

encroached. The Arab refugees must be readmitted to their homeland. The imperialists must stop their intervention and aggression, aimed at recolonising the Arab lands.

Only along these lines can there be a future for the State of Israel, which cannot coexist with the Arab countries without abandoning its alignment with imperialism, the bitterest foe of the Middle East peoples, of peace and freedom throughout the world.

The Nigerian Tragedy

TO A VERY LARGE extent the troubles of Nigeria, now exploded into armed conflict between the troops of the military government and those of the breakaway Eastern state renamed Biafra, are the legacy of colonialism. For a long time the British imperialists cultivated inter-regional and inter-tribal animosities in this country as in very many other colonies, with the aim of pursuing the classical policy 'Divide and rule'. They also favoured all kinds of privileged elements—tribal and feudal overlords and capitalists—confident that they would prove agencies of indirect government and control, and that they would join with colonialism in resisting what it fears most: the growth of radical mass movements, imbued with the scientific socialist and communist ideology.

The constitution for independent Nigeria, imposed by Britain as the price for withdrawal of direct colonial rule, was specifically designed to perpetuate all the features which had been cultivated as a result of these policies, and therefore to leave Nigeria, though the most populous African state, with a weak, pro-imperialist government, well-entrenched privileged classes, and profoundly divided internally. When, after years of corruption, capitalist policies and misrule, the government established under this constitution collapsed in the face of an army coup, the people of Nigeria rejoiced, believing that nothing could be worse than the sort of regime under which they had been suffering. But, in truth, the army takeover solved nothing; having overthrown the old order the army men had nothing positive to put in its place. To command an army is not the same thing as to lead a nation. One coup followed another, with rival groups of military men at their head. At no time were the masses of the people democratically consulted about the future of the country and drawn into the tasks of administration and national regeneration. Tribal and regional hostilities were not eliminated and merged into a greater patriotism. Political parties were outlawed, not only the discredited bourgeois groupings, whose corrup-

tion and lack of patriotism had led to the collapse of bourgeois parliamentarism, but also such a party as the Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party, whose unquestioned devotion to the interests of the common people held the key to a united, progressive and free Nigeria.

No African patriot can be in favour of the continuation of the divisive concepts of the imperialists, who would like to see our continent still further fragmented into mutually hostile states, none economically viable, all dependent on outside assistance, a fertile field for the intrigues and rivalries of the anti-African imperialist powers, among whom must now be included the Republic of South Africa, as Nkosi demonstrates in his article in the present issue of our journal. We are for African unity and for Nigerian unity.

At the same time, unity must be based upon consent, not force. It must be built on the foundations of equality, self-determination and democracy. Whatever the immediate outcome of the present conflict—in which oil and British interests therein plays a far greater part than either side is prepared to admit—one thing is sure: no genuine solution, unitary or secessionist, can be achieved by mutual slaughter of Africans by Africans. In the long run the unity of Nigeria, as of Africa as a whole, can only be found in common resistance to the main enemy—imperialism. And in the leadership as an independent force of the organised masses of peasants and workers, overriding the vested interests of the tribal, feudal, capitalist and military castes.

Again the Congo

President Mobutu declares that he is faced by an insurrection spearheaded by the Belgian, South African and other white mercenaries who have been the curse of the Congo (Kinshasa) ever since the first attempt to split off Katanga. No doubt the supporters of the traitor Tshombe (at the time of writing, a prisoner in Algiers, following the daring diversion of his private charter plane) are hoping to make a comeback. And clearly there is a serious threat to the Kinshasa government, spearheaded by the mercenaries who not long ago were given their long-overdue notice to quit the country, and backed by powerful Belgian and other imperialist interests behind the scenes.

But who does Mobutu speak for, and on which forces is he relying to maintain his government in power? The image he is striving to build up, as a revolutionary African patriot, defending Congo independence against foreign imperialism, is sadly tarnished by the news that the U.S. government is supplying him with aircraft and that he has