist ideas. By attacking internationalism and anti-imperialist class positions, the Chinese leadership wants to implant a reactionary nationalist ideology, racism and chauvinism in African countries. In the light of this fact, the growing co-operation between South Africa's racists and the Maoists does not seem so very strange. Nor is it accidental that today Peking encourages the expansionist schemes of Pretoria by backing the Vorster regime's policy of "detente".<sup>1</sup> The Maoists' attitude to this regime is, in effect, the same as the imperialists'.

Lumumba, the Maoists contrived to involve some of his followers in an extremist policy. Peking tried to bring the movement of Lumumba's followers under its sway by defaming the socialist community, specifically by accusing the Soviet Union of surrendering to imperialism. Subsequently Maoist influence was a major factor in the defeat of what was a powerful movement.

Along with attempts to win over African patriots, Peking has throughout these years followed the tactic of allying itself with domestic anti-national groups and organisations. In Namibia, it fostered the South West African National Union (SWANU) for a long time while denying support to the South West African People's Organisation (SWAPO). And though afterwards the Chinese leadership had to recognise SWAPO, Maoist subversion against the Namibian liberation movement continued.

In the South African Republic, Peking pinned its hopes on a handful of traitors to the nation enjoying especial favour in imperialist quarters. We mean the Pan-Africanist Congress, which is opposed to the country's leading national liberation movement, the African National Congress. For more than a decade now, the Maoists have been giving political and lavish financial aid to the anti-Communists and renegades in the Pan-Africanist Congress. They have also encouraged splitters from the so-called Revolutionary Committee of Mozambique (COREMO) and counterposed them to the FRELIMO patriots.

Peking's assurances of supporting the movement for non-alignment, which comprises almost all African states, turned out to be an empty promise. The Maoists are against the development of the movement's genuinely anti-imperialist principles. Their sole concern is to draw African states into the sphere of their influence.

The Maoists have shown themselves to be a force hostile to the anti-imperialist unity of the African peoples. They foment division on the continent in an effort to undermine the front of progressive

Democratic, progressive Africa knows by experience the meaning of the Maoist-imperialist alliance. In looking at what the bourgeois and Maoist press writes about the Angolan events, even an unenlightened reader will discover a surprising "unanimity" of comments and estimates. Both the bourgeois and the Maoist press harp on "Soviet interference" and "Soviet colonialism", calling for a tougher stand towards the Soviet Union and burying detente alive.

Like the imperialists, Peking attaches great importance to alliance with conservative African regimes. Thereby the Maoists deliberately create a mortal threat to opposition organisations and forces which China encouraged until recently to fight against their respective regimes. According to some press reports, Mao Tse-Tung said that the support of those forces had been a "mistake" for which China had paid "very dearly". The Maoists did not even shrink from offering their apologies to certain quarters for having backed Lumumba's followers. To show their "good faith" and improve their relations with the various regimes, they even liquidated organisations which they had until recently taken under their tutelage, as in Cameroun, Niger and some



other countries. All this is evidence of a complete lack of principle on the part of Chinese politicians, who are only prompted by chauvinist, cynically pragmatic considerations.

There is an obvious tendency among the imperialists and Maoists today to accord each other "most-favoured-nation treatment" in carrying out joint propaganda and political actions. Bourgeois propaganda aimed at the African continent rehabilitates and embellishes Maoism, thereby helping Peking appreciably in its attempts to bolster its position. The Maoists reciprocate. While urging African countries to restrict economic and other relations with the Soviet Union, Peking declares for the fullest development of essentially neo-colonial relations between the Common Market and Africa. The Maoist-imperialist alliance in Angola is further evidence of Peking's consistent support for the most reactionary imperialist quarters plotting against progressive forces in many parts of the world. Maoism, says a Central Committee resolution of the South African Communist Party, is exposing itself as a dangerous anti-Communist, anti-Soviet and pro-imperialist policy. This has been confirmed by the experience of Chile, Bangladesh and many other developing countries.

Underlying the Maoist-imperialist alliance is a morbid hatred for the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community, which both imperialist reaction and "leftists" regard as the main obstacle to their policy in Africa and elsewhere. Maoist subversion is spear-headed against alliance of the forces of socialism and national liberation.

