

THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST

*Published quarterly in the interests of
African solidarity and as a forum for
Marxist-Leninist thought throughout
our Continent, by the
South African Communist Party*

Contents

Editorial Notes:

4 THE WAR IN THE SOUTH

9 UHURU'S BITTER FRUITS

MUHOI WA KIRINYAGA

Increasingly bitter conflict is developing between the militant Kenya People's Union and the ruling Kenya African National Union. This searching review of the historical origins and direction of this conflict relates it—with a wealth of factual illustration—to maturing class contradictions within the country.

19 AID AND CO-OPERATION: A Democratic Policy for France

JEAN SURET-CANALE

Behind much of the so-called 'aid' extended by imperialist countries to former colonies lies the reality of continuing dependence and intensive exploitation in new forms. This scholarly thesis by a noted French Marxist and specialist on African affairs is the result of painstaking research and original thought. The article—translated from Cahiers du Communisme explains the approach of the important French Communist Party to the problem of evolving a truly democratic policy of aid and co-operation.

42 HOMAGE TO CHE GUEVARA

44 TOWARDS VICTORY AND PEACE IN VIETNAM

A summary of the recently adopted Political Programme of the South Vietnam National Liberation Front.

48 THE LIBERATION STRUGGLE IN MOZAMBIQUE

URIAH SIMANGO

The vice-president of the Mozambique Liberation Front (FRELIMO) presents a brief historical survey of the Portuguese occupation; the position in the country; the strategy and aims of the armed struggle now in progress.

Contents (continued)

62 BOOK REVIEWS

Verwoerd (ALEX HEPPLE). *The Political Economy of South Africa*
(RALPH HORWITZ). *The World That Was Ours* (HILDA BERNSTEIN).
A Healthy Grave (JAMES KANTOR).

69 DOCUMENTS

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION—1917-1967. (*Text of the contents of the illegal journal Freedom published and circulated underground in South Africa by the Communist Party.*)

STRENGTHEN ANTI-IMPERIALIST UNITY! (*Joint Communiqué issued by representatives of the South African Communist Party and the Socialist Unity Party of Germany.*)

BRITISH COMMUNISTS HAIL SOUTHERN AFRICAN REVOLUTIONARIES.
Text of message adopted at the 30th Congress of the C.P.G.B.)



Editorial Notes:

THE WAR IN THE SOUTH

THE CLOSING MONTHS of 1967 saw the first armed clashes South of the Zambezi, foreshadowing the long struggle ahead—the many-sided people's war to overthrow minority white rule and win power.

These were preliminary skirmishes. The relatively small advance units of the Zimbabwe African People's Union and Umkhonto We Sizwe were obviously not intended to engage the major forces of the enemy in pitched battles. When they were intercepted they fought back with tremendous courage and skill. They outgeneralled their opponents and inflicted a heavy toll of casualties, before melting back into the bush, merged with the people. It was an earnest of what is in store for the white supremacy regimes, rather than a head-on confrontation at this premature stage.

Yet these first clashes have had a tremendous impact, far beyond their immediate military or strategic importance.

Among the subjected and disinherited masses, the news brought

fresh inspiration and confidence that our people will succeed in overthrowing the unbearable yoke of alien oppression, and regaining their land and freedom.

Throughout the continent of Africa, the beginning of the final phase of the struggle in the South had, likewise, a most salubrious effect. A realistic survey must concede that—however temporary—the cause of the African revolution had suffered a number of serious setbacks at the hands of neo-colonialism and its allies, the reactionary classes and social forces in many of our countries—particularly since the plot which ousted that tireless defender of African unity, Kwame Nkrumah. As preparations were being made for the Kinshasa summit meeting in September, there were widespread tendencies towards defeatism and cynicism.

This mood was fortified by the serious consequences of the Israeli blitzkrieg and the failure of many African countries to demonstrate any solidarity with their brothers in the north as victims of aggression. The protracted and inconclusive fighting in Nigeria; unedifying border disputes in some areas; the ineffectiveness of the O.A.U. in the face of Smith's constitutional coup in Rhodesia; the increasing subordination of some African countries to imperialism and, in particular, the open defection of Dr. Banda—all these and other factors had cast a shadow over the conference and led to confident predictions that the Kinshasa conference would be a flop, indeed that it might be abandoned altogether.

In fact it was nothing of the sort. Every African country, except of course Malawi, was represented, mostly at top Cabinet level. The prophets of doom were confounded; the Summit went far to recapture the ideals and temper that had established the foundation of the O.A.U. at Addis Ababa in 1963. To no small degree this transformation must be ascribed to the presence and activities of the joint delegation of Z.A.P.U. and the A.N.C., whose fighting men were demonstrating on the battlefields of Zimbabwe that African unity and freedom are not pious abstractions but vital realities, only to be got and held by blood and sacrifice.

The same events that inspired the African peoples and their friends throughout the world brought a chill of fear to the white supremacists of Salisbury and Pretoria.

The opening battles of the South African War of Liberation brought an exhilarating revival of hope and confidence in Africa's destiny, not only at the meeting in Kinshasa, but throughout the African continent and among the upholders of human rights, throughout the world.

The same events brought a chill foreboding of doom to the white terrorist regimes in Southern Africa.

Faced with Britain or even the United Nations Ian Smith is always ready to play the part of dauntless hero. When Wilson threatened him, aboard the Tiger with the possible use of force, he coolly replied that 'he believed these threats to be of no consequence', went back to his miniature 'state' of 200,000 whites from where he thumbed his nose at Britain and has continued to do so since. He repeated in his 1968 new year message that 'we welcome the challenge' offered by Britain.

It is a very different Smith we observe when faced with the real challenge not of meaningless threats and make-believe sanctions, but of the armed freedom-fighters of the Z.A.P.U.-A.N.C. alliance. The appearance of a relatively small advance detachment was enough to send him scuttling to his 'protectors' in Pretoria, to rush in South African troops to save his ridiculous pretence of a 'government'.

