

island. Who can doubt that if the White minority left the shores of South Africa we would suffer a similar economic eclipse? But if there is to be a violent race-war, and if the Africans won in the end, it is improbable that a White minority would remain. The Africans would be left with the damaged equipment of an industrial society, without the technical knowledge to work it. They would be poorer than they are to-day. Thus, even from a purely Africanist point of view, violence on this scale, even if successful, would be a catastrophe.

So let us all, White and Black, use our heads and hearts together for the future of our race, the human race, in our country. Let us use our heads to put behind us the childish nonsense of which the Tomlinson Report is so brilliant an example. Let us realise, as all the rest of the world realises, that White supremacy is doomed. Let us build realistically on the real, and aim at the possible. Let us open our hearts to the influences of true patriotism, and teach our children to love this land and the people among whom they have been born. But such ideals will remain idle talk unless we work to actualise them. And it is the purpose of this essay to show that there is only one way to do this—the way of Gandhi.

THE UNITED STATES DISCOVERS AFRICA

DR. GEORGE W. SHEPHERD, JR.

THE single most important historical event of our century has been not world warfare, nor even the advent of Communism, but the emergence within the last decade of over 600 million people (one-third of the world's population) from the political domination of the West. Now we must place Africa, with another 200 million people, within the context of this historical thrust of dependent and exploited peoples towards freedom. Only a small percentage of Africa's people has gained that freedom, but the others will not be denied theirs for long and remain peaceful.

American policy is just beginning to recognize the fact of this "world revolution". It took the Japanese conquest in the Pacific and the victory of Communism in China to awaken any large section of American opinion to the true proportions of the situation

in Asia. But there have not been such devastating blows in Africa. American opinion and policy are almost unaware that Africa exists. Now thanks to John Gunther who, one critic thought, should be ranked with Stanley as one of the two greatest American explorers of the African continent, there are stirrings of reognition among our people that Africa, too, must be taken in deadly seriousness.

Since our relationship with Africa to date has been largely through the European colonial powers, American attitudes toward the African continent have been shaped mainly by the European viewpoint. Our scholars, diplomats, businessmen and missionaries have, with only minor moderations, picked up and reflected the European attitudes on this question. We have no American policy for Africa. Chester Bowles recently reminded us of this in his book *The New Dimensions of Peace*. We are simply the pale moon which reflects the light of the European sun on this subject.

However, this state of affairs is not likely to continue for very much longer. We are going to be forced out of our back-seat role by the "world revolution" that is now coming to Africa. The big question before Americans is: Are we going to burn our fingers badly by continuing to try to pull the European chestnuts out of the fire, or will we develop a reasonable policy in time to avoid the pending disasters in Africa? In Asia we did not. In Asia we came late to the banquet table where the European powers were engaged in carving up the prostrate body of China after the Opium War, and we decided that we, too, must have our share. We did nothing to attempt to convince our European friends that they should mend their ways in Indo-China, Malaya, Burma, Indonesia, and India. It was only the Japanese aggression and the Second World War that blasted the *status quo* of that part of the world and made it possible for these countries to gain their independence.

Now that America has discovered Africa, the colonial peoples are wondering if she will simply demand her share from the European powers or will throw her vast influence behind the freedom movements of the African peoples. The Communist assumption is, of course, that American capitalism will see in Africa a fertile field of investment, and will set out to extract the great mineral wealth of that continent by joining the colonial powers in the exploitation of cheap labour. According to them, capitalism cannot be reformed or even curbed. This, however, is a gross over-simplification of the factors shaping events and policies in Africa. The destiny of Africa is being shaped by factors far more important than the economic consideration of private capital.

Too often the Communists have been right about the revolution in colonial areas for the wrong reasons. After the outbreak of revolution it becomes very difficult for democratic countries to convince the ex-colonial peoples that the Communists were wrong.

The first factor shaping American policy is security considerations. Our alliance with the European colonial powers in the struggle against world Communism has resulted in acceptance of their policies in most cases. The most obvious example of this is in North Africa. Until the present at least, we have regarded the continued presence of France in North Africa as an indispensable part of the preservation of our string of military air bases. Our State Department has not liked many things which the French have done and considerable private pressure has been exerted on the French to give greater freedom to the people of Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria. Yet we have always hesitated to criticize publicly the French and we have permitted equipment designated for French forces in N.A.T.O. to be transferred to North Africa for the suppression of rebellion there.

Many of our leaders, particularly the military, have been impressed by the argument that if the European powers are forced to withdraw from Africa we will no longer be able to rely upon much of Africa in an all-out struggle with the Soviet Union. This attitude the State Department has been careful not to express publicly because of the tremendous resentment it would create among the colonial and ex-colonial peoples. Yet there can be little doubt that it is the determining factor in our silence over the injustice of the French in Algeria and the crimes against humanity of the Nationalist Government of South Africa. Professor Hans Morgenthau of the University of Chicago has summed up this attitude in these words: "The United States believes that it cannot pursue policies in Africa which would jeopardize the position of, and its relations with, its allies in Western Europe".