Peking has for years been trying hard to isolate the peoples of Africa from their reliable allies, first of all from the Soviet Union. The Maoists attach special importance to plans for fanning the anti-Soviet campaign. The notorious concepts of "superpowers", "poor and rich" countries, and so on, are expected to serve the same purpose. In advocating the nationalist and racialist idea of "uniting the poor countries" of the "third world", of which, the Maoists say, "developing, socialist China" is part, Peking propaganda described the

<sup>1</sup> See "'Detente'—Vorster Style" in *W/MR*, February 1976.

Soviet Union as the "number one enemy", alleging that imperialism no longer presents any serious danger.

Maoist leaders feel no qualms about using falsehood or calumny against the Soviet Union. A record was probably set by Foreign Minister Chiao Kuan-hua at a Peking reception in honour of a Zairean delegation, at which he made a slanderous anti-Soviet speech. Commenting on the Angolan events, Chiao deliberately increased the usual dose of stock accusations and vituperation of the Soviet Union to conceal the crisis and daily condemnation of Maoist policy in Africa, primarily in view of the Chinese position on Angola. By co-ordinating its subversive policy with the policy of the imperialists and South African racists and by assuming the role of "guardian" of the FNLA and UNITA puppets and their leaders, Roberto and Savimbi, the Maoist leadership has fully exposed itself as an enemy of African peoples.

The Maoists' solidarity with the worst enemies of an independent Angola was a real culmination of the exposure of the methods used by Peking against the genuinely revolutionary forces of liberation movements.

The history of this betrayal goes back to the early 1960s, when the Chinese leadership took a hostile attitude towards the Angolan people's vanguard, the People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA). Peking showed especial benevolence towards the "Angolan revolutionary government in exile" under Holden Roberto. At the same time the Maoists tried to disrupt the MPLA from within. They supported the liquidationist attempts of Da Cruz, ex-secretary for organisational matters, who later deserted to Roberto. In other words, the Maoists' traitorous role in Angola today is a logical sequel of their earlier policy.

"All my men were trained by the Chinese", Roberto bragged. "besides, the Chinese give me their unqualified aid." To this day, US and Chinese instructors train bands of traitors to the nation, pitting them against the finest patriots of the country's liberation movement. In a statement released on November 15, 1975, the Central Committee of the African Independence Party of Senegal expressed deep concern about the activity of the Maoist-CIA alliance in Angola and denounced its as collusion against the people.

Maoist intrigues in Angola caused a storm of anger on our continent. The most influential and authoritative leaders of African revolutionary democratic regimes criticised the Chinese leaders' position, which is also emphatically condemned by the Angolans themselves. President Agostinho Neto of Angola, criticising Peking's attitude, said that China found itself in the camp of the enemies of the republic's lawful government. Widespread international recognition of the People's Republic of Angola, primarily by most members of the Organisation of African Unity, and its admission to the OAU are indicative of the extent of Peking's isolation over this issue.

The prevailing mood of progressive world opinion in regard to the subversive policy of Peking was expressed by the Extraordinary International Conference of Solidarity with the Struggle of the Angolan People (Luanda, February 1976), attended by prominent politicians and other public figures from numerous countries, particularly African countries. The participants sharply criticised the Maoist manoeuvres and showed them up as being thoroughly alien to the interests of the national liberation movement. In a general declaration adopted by it, the Luanda forum condemned the Peking Maoists, who side with the enemies of the Angolan people and found themselves in an "unholy alliance" with the South African racists, US imperialism and its puppets.

It is becoming more and more difficult for Peking to smuggle its ideas into Africa and win support for them. At a press conference in July 1975, President Julius K. Nyerere of Tanzania dismissed out of hand the possibility of economic relations with China being used for influencing Tanzania ideologically and politically. In Congo, Tanzania and Guinea, Chinese military experts have been forbidden to carry on propaganda in the armed forces. The channels through which Peking tries to impose its influence are narrowing.

Maoist attacks on the Soviet Union and other members of the socialist community are fittingly rebuffed on our continent today. They are condemned both by the ruling quarters of many countries and by African opinion at large. This is particularly evident in the case of Angola. President Ahmed Sekou Toure of Guinea stressed that

## THE DANGER OF SUPERPOWER CONTENTION TO AFRICA

This is an excerpt from a paper presented at a Symposium on Southern Africa in Dar-Es-Salaam early this year. The paper attempted to "examine aspects and problems of the changing imperialist strategy and ever-developing anti-imperialist struggle in Africa. particular section presented herein deals with the question of Angola and superpower rivalry between the USSR and US in that country. We present it for its analysis of Russia's role there recently and the grave threat it presents to the freedom and unity of Africa.