At one stroke the first battles in Zimbabwe served to dispel a number of myths:

Firstly, the myth that the Smith regime is really an independent and viable administration. The fact that, not only economically, but physically and militarily it is dependent on Vorster's Republic, means that in reality it is no more than a puppet state of Apartheid South Africa. Any attempt by the African states and the United Nations to solve the 'Rhodesian crisis' must be based on a recognition of that reality.

Secondly, the myth that the British government is seriously concerned to obtain a democratic solution in Zimbabwe. All along, even when placing the matter, unwillingly, before the United Nations, Britain insisted that the Rhodesian 'rebellion' was primarily her concern, that the country was legally her colony, and that no one else should intervene. Yet when foreign troops invade her colony from the Republic to help the rebels maintain themselves in power, Britain stands idly by, refraining from retaliation against the fascist government in Pretoria, but warning the democratic government in Zambia not to allow freedom-fighters to pass through. As President Kaunda has correctly pointed out, Britain's role in the Rhodesia crisis has been a deliberate refusal by a United Nations member to honour her obligation in respect of human rights.

Thirdly—and most significant for the future—the myth of the supposed invulnerability and military superiority of the South African state and its all-white army.

ON THE MILITARY SIDE

For a number of years now, the Republic of South Africa has been arming its white minority to the teeth.

Defence estimates have jumped from 44 million rand (1960-61) to 255 million (1966-67). (1 rand equals 1.4 U.S. dollars.) Police expenditure over the same period had advanced from R36m. to R56m. The United Nations Security Council embargo on the supply of arms to South Africa has not been very effective. Some imperialist countries (notably France) have blatantly disregarded it. With the help of foreign imperialist firms—I.C.I. of Britain, F.N. of Belgium, Panhard of France, and others, big advances have been made in setting up local industries for the manufacture of arms, including automatic rifles, armoured cars and ammunition. West Germany is collaborating with the Republic in the production of advanced modern weaponry, including poison gas and nuclear bombs.

For the first time universal conscription has been introduced for whites for the 'citizen force'. (South Africa participated in both world wars with volunteer armies.) From seventeen years of age onwards all white males have to undergo nine periods of compulsory military training, the first period being for twelve months. The aim was stated by Commandant-General Hiemstra to be able to mobilise 100,000 men for the force in 'a very short time' (*Cape Times*, March 16th, 1967).

Despite this formidable array of military strength, the Vorster regime and its supporters (among whom must be included the nominal United Party 'opposition', which backed the adventurous invasion of Rhodesia to the hilt) live in a continual state of insecurity and neurosis.

It is not only the combat forces of Umkhonto We Sizwe that they fear—although they do fear them and with good reason. The first brushes between the African freedom fighters and the joint South African-Rhodesian 'security forces' resulted in far heavier casualties on the side of the defenders of white supremacy; and the lessons of Vietnam, have not been entirely lost in South Africa. But even more than the dread thought of the Umkhonto men advancing South is the ever-present spectre of massive revolutionary action by the oppressed masses in the Republic, a threat which mounts steadily as the freedom-fighters march South.

In some respects the liberation war in South Africa differs from the many similar conflicts which have raged in Africa and Asia. Perhaps the most important is that in South Africa we find what the Communist Party describes as 'colonialism of a special type'. The 'imperial power' is 'White South Africa' itself (though sustained by its alliance with other imperialist states)—sharing a common territory and economy with the very peoples whom it has colonised and oppresses. Unlike, for example, the United States in Vietnam, France in Algeria, or Britain in Kenya, it has no secure home base from which it can operate with impunity. Food and industrial production, transport and every other

branch of the economy is dependent on a labour force which overwhelmingly (in agriculture, entirely, in industry two-thirds) is composed of members of the African and other oppressed non-white groups who from the start—despite all the millions spent on indoctrination—are heart and soul on the side of the liberating revolutionary fighters.

It is this factor, more than any other, which bodes victory for our people and hard blows against the oppressors, in the stormy and bloody struggles which face Southern Africa in 1968.

ALPHEUS MALIBA

Alpheus Madaba Maliba was born in 1901, at Nzhelele in the Zoutpansberg district of the northern Transvaal. When he came to Johannesburg in 1935 he could neither read nor write, and had no possessions other than a lion-skin which he had come to town to sell—and of which he was soon tricked by the cunning *tsotsis*. All the same, he got a job in a factory, and began to attend literacy classes at a Communist Party night school. His hard work and vigorous intelligence made him an outstanding student, and he rapidly mastered not only the difficulties of literacy, but also the intricacies of political economy, dialectical materialism and the complex structure of our country.

Alpheus Maliba had a profound love for and pride in his people—the Venda people from whom he came and the nascent African nation. He never lost his roots in the platteland. Together with other patriots from his area he helped to found first the Zoutpansberg Cultural Association, and later the Zoutpansberg Balemi Association (balemi—ploughmen) the first modern peasants' organisation in South Africa, which fought many hard and historic battles for land and the rights of agricultural workers.

From 1939 until 1950, when the Party was driven underground, he was a member of the Johannesburg District Committee of the Communist Party, and editor of *Mbofolowo*, Venda language section of the Party organ *Inkululeko*. He won tens of thousands of votes as Communist candidate for the 'Natives' Representative Council' (rural areas). On May 1st, 1944, he organised the biggest May Day meeting ever in the countryside when tens of thousands of peasants converged on Louis Trichardt. He was a leading colleague of Dr. Dadoo in the Transvaal Non-European United Front. Many times he was jailed, restricted and banned.

He was a brilliant public speaker, a man of unlimited personal courage, an enormously warm lovable and charming comrade.

In September 1967, at the age of 66, he was arrested by the special branch of the South African police, taken to Louis Trichardt prison, held in solitary confinement, tortured and then murdered.

UHURU'S BITTER FRUITS

MUHOI WA KIRINYAGA

IT IS LESS than two years since a new era opened up in Kenyan history, with the formation of the Kenya People's Union, led by Jaramogi Oginga Odinga. That momentous event, the breakaway from KANU, the party of independence, has transformed Kenya's image in the eyes of democratic Africa and progressive mankind, and compelled us to take a new look at this, the richest and most highly-developed state in Eastern Africa. Four years ago, when Kenya won its independence after a bloody revolutionary struggle, it seemed that Jomo Kenyatta would lead his nation to take its rightful place in the vanguard of Africa's struggle for complete independence, unity, and socialism.