However, in recent months there has been increasing realization of the suicidal nature of this attitude. Aggressive Communist expansion has become less of a threat and competitive Communist expansion has become much more dangerous. Some of our policy makers seem to be awakening to the realization that even a "neutral" Africa would be preferable to one caught in the grip of growing violence and increasing Communist penetration. For this reason, the strategic considerations shaping our acceptance of European policies have become weaker and it is possible that factors of a humanitarian and economic nature will become more

powerful in the final determination of U.S. policy.

In comparison to our economic stake in Asia or South America, the U.S. has little economic interest in Africa at present. However, this interest is growing. Strategic minerals such as uranium, copper, cobalt, and manganese have been our major imports. Unquestionably our desire to secure larger quantities of raw materials from Africa is growing as other sources of minerals, such as copper, are becoming depleted. Yet the United States economy is not wedded to the African colonies in the same sense as are the economies of Britain, France, Belgium, and Portugal. If Belgium and Portugal were to lose their African possessions, there would be drastic cuts in the standard of living of the Belgians and Portuguese. Exports in the Belgian Congo in 1951 were in excess of imports by \$17,200,000. Huge profits are being made by the five controlling firms in the Belgian Congo in which the Belgian Government owns a large share. In 1950 the most important one declared a gross profit of \$50,000,000. The French and British economies are less directly dependent upon African colonies, although in both countries there are powerful trading and investment interests which have a considerable stake.

Related to the problem of European investment in Africa is that of European immigrant groups which have settled in North, Central, and South Africa. This presents a tie of cultural and filial interest which, to some extent, is related to European investment. These minority settler interests are much more selfish and short-sighted than even overseas investment interests.

Fortunately, United States policy in Africa is not greatly influenced by either large financial interests or an immigrant group settled in Africa. Our policies to date seem to have reflected the interests of these forces because of our overall policy of accepting the basic directions of the European powers.

There is little prospect that large blocks of American private capital will seek fields of investment in colonial Africa. There has been a recent increase in American investment in mineral production in South Africa, the Belgian Congo, Liberia, and Northern Rhodesia. However, the American businessman has traditionally recognized the fact that he operates under a disadvantage in a European colonial territory. As long as these areas remain dependent upon European powers, large amounts of American capital are unlikely to seek these outlets, despite the unusually high profit opportunities.

The actual effect of growing American interest in raw materials

from Africa is likely to exert a pressure in favour of the independence of colonial peoples. European suppression of the natural aspirations of the colonial peoples for freedom creates rebellion and a disruption of the sources of supply. Most of the nationalist leaders among the Africans have made it clear that they would welcome American capital and trade, provided they retain political control of their own destinies. Dr. Nkrumah of the Gold Coast and Dr. Azikiwe of Nigeria have both stated that they realize the importance of foreign capital and trade in the development of their countries. However, they wish to direct this development in the interests of their own people and not simply for the benefit of foreign exploiters. This is being increasingly realized as a legitimate aspiration by United States businessmen and U.S. government policy makers. It is also becoming a point of friction with European powers who too often interpret their own interests in terms of retaining political power as a means of controlling for their own benefit the economic development of these areas.

A third important factor shaping American policy is the humanitarian and religious interest among several groups in this country. This factor has been very weak in terms of actual effect on policy to date and yet it is a growing influence as the intense preoccupation with purely strategic concerns relaxes.

American Christian churches have done a great deal of missionary work in Africa. They have built schools, hospitals, and churches in almost all the colonies and countries of Africa outside of the Moslem North. Most of their activities have been concentrated in West African territories and South Africa. Recently, these missions have come under sharp criticism from the growing nationalist forces who feel that, too often, the missionaries have either avoided political questions or supported the colonial administrations. However, the missionaries and churches who have given so much to Africa are unquestionably deeply sympathetic to the aspirations of the people they serve. They are becoming increasingly concerned that all that they have done is being undermined by the rising tide of bitterness directed against the West and all white men. American Protestantism and Catholicism are extremely fearful that what happened in Asia might be repeated in Africa. Therefore, the American government finds increasing pressure from the Christian Church to support policies in Africa which recognize the rights and dignity of the African people as against the selfish interests of a colonial system and a white supremacy which is contrary to the basic teachings of brotherhood

and equality in the Christian faith.

The religion of Islam represents a much greater competitor than Communism to Christianity in Africa. Reports of Moslem converts indicates that this faith is sweeping like a forest fire through sections of Africa. The fact that it is carried by coloured missionaries and is not tarred by the brush of white supremacy, but preaches and practises equality among men, gives it tremendous force in Africa. Christian leaders remember how all of North Africa was lost to Christendom from the 5th to the 7th century when Islam swept in on the tide of anti-Roman imperialism. While many American church leaders seem to be unaware as yet of the full dangers to their cause in Africa, it is unlikely that they will long remain in ignorance.