However, the chief threat to US imperialist hegemony in Africa comes, not from these rather old, anaemic and enfeebled imperialisms, but from its present chief partner in the enterprise of raising "a new structure of world peace", the other - younger, more vigorous and more aggressive - superpower. The US-Soviet rivalry is now, clearly, the mainspring of imperialist conflict in Africa; and a comparison of the of the Congo in 1960 with Angola in 1975 is as good a measure as any of how in recent years the balance of power between the two superpowers has been shifting markedly in favour of the Soviet Union. In the old imperialist style the Soviet policy in Africa seeks to foster divisions and conflicts among the African people and countries, while in a new imperialist style it seeks to divert the African liberation struggle from the path of active resistance and revolution, in various places and various means. The latter is best exemplified by the case of South Africa, where the Moscow-controlled South African Communist Party has long sought to infiltrate and seize control of the ANC with a view to directing and doctoring the African liberation movement. It has sought to do this not only organisationally but also by pushing a political line which has had the effect of seriously dividing Marxist-Leninist forces from African nationalist forces, because of the sectarianism of its policies (masquerading as multi-racialism) and the bureaucraticism of its organisation and methods of work. This has led it, furthermore, to concentrate on international work as opposed to local political work, and to rely mainly on diplomacy as opposed to armed struggle. In this line of the SACP is but an echo of the revisionist line of the CPSU.

But it is the present civil war in Angola which illustrates most vividly the fact that rivalry between the two superpowers is now the main source of imperialist power politics and of the many-sided foreign interference in Africa, and the chief danger to the interests, independence and unity of the African people. It demonstrates, moreover, that of all foreign powers, imperialist or 'socialist' the Soviet Union is today the single most active source of foreign interference in Africa, and thus increasingly the single greatest threat to African independence and African unity. At a fairly elementary level this may be seen in the rather crude attempt, recently, by the Soviet Ambassador in Uganda to browbeat Amin, in his capacity as chairman of the OAU, to recognise a particular government in Angola, and in the hectoring message addressed some months earlier by the Soviet regime to the annual summit meeting of the OAU.

Without going at this particular moment into the question of the nature and causes of the present splits within the Angolan national movement the fundamental point about the current situation in Angola is that it has been brought about, not by differences of tribe, region, ideology or personality - as is commonly alleged - but first and foremost by foreign intervention, prompted by considerations of imperialist advantage and competition and taking the form of massive supplies of military equipment and 'advice' of arms and experts to the rival Angolan organisations. In size, scale and 'sophistication' the arms now being poured so generously into Angola by the superpowers, whether directly or through 'third parties' greatly exceed anything given the Angolan liberation movements in the long years of their struggle against Portuguese colonialism, and cannot but lead one to suspect that such generosity is only a new exercise in 'making Africans fight Africans'.

Whatever the original differences among the Angolan people and nationalist organisations, it is this new fact of large-scale military assistance from outside which has transformed these differences into an all-out, bloody, fight-to-the-finish civil war. The civil war in Angola is, thus in a very real and basic sense the child of imperialism, the offspring, in particular, of inter-imperialist competition and of Soviet-US rivalry. In order to justify their activities the rival imperialist interests have had recourse to the time honoured practice of dividing and setting up Africans against each other by sticking all sorts of labels to the various organisations and groupings of Angolans. The real enemy in Angola, the real source of the civil war, is imperialism, and in particular, inter-imperialist rivalry, and not this or that Angolan organisation. That US imperialism, South African sub-imperialism and Zairean expansionism are all deeply implicated in the civil war in Angola is hardly to be wondered at, considering the immense riches of the country. But it is the Soviet Union which is at present the most deeply involved in the civil war - far more actively and directly than the other superpower which for the moment is working indirectly - and which by its decision to give all-out support to one Angolan organisation until the latter wins final victory has exacerbated the division between it and the others and is, thus, chiefly responsible for the present bloodshed in Angola.

In short, then the gravamen of the charge against the Soviet policy in Angola is that it has had the effect, first, of sharpening the divisions among Angolan organisations, and secondly - and more important - of encouraging and giving other imperialist powers the excuse further to step up their 'assistance' and interference on the other side. The victims of this foreign interference, whatever its motives or sources, are in any event, and always the African people. Even on the most generous interpretation of Soviet 'motives' the truth must be faced that at the very least its policies are fostering and encouraging the forces of division among the Angolan peoples and among African countries, as well as conferring an element of respectability on other imperialist powers interference in Angolan affairs, and in so doing are bolstering the imperialist system in Angola and Africa.