At independence Kenya's leaders, so it seemed, were tried and trusted patriots—Jomo Kenyatta, the Father of the Nation, his longtime lieutenant Oginga Odinga, his former comrades in prison and detention, Bildad Kaggia, Fred Kubai, Achieng Oneko. The British-inspired, tribalist KADU party had been crushingly defeated, and, under Kenyatta's leadership, the nation was united after the years of internecine feuds and tribal suspicions which the British and their stooges had so ardently encouraged. If there were any doubts, they concerned the presence of some dubious characters in the front rank of political life—the long-time bright hope of the C.I.A. Tom Mboya, for instance. But Kenya was beset with many difficulties—not least of them a divisive regionalist constitution and crippling loan obligations to the British Government for money to buy out the European settlers—and the progressive world took its cue from the progressive Kenyan leaders themselves, who were confident that the KANU government would defeat both internal and external reactionaries and fulfil its revolutionary promise.

Ominous signs that this was not to be were, however, quickly forthcoming. Barely six months after independence, Bildad Kaggia, one of Kenya's greatest sons, who had been sentenced to prison with Kenyatta for leadership of the liberation movement, was dismissed from his

government post. The circumstances of Kaggia's dismissal are important, for they illustrate the beginnings of the process of abandonment of the people which has by now become so depressingly obvious in Kenya.

Kaggia had refused to give an undertaking not to expose the Government's shortcomings on land policy. He insisted that the government's first priority was to the dispossessed, the landless, the former forest fighters who had returned from the forests and detention camps to find that the quislings who had helped to hunt them down were growing fat on land that had been stolen from them, either blatantly or under the pretext of 'consolidation'. These were the people, Kaggia pointed out, who had fought for independence, whose kinsmen had died, whose children had lost all hope of education, so that Kenya could be free.

And it was painfully obvious that these were not the people who were benefiting from Uhuru. As Kaggia saw, settler farms were being taken over, and, even where they were not quietly bought up by get-rich-quick Cabinet Ministers, they were turned into settlement schemes for which a substantial deposit had to be paid before an African could get a plot—thereby depriving the landless, who had no money, of any hope of land. Nobody knows how many people are landless: no figures are kept. But there can be no doubt that the men who roam the streets of Nairobi in rags, the women who stagger along the country roads bent double under huge bags of charcoal which they sell for a few miserable shillings so that their children can eat, run into hundreds of thousands, if not millions.

Odinga and other progressives remained in the government, hoping that they would be able to turn Kenya from the capitalist, pro-imperialist road. Jaramogi knew very well that Kenyatta was surrounding himself with self-seekers and reactionaries, men like Kiano, Mboya, Njonjo and the rest. He could see that there had been no wholesale examination of the civil service, which was—and is—full of former Home Guards, chiefs and other ex-colonial stooges. And he could see the growing influence of American and West German 'experts', 'aid officials' and diplomats who were zealously trying to stamp out any hint of anti-imperialism or socialism in Kenya.

But, like so many people within Kenya and elsewhere who observed the reactionary trend with growing disquiet, Kenyan patriots placed their faith in the strength of KANU's popular following, and also in the ultimate patriotism and good sense of Mzee Jomo Kenyatta. With the benefit of hindsight, it is easy to criticise this faith. And indeed, one could argue that African militants have tolerated in silence for too long, the antics of Kenyatta's henchmen, particularly their pro-imperialist

activities in connection with the Congo uprising of 1964, and Africa's struggle to liberate the slave South.

For it is now plain that the dominant reactionary clique set about sabotaging the grass-roots organisation of KANU, to ensure that there was no strong popular base to challenge their intrigues. Branch elections were quietly forgotten, and MPs from the countryside who complained were either bribed into silence or threatened with withdrawal of the KANU imprimatur at the next election. Mboya, as secretary-general, did his best to ensure that only yes-men had any say in party affairs, while the organisation of KANU itself quickly disintegrated. As Odinga relates in his autobiography, *Not Yet Uhuru*:

Branches in most parts of the country were allowed to die; or at most were used at election time as election machines or to hang out the flags, usher the crowds, and cheer an M.P. or Cabinet Minister at a public rally. Membership was not recruited, membership dues were not collected. Headquarters and branch rents, office post office box rentals and telephone accounts went unpaid, and telephones were disconnected. As an arm of government for popularising development programmes, for encouraging the discussion of policy, for keeping the people alive to the aim of *uhuru*, or the government alive to the needs of the people, the party was paralysed.

And neither was any comfort to be gained from Kenyatta. This, in many ways, has been the bitterest pill for thousands of patriotic Kenyans: the Father of the Nation, the man who had been unrelenting in his struggle against the British imperialists, was not only passively allowing the pro-imperialist elements to gain the ascendancy in Kenya, but was more and more actively collaborating with them against the Left. Kenyatta, too, had succumbed to the enticements of wealth. Not content with the palatial State House in Nairobi and State House in Mombasa, he was acquiring large properties throughout Kenya—notably at Gatundu, his former home, where a rough road has been specially tarmacked for his convenience, and at Bamburi Beach in Mombasa.

In October 1964 KADU, the pro-imperialist opposition, crossed the floor of Parliament and dissolved itself, merging with KANU. At the time, Kenyans welcomed the move as a further step towards national unity. But it soon became plain that the merger was the outcome, not of a genuine desire to unite the nation, but of more schemes by the Right to isolate the patriots and force them out of all positions of influence. It is no coincidence that, in the months following KADU's dissolution, attacks on progressive figures in the government became increasingly frequent. These attacks—on Kaggia, on Odinga himself, on Achieng Oneko, and others—were part of a carefully-laid plan by what was known as the Corner Bar Group, a clique of right-wingers led

by Ngala, the former leader of KADU, and Njonjo, the Attorney-General (who is supposed to be a Civil Servant, and therefore non-political!). This group, which originally met in the Nairobi curry restaurant which gave it its name, had by April 1965 become so confident that one of its spokesmen, Assistant Minister for Home Affairs Nyagan, brazenly told Parliament how the group had planned a Parliamentary attack on the Lumumba Institute, the school for KANU cadres which had been set up with generous aid from the socialist countries. And two months later another member of the group proudly told the House how the Corner Bar conspirators had 'saved Kenya from Communism'!