Another group which has a deep interest in Africa from the humanitarian and religious point of view is the American Negro. American Negroes are gaining a new sense of dignity and pride about their past. Many of them no longer regard the period of their ancestry in Africa as a time of ignorance and savagery which they would like to forget. Recent studies, such as Professor De Graft-Johnson's book *The African Glory*, have uncovered the rich heritage of African culture. The African people themselves, as on the Gold Coast, are recovering an understanding of their own past; so, too, the American Negro is realizing he has a tradition in which he can take as much pride as any Englishman or Scot. As this kinship with Africa grows, the American Negro is developing a great concern over the injustices in Kenya and South Africa and wants to forward the welfare of the people from whom he came. Too much cannot be expected from this quarter immediately as the American Negro has his hands full in completing his own struggle for social justice in this country. Yet a great many of his leaders see clearly the relationship of the struggle of the coloured races of the world for freedom with their own cause in America.

It is of course not only the American Negro who is awakening to the full moral dimensions of the battle for racial equality. American liberals have been greatly sensitized to this problem, and the beam that we see in the eye of our South African brethren is unquestionably a reflection of the mote in our own. We are at present beset by the difficulties of making racial equality a reality in this country and all the signs indicate that this will not be an easy road. However, great strides have been made. Our own experience is now tremendously useful in parts of Africa which

are going through a similar problem. Yet this problem is far more difficult in such areas as South Africa, Central Africa and Kenya, because small minorities of whites are surrounded by a great black sea and they are determined to hold their fortress against the in-rushing tide of the long-suppressed hatred of white oppression.

The liberal tradition is strong in America. It believes in the basic dignity and equality of all men. It rejects paternalism and racial discrimination. This is a faith that, given some education and economic progress, all men are capable of governing themselves, if not perfectly, at least reasonably. Liberal leaders in this country realize that our own country was born out of an anti-colonial struggle, and the reminders of our revolutionary past with which leaders in Asia and Africa have presented us have struck home. Chester Bowles and other leading liberal spokesmen are leading a movement for the re-establishment of these basic American beliefs as the keystone of a new foreign policy.

It is conceivable that, with the shift in Soviet strategy and the easing of world tension, the economic, humanitarian, religious, and liberal factors working behind the evolvement of an American policy on Africa may begin to offset the dominant role of purely security considerations. Unquestionably we have entered a new phase in the struggle with world Communism in which the issue will be decided ultimately not in terms of armed might, but in terms of the relevance of each doctrine to the position of poverty and subjection in which two-thirds of the human race dwells. This is not fully apparent to those who hold the reins of power. It will take time; yet there are hopeful signs.

I believe the United States may develop an independent African policy of its own. These liberalizing factors will cause sharp breaks with the old policy of support for European powers who continue to hang on regardless of the desires and welfare of the dependent peoples. We will not see the United States, on the other hand, form an alliance with the ex-colonial peoples against the colonial powers, but in the years ahead we can look for an increasing movement in our policy toward a recognition of, and sympathy for, the less developed peoples who live in bondage. We will see develop an independent position which will stand for justice and oppose exploitation, racial discrimination, and the domination of the weak by the strong.

What the character of such a policy would be can only be briefly sketched here:

It would seek a speedy international settlement of the clash in

North Africa between France and Arab nationalism. It would condemn and boycott South African racialism. It would seek the fullest utilization and extension for Trusteeship Powers for the rapid achievement of self-government for Trust Peoples. It would support the U.N. and international action for the realization of independence and the development of all colonial area territories. It would support financially and technically the launching of large scale development programmes among all dependent peoples. In short, it would encourage the most rapid emergence of all colonial peoples to a position of equality and dignity in the family of nations.

BRITISH COLONIAL PROBLEMS

FENNER BROCKWAY, M.P.

THERE are three distinct problems in the British Colonies. The first relates to those territories where there is no European population of any considerable strength and where no military strategic issues are involved. The Gold Coast and Nigeria are examples of such territories.

The second problem relates to places of strategic importance such as Cyprus, Singapore and Aden. The third to colonial territories or protectorates where there are strong European populations within the territory. Examples of these are Kenya, the Rhodesias and the Protectorates in South Africa.

The Gold Coast and Nigeria are now well on the way to self-government and independence. As I write, an election is taking place in the Gold Coast which will determine whether its independence will be immediately recognised. Mr. Lennox-Boyd, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, has said that if Dr. Nkrumah obtains a reasonable majority, its independence will be declared within the next few months. In the case of Nigeria there is already internal self-government within the three regions, East, West and North, and full independence is postponed only until the North is prepared to accept it.

It is a little humiliating to an Englishman that the colonial territories which are making the greatest advance towards self-government and independence are those in which British immigrant influence is least strong. If one asks a West African why it is that