## **CONCP MEETING ATTENDED BY MOZAMBIQUE WHICH DECLARED SUPPORT EXCLUSIVELY FOR MPLA**

The CONCP, an organisation of Portuguese liberation movements was created many years ago to co-ordinate the struggle against Portuguese colonialism. It consisted of some liberation movements and excluded others, and was referred to by Savimbi as the 'favoured six'. The CONCP idea is being revived by the Soviet Union as it attempts to bring certain countries in Africa within its embrace. The CONCP was the instrument which the Soviet Union tried to use to by pass the OAU Liberation Committee.

It was at a CONCP meeting that Samora Machel declared his support for the MPLA exclusively. Among the resolution taken at the one-day meeting, and attended by representatives from the PAIGC and Sao Tome, the following resolution was also taken:

"To reaffirm the solidarity and total support for the party and the struggle of the Angolan people, led by the MPLA, a solidarity founded on the identity of ideas and political objectives forged between the PAIGC, MLSTP, MPLA and FRELIMO, in the long process of the common struggle against colonialism and imperialism."

Supporters of MPLA (and IKWEZI does not take an anti-MPLA position) use Samora Machel's support for MPLA to justify their own support. It is not probable that Machel's support has got as much to do with sentimentality as anything else.

## **Zambia's Principles on Angola**

### **PRINCIPLES OF PAN-AFRICANISM, NAMELY:**

- (a) non-intervention by foreign Powers in any shape or form in African affairs;
- (b) non-interference in the internal affairs of independent African states in accordance with the Charter of the OAU.

### **PRINCIPLES OF GOOD NEIGHBOURLINESS:**

We believe that Zambia can live and will live and co-operate with any Government which will be established in Angola. It can be MPLA. We assisted them during their struggle. Our people died for them, property destroyed for the cause of MPLA. But we can equally cooperate with Unita or FNLA...because we are not against any one of them. We know that Zaire and Zambia are neighbours and MPLA cannot afford to deliberately create an enemy in Zambia which assisted it and which is not opposed to its aspirations in Angola.

### **PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRACY AND NON-ALIGNMENT:**

We believe we cannot usurp the right of the Angolan people to choose their Government. This is their prerogative. We believe that even if MPLA or Unita or FNLA were to overrun the whole of Angola...this is no proof of the popularity of the victor nor the unpopularity of the vanquished. Military victory by one party will not be proof of the non-existence of the other political parties. It is merely proof of the military weakness of the vanquished or the lack of military resources or capacity.

### **THE PRINCIPLE OF LIBERATION VIS-A-VIS MAKING GOVERNMENTS:**

We believe that the task of Zambia, like other independent African states, is the total liberation of Africa. But we will not make governments for a sovereign people. We have no mandate to impose on the masses a Government which is not of their own choice. We cannot extend our mandate to decide what type of Government the people of Angola must have. That is their prerogative. In our view MPLA victory is not really theirs. It is a Soviet/Cuban victory.

## **UNITA FIGHTS ON — WITHOUT SOUTH AFRICAN HELP OR CIA MONEY**

At the time of IKWEZI going to Press there are reliable and substantial reports that UNITA is fighting in Southern Angola where it commands popular support and where MPLA has to tread gingerly.

UNITA which is fighting deep in the interior of Southern Angola together still with SWAPO guerillas receives no support from South Africa or any CIA money. Its support comes from the people upon whom it relies.

Cuban troops are reported to be still leading the struggle against UNITA and many Cuban soldiers have died. At the same time more Russian 'advisers' and 'personnel' have arrived in Angola.



There is also opposition inside the MPLA to the presence of Cuban and Russian troops inside Angola. Some of them who have taken this position are reported to have been put on trial.

IKWEZI which does not in anyway take an anti-MPLA position calls for the Cubans and the Russians to leave Angolan soil so that the Angolan people themselves can decide their destiny; This is the meaning of national independence. Nobody is threatening the national independence of the Angolans today except the Cubans and the Russians. To call this proletarian internationalism is to twist the meaning of the word. Genuine proletarian internationalism means respecting the rights of a nation to choose a government of their liking through struggle, and through civil war if that is what the people want and when the basis for it is just.