Simultaneously with the attacks in the House on progressive leaders, the reactionaries were undermining their positions throughout the country. In Muranga (Kaggia's stronghold), in South Nyanza, in Kisii and Kitui, illegal 'elections' for KANU branch officers were held to throw out the popular leaders and put in their places stooges of the dominant Right wing. Throughout 1965, Mboya, Ngala and Kenyatta were preparing the way for the final confrontation with the forces of progress, which was to eject Odinga and Oneko from office, and drive them from KANU. When this confrontation took place, in March 1966 at the KANU conference at Limuru, the extent to which the reactionaries had made common cause with the imperialists, and particularly with the Americans, became obvious.

The Limuru conference was sprung on the country at scarcely ten days notice: and the Government, led by Mboya, was deaf to the pleas of a substantial number of MPs that it should be postponed until fresh elections could be held in KANU branches throughout the country. Thanks to the revelations of the former American Ambassador to Kenya, we now know just how a party which had been disorganised and bankrupt a few weeks before was suddenly able to bring hand-picked 'delegates' from all parts of the country, issue well-printed draft resolutions and a draft constitution, organise rigged elections for party officials, and so forth.

The answer is simple: Uncle Sam was bankrolling the whole affair.

As former Ambassador Attwood makes clear in his book of memoirs, *The Reds and the Blacks*, he helped with the Limuru conference because the conference had been planned to oust the 'reds', Odinga, Oneko, Kaggia and the rest. Little wonder, then, that KANU's reactionaries suddenly had brand-new Landrovers at £1,300 apiece at their disposal, had the money to put scores of delegates up at Nairobi hotels, to wine them, dine them, intimidate them, and bribe them. And there can be no denying that the Right succeeded admirably. They succeeded, with the willing help of the police, in excluding 'unfavourable' delegates from

the conference, they succeeded in illegally reversing the overwhelming election of Bildad Kaggia as KANU Vice-President for Central Province, they defeated a move to have Masinde Muliro elected Secretary-General in place of Mboya, and they stripped Odinga of his post as Vice-President of the party.

As has been recounted in an earlier number of this journal,* the KANU militants felt that it was now impossible to continue, as they had for so long, to work from within the party to effect a change of policy. They broke away, and, with Odinga and Kaggia at their head, formed the Kenya People's Union. Twenty-eight MPs went with them.

THE 'LITTLE GENERAL ELECTION'

In the 'Little General Election' which was forced on the new Opposition immediately afterwards, Kenyans saw a sordid repeat performance of the trickery and intimidation which had been the hallmark of the Limuru conference. But here a new facet of KANU's political bankruptcy showed itself: violence. Electoral violence was concentrated in those areas where the KANU hierarchy knew they would be beaten, but where it was extremely important that they should win. Top of the list, predictably, was Kandara, the constituency held since 1963 by Mzee Bildad Kaggia. Here, it was necessary to sustain the myth which was central to Kenyatta's propaganda, that Odinga's party was a strictly Luo tribal affair, with no support among Kenya's other ethnic groups, and in particular with no support among the Kikuyu, Kenyatta's own tribe. The facts, however, were in blatant contradiction. Kandara is in the Kikuyu heartland, the home of some of the sturdiest fighters in the war of liberation, and the home, too, of thousands of Kikuyu landless, the very people who felt themselves betrayed by KANU's empty promises of land, promises which Kaggia had fought so tirelessly to make a reality.

Thus, even Kenyatta's notorious visit to Kandara on the eve of polling was not enough. (Kenyatta told a rally that Kaggia was building an 'eighteen-room mansion' with Chinese money. In fact Kaggia's house has four modest rooms, with about one acre of ground.) Thuggery, murder and arson became the order of the day in Kandara, with all those suspected of KPU sympathies as the victims. It is known that at least four people were murdered, many huts and houses were destroyed, and innocent farmers beaten up by KANU Youth Wing thugs and by the police. To remove all prospect of a KPU victory, the ballot papers were not counted for a fortnight after the election, but were kept in a clothing warehouse at the District Commissioner's headquarters in

* *Showdown in Kenya*; No. 26, Third Quarter, 1966.

Fort Hall. When counting time came, Kaggia himself caught redhanded a supposedly impartial counter who was trying to doctor bundles of votes. He demanded a recount, but the central fact remained: there were more ballot papers than there had been votes cast. It was then that he realised that further attempts to ensure fair play were useless, and walked out in disgust, leaving the District Commissioner to announce that Kaggia's opponent, a man who had previously been rejected by the people in the 1965 Senate elections, had won by a 'huge majority'. And this pattern was repeated elsewhere in the country, although—notably in Machakos and Elgon West—it did not always succeed. Even though KANU succeeded in defeating the majority of the KPU candidates, the new opposition actually polled *more* votes in the Little General Election than the Government.

The opposition can therefore take heart, as it has on this evidence and on political trends since the election, in the fact that the masses of Kenya are quickly realising that promises from the Government of Jomo Kenyatta are empty, that the bright hope for the future which uhuru brought will not be realised while KANU remains in power. While the settlers and businessmen and western diplomats talk of Kenyatta's 'stable' rule, the wananchi have seen their hopes of land, of employment, of a better life being smothered by the spreading morass of corruption, political intrigue and self-seeking which is so noticeable a feature of life in the capital of their own country.

This depressing picture of Kenya, however, must be submitted to a closer, more profound scrutiny. It is not good enough to explain the steady drift to the Right solely in terms of evil, self-seeking men in power—although, God knows, there are plenty of those. What we are witnessing in Kenya is an acceleration of class differentiation, and to a large extent the political changes since independence are a reflection of this process. Under the peculiar conditions of a rich but underdeveloped country, which is moving rapidly away from the communalistic, broadly egalitarian social structure of tribal life towards capitalism and a money economy, Kenyan society is beginning to show sharp distinctions between poor peasants and rich landlords, between manual workers and owners, between white-collar civil servants and lowly government labourers. These tensions, reflected in the leadership of the national movement, have manifested themselves in different forms in virtually every African country. In some, such as Tanzania, the nascent capitalist, pro-imperialist class has been isolated and, at least for the time being, driven into retreat. But in few African countries have such drastic measures as the anti-capitalist clauses of the Arusha Declaration been put into effect; in few places have the sheep and the goats been sorted out so effectively.

In Kenya, it is common knowledge that there always existed severe class difference in the composition of the liberation movement. Such men as Mboya, Kiano and Moi have consistently voiced the interests of the small group of intellectuals and businessmen who, consciously or unconsciously, saw independence as a change over from British to African personnel, rather than as the time for drastic remoulding of society in favour of the dispossessed. (This is not to deny the valuable part played by a few, notably Paul Ngei, in the independence struggle.) On the other hand, another group of leaders just as vigorously represented the interests of the poor, the landless, the workers whose trade unions were being exploited by Mboya to further his personal ambitions. Ultimately, as in Tanzania, the U.A.R. and other African states, these fundamental contradictions could not be contained within the rhetoric of national unity. One side or the other had to win out, to oust its opponents, and to consolidate its position.

In Tanzania and the U.A.R., those representing the interests of the ordinary people have made substantial gains; in Kenya, with a reactionary white settler community and the imperialist powers as willing allies, the pro-capitalist element is in the ascendancy. Its ideology is that of the paper on African Socialism, written by Mboya and his American 'advisers', which was so devastatingly dissected in the *African Communist*. Its policy, under the guise of socialism, is the embourgeoisement of Kenya for the benefit of its class and, since the Kenyan capitalists lack skills and above all capital, ultimately for the benefit of the imperialist companies which already have such a power presence in Kenya. For these men, as indeed for Kenyatta himself, there can be no more fitting judgement than that of Frantz Fanon, commenting in his book, *The Wretched of the Earth*, on the national leader who has duped the people:

The people who for years on end have seen this leader and heard him speak, who from a distance in a kind of dream have followed his contests with the colonial power, spontaneously put their trust in this patriot. Before independence, the leader generally embodies the aspirations of the people for independence, political liberty and national dignity. But as soon as independence is declared, far from embodying in concrete form the needs of the people in what touches bread, land, and the restoration of the country to the sacred hands of the people, the leader will reveal his inner purpose: to become the general president of that company of profiteers impatient for their returns which constitutes the national bourgeoisie.

WHO BACKS KANU?

Who, then, make up the hard core of KANU supporters in Kenya? That the career politicians, the prostitute intellectuals, the white settlers and businessmen are committed to Kenyatta's government goes without

saying. It is also true, however, that there is a growing class of large-scale African farmers whose very existence is a result of the Government's policy of selling off former White land to Africans in large blocks, instead of breaking it down into small peasant holdings. In the rural areas, particularly among the commercially-active Kikuyu, this landlord group is reinforced by the African shopowners who, while their actual economic situation is relatively poor, see in commerce the opportunity to break free of the ties of rural poverty into the dreamed-of wealth of the larger towns.

The position of the civil service is more complex. On the one hand, public officials depend on the government for their jobs which, however miserable, are better than being unemployed, and offer the hope of economic advancement, of bribes by Asian businessmen, of social status. At the same time, however, it is clear that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction in the lower echelons of the administration, as low-grade civil servants see that promotion and prospects are dependent, not on ability, but on the corruption and nepotism which have become standard procedure in the civil service. Their commitment to KANU is also limited by uncertainty—they cannot be absolutely sure that the 'wild men' of the Kenya People's Union will never be in power, and they are frightened that their discrimination and sharp political practices will not be forgotten. For KANU, they are ambiguous allies.

Nevertheless, the Government has at its disposal considerable political resources, and it has support among crucial economic groups who wield considerable economic power. The KPU, on the other hand, also has several advantages.

Firstly, it can claim the overwhelming support of the Luo tribe, numbering more than one million people. No doubt much of this support has been based on ethnic solidarity and the unquestionable tribal leadership of Odinga. But even among the Luo, the development of classes and the divergence of class interest proceeds apace: recently, for example, a group of Luo elders, chiefs and other wealthy people were granted an interview with Kenyatta, at which they begged him to realise that not all Luo were KPU supporters, and told him that he could count on their support.

Increasingly, the support of the Luo masses for the KPU is based, not on tribal loyalties, but on the clear realisation of the Luo people that their future must be committed to the KPU if they are to go forward and prosper. And this is the developing pattern throughout Kenya. Gradually, the masses are taking stock of the bitter fruits of independence, and realising that KANU, so powerful a symbol of liberation, has become the oppressor. This realisation is also rapidly being forced upon Kenya's workers and trade unionists, who since 1966 have been forced into the

Central Organisation of Trade Unions, a government-sponsored body with Clement Lubembe, a KANU stooge, at its head. The workers have seen their trade union leaders bullied and detained, heard the Minister of Labour, Kiano, screech that every strike is 'illegal' when it quite obviously is not, seen the Government take the side of the white employers every time workers take action to defend their interests.

KPU'S ELECTION CHANCES

KPU can do much to consolidate this huge body of support among the working class and the landless masses. But they have a further task, which though extremely difficult is of the greatest importance: they must show the small farmers, those with two or three acres of land, that to support KANU is to work against their own interests. Let us not underestimate the difficulty. As a result of the land consolidation policy, these farmers have for the first time secure, freehold title to their land. KPU must show them that the value of their land as a source of income is declining as a result of Government discrimination in favour of the big estates, and that they are doomed to impoverishment and rural poverty while this discrimination persists. This task is made more difficult by two factors: KPU is rarely allowed to hold public meetings to tell the people the truth, and their party branches have been destroyed in more than one area by KANU thugs. In addition the name of Kenyatta still holds some of its old charismatic power, although it is losing potency as Kenyatta's megalomania and contempt for democracy become more obvious.