Since UNITA's position on the war in Angola has been totally twisted by the revisionist world we present here a UNITA document defining its position at the time of the war. IKWEZI does not look upon UNITA as a reactionary organisation or tool of the South African regime. It is a legitimate nationalist liberation organisation.

## Declaration of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of Unita

*Nova Lisboa, 15 October 1975*

### Where is the legality in the Civil War in Angola?

(1) The civil war which rages today in Angola is an anti-patriotic anti-democratic struggle which Unita has done everything to avoid. It has tried by all means possible to bring the three liberation movements to find a political compromise.

(2) Since 1961, the year when the armed liberation struggle began, the two then existing liberation movements, FNLA and MPLA, began to compete with one another politically and militarily in seeking leadership of Angolan nationalism instead of uniting their efforts for the joint purpose of the country's independence.

(3) The present civil war is only the tragic and unfortunate result of internal quarrels which have followed the long path of the national war of liberation.

(4) Unita does not believe in division and in fratricidal struggles and it made its first appeal for unity in 1966 at its constituent congress on 13 March in Muangai, which is today a historic village for our movement. Our appeal yielded no result because we were considered too small and too weak militarily.

(5) Immediately after the coup d'etat of 25 April 1974, which brought to power in Portugal the regime which began the decolonization of Africa, Unita considered that a valid discussion with the Portuguese Government was impossible without a minimum degree of unity between the three liberation movements.

In spite of the insults, lies and insinuations of which our movement has been the subject on the part of our brothers, we courageously undertook, in a spirit of selflessness and forgetting the past, journeys which took us to Kinshasa where we were to conclude a reconciliation agreement with the FNLA on 16 November 1974 thanks to the patriotic spirit of brother President of the FNLA, Roberto Holden.

We let them know that this act would not be complete if our brothers in the MPLA were not parties to it and that we would be prepared to go to Dar es Salaam for that purpose.

(6) After numerous journeys to Dar es Salaam and Lusaka, we finally succeeded in signing a reconciliation agreement with the MPLA at Luso in Angola on 20 December 1974. After this was done we put forward the idea of a conference of the three liberation movements before starting any talks of any sort with Portugal.

(7) In this way the efforts of Unita resulted in the conference at Mombasa in Kenya on 3 January 1975. We had agreed to set aside our ideological and political differences, but also succeeded in reconciling the FNLA and MPLA and putting in hand a programme of negotiations with Portugal.

(8) Thanks to the Mombasa conference, we succeeded in signing with Portugal on the 15 January 1975, at Alvor, the historic documents which recognizes the right of our people to independence and sets up a coalition government of the three liberation movements which would approve the most democratic formula for holding general



elections before independence and fix the date for independence as 11 November 1975. These victories have been possible thanks to the unity of the three liberation movements.

(9) In March 1975, the first military conflicts arose between the MPLA and FNLA. Unita was concerned to find another compromise for a reconciliation between the three liberation movements. Its efforts resulted in the conference at Nakuru (Kenya) on 10 June 1975. It was called the 'last-chance conference'. We should however pay our respects to the doyen of the struggle in Africa, President Mzee Jomo Kenyatta for acting as a mediator between the three liberation movements.

How is it then that, three weeks after the agreements reached in Nakuru, civil war began in Angola? How did Unita, believing in peace and unity, become involved in the war? What are the prospects for settling this conflict before 11 November, 1975?

The Political Bureau of Unita considered it opportune to prepare this document so as to state its position before the Angolans, before Africa and before the world. The entry of Unita into the war is entirely the fault of the MPLA which has systematically violated all the agreements which have been made, and has attacked the forces of Unita in a cowardly way.

Our troops have been massacred without possibility of defence at: Pica-Pau on 4 June 1975, Gabela 10 June 1975, Lobito 25 June 1975, Cassamba 30 June 1975, Henrique de Carvalho 15 July 1975, Kalabo 22 July 1975, Lukusse 30 July 1975. The aircraft which should have carried brother Savimbi, the President of the movement, was attacked on 5 August 1975 at Silva Porto by the MPLA. As a result of all these acts Unita understood that MPLA had declared war on it. It was necessary to defend itself and to defend the legality of the agreements of Kinshasa, Luso, Mombasa, Alvor and Nakuru.

The responsibility of Portugal, which did not honour its commitments to the three liberation movements, is pregnant with consequences. We are waging war against our will and we are ready to cease fighting immediately in order to begin talking. We have no preliminary conditions for the return of peace to our country and to reconciliation between brothers. Let others answer our appeal and tomorrow there will be no war in Angola.