To place too much faith in the ballot box would be a mistake.

In the first place, there is little chance of the election being fair.

Secondly, by a constitutional manoeuvre involving the abolition of the Senate in November 1966, the general election has been postponed by KANU from 1968 to 1970. (Although, typical of the Byzantine intrigue that characterises Kenyan politics, there are persistent rumours that the election will be held in 1968 after all. The argument runs thus: Kenyatta is known to be very ill, and the KANU leadership fears that, if they wait until 1970, he will be dead, and they will be left to fight the election without even the tattered trump card of the Father of the Nation. It would therefore be in their interest to hold the election soon, hoping to defeat KPU with Kenyatta's help, rather than face the Opposition without him, merely for the sake of two more years in power.)

There is a third, more ominous reason. In the wings of Kenyan politics wait the Army, with Sandhurst-trained officers, augmented by the villainous General Service Unit, which has in the past been used as

an intimidatory weapon by the government. The police and the top civil servants, too, are distinctly anti-KPU, since the majority were colonialist-trained and indoctrinated (many of them, in fact, are veterans of the British campaign to butcher the forest liberation fighters). The progressives in Kenya should not hope for too much from the next election. It may never take place.

REBECCA BUNTING

Veteran S.A. Revolutionary

JANUARY 22nd, 1968, marks the eightieth birthday of Rebecca Bunting, pioneer of the revolutionary Marxist movement in South Africa. Together with her husband, the late Comrade S. P. Bunting and other stalwarts, she helped to build the International Socialist League, predecessor of the Communist Party, established in 1915.

She was present at the Foundation Congress of the Communist Party of South Africa in July 1921, and was elected to the first Central Committee of the Party. Now in exile she is still an active member of the Communist Party of Great Britain.

A message of warm fraternal greetings sent to her by the Central Committee of the South African Communist Party on her eightieth birthday pays tribute to her 'very many years of devoted and exemplary service to the Party and the national liberation movement of our country'.

'Dear Comrade Rebecca', concludes the message, 'we wish you good health and continued strength, at this time when a new generation of South African freedom fighters is challenging the fascist tyranny with arms in their hands. We are sure that our cause will be victorious — that our country shall be liberated; that our militants shall be returned from jail and exile; that we shall build the free South Africa of our aspirations, our strivings and sacrifices'.

AID AND CO-OPERATION

A Democratic Policy for France

JEAN SURET-CANALE

WITHIN THAT PART of the world still dominated by imperialism, contradictions on the economic level are being aggravated. This is revealed by a growing inequality of development, a constantly widening gap between the rate of development of the advanced capitalist countries and that of the economically and politically dependent—so-called ‘underdeveloped’—countries.

It is euphemistically stated that these countries are ‘in the process of development’, but this is far from being the case. Even when the balance-sheet of their economy shows some progress in absolute value, they are still falling behind in relation to other countries, and this gap is inexorably widening.

This tendency is borne out by a good deal of statistical data. Accurate figures are difficult to ascertain, and their value may be debatable. But their magnitude and relative significance all point in the same direction.

The following three tables provide illustrations.

TABLE 1¹

INCREASE OF GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT 1953-1962

(Average annual increase per head of population, calculated at

¹ Source: P. Jalée, *Le Pillage du Tiers Monde*, Paris, 1965, p. 19.

constant market prices ² for the ten-year period—index: 1958=100) ³	
Seven socialist countries, including the USSR	+5.27%
Eleven advanced capitalist countries (including the USA, Japan, West Germany, France, Italy)	+3.2%
Twelve 'underdeveloped' countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, including Brazil, Argentine, Mexico, India, Congo-Kinshasa and the former Federation of Rhodesia-Nyasaland ⁴	+1.45%

This table demonstrates both the superiority of the socialist system, even in relation to the most advanced capitalist countries, and the inequality of development within the imperialist sphere, as between the imperialist and the dependent countries.

TABLE 2⁵

INCREASE OF GROSS INTERNAL PRODUCT 1950-1960

(Calculated per head per year at average mean rate compound interest.)

'Developed' countries	+2.7%
'Underdeveloped' countries	+2.2%

These figures seem more complete, because they cover more countries, but they are in fact less valid, because they disregard social systems and classify countries into two categories rather arbitrarily. Nevertheless, though the gap is smaller, the same trend is shown. The study from which these figures were taken, itself comments: *'Thus the gap between the two groups of countries . . . has widened, not only in absolute value, but also in relative value'*.

TABLE 3⁶

DEVELOPMENT OF EXTERNAL TRADE 1960-1964

(1) Progress in value of external trade			
World average		+34%	
Fifteen industrial countries		+38%	
'Underdeveloped' countries		+18%	
(2) Share of world trade		1960	1964
Fifteen industrial countries		58.0%	59.6%
'Underdeveloped' countries (excluding oil-exporting countries)		17.3%	15.3%

² Thus allowing for currency depreciations.

³ Average year over the period.

⁴ Note that several of these countries show relatively high rates of progress: 6.5 per cent in 1965 for Mexico, 5 per cent for Brazil, 7 per cent for Argentine.

⁵ Source: U.N. *Study of World Economy*, 1963, Part One (taken from Tables 2-3).

⁶ Source: *Bulletin de la Banque Centrale des Etats de l'Afrique de L'Ouest*. Notes and information; No. 124, December 1965.

The development of external trade is never strictly on a par with that of production. Nevertheless, more often than not there is a relative correlation between the two. It is noticed here that this development shows a continuous decrease on the part of the underdeveloped countries in world trade and a rate of progress inferior to that of the 'developed' countries.