Our immediate objects are as follows:

- (1) To stop the fighting in Angola immediately.
- (2) To hold a conference of the three liberation movements with Portugal, neighbouring countries of Angola and observers from UN and OAU so as to find a satisfactory solution to the conflict. Angola must not divide Africa.
- (3) To find a provisional solution for 11 November 1975 around a minimum programme for a government of national unity, and to include in this government political and religious leaders of the country who are outside the three liberation movements.
- (4) To organize free general elections within eight months after ceasing of military hostilities.
- (5) To work for the Unity of the country and its territorial integrity.
- (6) To work for national reconciliation of all Angolan brothers.
- (7) To work for national reconstruction on a socialist and democratic basis.
- (8) To call on international organizations to start the country's economy functioning again.
- (9) To compel Portugal to honour its commitments to the three liberation movements, to all Angolans, to Africa and the world as the sole security for its rehabilitation in the concert of nations.

Worse things will happen to our country and SA if:

- (a) The MPLA were encouraged in its attempt to make an unilateral declaration of independence. If this happened the other two movements (FNLA and Unita) would have no alternative to declaring that they are the government in turn. Thus, Angola would find itself with two Governments on the eve of its independence and



this would necessarily mean the division of the country with unfavourable repercussions at OAU and at world level.

(b) A unilateral declaration of independence by the MPLA would mean that the civil war in Angola becomes established with its procession of misdeeds. The MPLA would never be capable of controlling the immense area of the country and would never succeed in ending the civil war which it has lightly declared.

Every war in Angola is and will always be a war of the countryside where the towns would fall one after the other suffocated by the country people.

(c) The continued war in Angola would not favour the MPLA but it would favour the enemies of national liberation in Africa and the enemies of its unity.

Whatever happens to our country on 11 November 1975, Unita will be at its post.

On 11 November 1965 a minority of white colonials seized power in Zimbabwe against the will of the black majority. Africa condemned this and it is fighting against it. On 11 November 1975, ten years later, if a handful of men who are thirsty for power should legally seize power in Angola Africa must show this same courage in re-establishing political legality and national reconciliation. At the side of legality is the truth. At the moment they are weak but they will end in triumphing.

## IKWEZI MOURNS DEATH OF CHU TEH, GREAT PROLETARIAN REVOLUTIONARY AND HERO OF THE LONG MARCH

# SUPPORT IKWEZI

IKWEZI (A Xhosa word meaning Rising Star) is a Marxist-Leninist Journal devoted to proletarian socialist revolutions in Southern Africa. IKWEZI is published by a group of South African and Southern African revolutionaries with long histories of devotion to the struggle for freedom in Southern Africa. Amongst them are people who have spent several years in Vorster's prison and on Robben Island.

IKWEZI is vigorously opposed to the white-led South African Communist Party, totally subservient to the interests of the Soviet Union. IKWEZI does not even regard the leading elements of the SACP as Communists but as straightforward KGB agents of the Soviet Union. But the SACP has for too long manipulated and distorted our struggle. Unless the influence of the SACP is completely cleared out of the South African struggle the oppressed Black masses of South Africa will never be able to make a socialist revolution. IKWEZI is an answer to "Sechaba" and the "African Communist" sterile organs of the SACP. In the new situation of mass uprisings in South Africa there is need for a new alignment based on Marxist-Leninist leadership. IKWEZI aims to help in this process.

IKWEZI takes as its guiding star the Chinese model of revolutionary struggle and the transition to socialism which in its historical lessons is far superior to anything else taking place in the world today. IKWEZI does not take a slavish attitude towards the Peoples Republic of China but understands that Marxist-Leninist ideology must be applied to the concrete conditions of the South African social, economic and political reality. IKWEZI lay special emphasis on studying the Thought of Mao-Tse-Tung, which represents the highest wisdom of Marxist-Leninist politics in our era.

IKWEZI DESPERATELY NEEDS FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND APPEALS TO REVOLUTIONARIES ALL OVER THE WORLD TO ASSIST IT. YOU CAN SEND US STAMPS (A MAJOR COST) DONATIONS, HELP US WITH SUBSCRIBERS, ETC. IF YOU THINK THAT IKWEZI IS A WORTHWHILE PUBLICATION HELP KEEP IT ALIVE.

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO: IKWEZI, C/O BASEMENT, 103 GOWER STREET,  
LONDON, W.C.1.