Some might console themselves for this state of affairs by pointing out that even in the 'underdeveloped' countries there is none the less a certain increase in production, even when calculated per head, thus taking into account demographic progress. First of all, it must be pointed out that the figures given here are averages. In certain countries, there is no increase in production, but stagnation and sometimes a decrease. Above all, it must be emphasised that the increase in absolute value of the production or revenue per capita, without taking into account the realities of class and the regime of property, give only a very inaccurate picture of the real situation. The increase in revenue per head in Venezuela which includes the revenues of the oil companies does not mean anything in relation to the real income of the masses. The problem is not peculiar to the 'underdeveloped' countries: we are very well aware that in the most 'developed' capitalist countries, for instance in France, the considerable increase in production achieved during these last years both in absolute value and per capita, has in no way shown itself to be an increase in the income or the buying power of the masses. Only the determined struggle of the working class has prevented there being, on the whole, a decline, and on several occasions, there has been an improvement but in proportions which have nothing in common with the increase of productivity and of production.

Thus, in the 'underdeveloped' countries, the increase in production is essentially due to the progress of mineral production (oil chiefly, iron ores, aluminium, etc.) and agricultural production for export, whereas the production of food products remains stagnant or even declines.

A recent report of the F.A.O.⁷ indicates that '*world food production for 1965-1966, owing to a general drought, did not exceed that of the preceding year whereas the number of mouths to feed increased by about 70 million*'.⁸

In Africa, Latin America and the Far East, the global decrease in

⁷ International Organisation for Food and Agriculture.

⁸ *Le Monde*, October 14th, 1966.

production is 2 per cent, which means a decrease per inhabitant of 4 to 5 per cent.

Taken as a whole, food production per inhabitant has thus '*fallen back again to the level of 1957-58, which corresponds to the pre-war level, itself already insufficient*'.⁹

Thus, at the very moment when the outstanding progress of science and technology should provide a better standard of living for the whole of humanity, hundreds of millions of men are less and less assured of the minimum food supply necessary for survival!

Certain specialists even predict that if present economic trends continue in the same way, the 'Third World' will—towards 1980—experience an unprecedented famine.

At the same time, the growing integration of these countries into the world market has as its consequence a general raising of the level of needs in quantity, in quality and in diversity. Hundreds of millions of men who were living naked, in rudimentary shelters, deprived of education, now feel a vital need to obtain decent clothing, a form of dwelling worthy of the name, and schools for their children. The gap between the elementary social needs and the real buying power of the masses is increasing.

This paradox does not disclose a mysterious 'curse' on modern civilisation and technical progress, but the logical tendency of capitalist development which Marx revealed a century ago. It indicates the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, its incapacity to resolve its contradictions in the very terms in which Marx summed them up: accumulation of riches at one pole (today reduced to monopolies) and accumulation of misery at the other.

FALSE 'EXPLANATIONS'

This self-evident fact is beginning to be recognised nearly everywhere, and echoes of it are even found in the recent papal encyclical. But, at the same time, many authors, even progressives, do not appreciate its decisive character. Under the pressure of bourgeois ideology, they overestimate elements which are sometimes important but which are not decisive for an explanation of the situation in the 'underdeveloped' countries. This very term 'underdevelopment' lends itself to confusion. It was coined in the 'fifties by the bourgeoisie to designate a reality over which until then it had thrown a veil, that of the backwardness and the misery of the colonial and dependent countries enslaved by imperialism. It leads one to suppose that between 'de-

⁹ *ibid.*

veloped' and 'underdeveloped' countries there is only a quantitative difference and thus the decisive realities of economic and social organisation—the class structures—are blurred.

There is no such thing as 'underdevelopment'. The backwardness, and above all the internal imbalance, the distortion of the economy of the 'underdeveloped' countries, are due to their state of dependence on the great imperialist powers who have reduced them to appendages of their own economy. The 'underdevelopment' is only the other side of a certain type of 'development', i.e. capitalist development.

Thus it is useless and often dangerous, owing to the political use which can be made of these false theories, to try to analyse 'underdevelopment' as a phenomenon 'in itself', determined only by internal causes.

Thus certain authors used to explain the backward state of the colonial and dependent peoples as due to an alleged 'natural' fatality of the 'race' whose inferiority and incapacity were an explanation for poverty, or again as due to the curse of climate and nature. These theories are hardly ever openly upheld today, although one cannot say (as certain racialist reactions to the recent Middle East conflict indicated) that they have disappeared from men's minds.

It would be just as dangerous to see in certain historical internal circumstances the 'causes' of underdevelopment. Of course, these very complex circumstances can explain why countries with ancient civilisations like India and China did not achieve the industrial revolution and did not reach capitalism before the countries of Western Europe. For this reason, when the time came, they were especially designated as the prey of growing imperialism. But it is imperialism which made of them colonial or dependent countries, and not the particular circumstances of their social history. Other countries which did not have such a past and whose population and social structures have been entirely or almost entirely imported through colonisation—countries such as Brazil or Argentine—found themselves in the same state of dependency with regard to imperialism, and thus victims of the same 'underdevelopment'.

Among the so-called 'internal causes', there is one which it is worth examining because it is widely exploited, even in works with scientific pretensions. This is the demographic situation of the 'underdeveloped' countries.

The very slight increase in—or one might say—the stagnation of production in these countries is at present almost everywhere accompanied by an unprecedented 'population explosion'. At the time of the classic colonial epoch (about 1920-1925), the birth rate and the death rate just about balanced at a very high level (around 30 per

1,000). But since the end of the Second World War there has been a new development. On the one hand, the birth rates have been constant or on the increase (they are between 30 and 40 per 1,000—sometimes more: Mexico 45, Guinea 62) as against rates of about 18 in Europe. On the other hand, the death rates have fallen from a level of about 30 per 1,000 to a level of less than 20 (Brazil 20.6, Algeria 18, India 10.3), a level still higher than that of Europe (about 10 per 1,000) but coming closer and closer to it. This is the result, not of development in the standard of living, nor even of a noticeable improvement of the medical infrastructure, but of the establishment of mass prophylactic measures (the stopping or limitation of epidemics by the use of vaccination or serums) and the use of antibiotics which became the rule about the middle of the twentieth century.

This has resulted in a massive population growth, which puts a greater burden on these countries, since it essentially results in young generations not yet integrated into production. This is a *real problem* which may remain serious for a period, even for countries which have freed themselves from colonial or neo-colonial dependency, but which have inherited structures bequeathed to them by this dependency, which they cannot modify very rapidly.

Some people even go so far as to see in this the fundamental fact, the cause of underdevelopment. They consider the fundamental, if not the only, remedy to be the control of the birth rate.

This is merely reviving in modern conditions the theories of Malthus, which Marx refuted a century ago. Malthus, at the beginning of the industrial revolution, attempted to explain the terrible poverty of the British workers of his time not by capitalist exploitation, which was then in full development, but by the excessive birth rate of the working class! According to Malthus, the only way of fighting this misery was to control births. He stated that the population had a tendency to grow by geometric progression, whereas food resources could only grow by arithmetical progression. History has given the lie to these predictions. The birth rate which was very high in Europe until the end of the nineteenth century has dropped while the steady growth of productivity has created almost unlimited possibilities of increasing resources.

The idea of an over-populated world doomed to famine because of over-population is completely false. Three-quarters of the habitable world is still almost empty. In the present state of technology, even without taking into account foreseeable progress in this field, the world can easily feed all the excess populations that the most optimistic (or pessimistic) forecasts foresee for the century to come. In fact, in the countries of the 'Third World', whether they are apparently 'over-

populated' or clearly 'under-populated', poverty is not due to the insufficiency of available resources but to the bad way in which they are developed as a result of the private ownership of the means of production. Indeed, they are developed not to satisfy the needs of the great masses, but only to the extent to which they profit the rich, the great imperialist capitalists. 'Birth-control' will not change anything. The proof of this is that in certain countries of central Africa like the Congo, the Central African Republic and Gabon, where population growth is stagnating, all the evils of 'underdevelopment' exist.

The real population explosion observed in most of the countries of the Third World, a phenomenon similar to that which occurred in Europe during the last century, and which will diminish as the living conditions of the masses change and improve, is an important aggravating factor of the internal contradictions of social origin in the present world, but this is in no way the cause or the determining element of these contradictions.

The only cause is capitalism in its contemporary form of imperialism.

REFORMIST POLICIES

The dramatic situation of the 'underdeveloped' nations is not new. Its causes were analysed and denounced by Marxists from the beginning of the century. Lenin's work, *Imperialism, The Highest State of Capitalism*, played a fundamental role in this field. But the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, the collapse of the 'classical' colonial system, have made this situation critical and so obvious that the bourgeoisie can no longer, as it used to, keep silent about it or merely deny its existence. It is obliged to take into account the reactions of the great masses from whom this situation was formerly hidden.

It is interesting to observe that our people, in spite of campaigns appealing to egoism, xenophobia and even racialism, show a prevailing sense of human solidarity and awareness that something must be done to remedy an unjust and intolerable situation.

However, ideas are not very clear as to the causes of the evil and the nature of the remedies to be applied. A certain amount of confusion remains. This arises from inadequate analysis by well-meaning men who are victims of confusion deliberately spread by agents of the bourgeoisie. This type of muddled thinking appears, with variations, in the 'Jeaneney Report' (a synthesis of Gaullist principles on this question), the propositions of many university specialists—often written in good faith—the programme of the Federation of the Left, the proposals of Pierre Mendès-France and the recent papal encyclical.

What these confused ideas have in common is that they ignore or blur the decisive responsibility of imperialism for 'underdevelopment', and

that they lead to the belief that a definitive remedy for the evil is to be found in mere reforms or even acts of 'charity', leaving intact the existing social and economic structures.

However sincere or generous their motives, such reformist policies are in effect designed.

(a) to mitigate the brutality arising from the contradictions, without radical elimination of their causes—thus allowing imperialism to survive by modifying its methods;

(b) to conceal the responsibility of imperialism for the present situation. Sometimes natural 'fatalities' are invented, making the victims responsible, e.g. the neo-Malthusian thesis: 'they have too many children'; 'they are incapable of reforming archaic economic and social structures' (forgetting that these structures are kept up and maintained by imperialism). Or a third party is blamed, the workers of the capitalist countries or even of the socialist countries. (This is the theme opposing the 'rich countries' to the 'poor countries', thus substituting national conflicts for a class analysis—a theme which unites the reformists, the Pope and the Maoist leaders.)

Based on this sort of inadequate analysis, whether deliberately or otherwise, measures are proposed which, in essence, fall under two heads:

1) *Development and generalisation of 'aid' from the 'rich countries' to the 'poor countries'.*

For example there is the idea of taxing by 1 per cent or more the national revenue of the 'developed' countries, if possible in a 'multi-lateral' form through the United Nations or other international or regional organisations.

In this field, the French government prides itself on doing its 'duty', its 'aid' representing 1.88 per cent of our national revenue, whereas it only represents 0.99 per cent of that of the United States.

Without taking the argument any further for the moment, it must be pointed out that these purely quantitative proposals are meaningless without defining the context and the purpose of this 'aid'. One only needs to recall that out of 3,386 million dollars of American 'aid' for the year 1966, 917 million were devoted to 'military aid', of which 550 million were destined for South Vietnam!

2) *Stabilisation of market prices to benefit the 'poor' countries.*

The relative value of the products of the countries of the 'Third World' (mainly mineral ores or agricultural produce of tropical origin) continues to diminish in relation to that of industrial products. In order to remedy the difficulties thus resulting for these countries, it is proposed that international measures should be adopted to stabilise or revalue the market prices of the products of the 'Third World'.

But who will benefit in the first place from these measures? The producers or the mining and commercial monopolies which control the production or the commercialisation of mineral ores and tropical food produce.

Naturally, there is no question of rejecting these reforms on principle, or of considering them *en bloc* as being reactionary or utopian, though nothing has so far been done to effect them.

We have never been against reforms of a capitalist regime; no one has done more than the Communists to force the capitalists to make reforms! We are for all reforms which contribute towards improving the condition of the workers at the expense of the capitalists, and we consider that the battle to obtain these reforms mobilises the workers to achieve the revolutionary transformations of tomorrow.

But we are against the 'reformism' which tends to see in such reforms an end in itself, which supports them in no matter what conditions, even if they are carried out against the interests of the workers and to the benefit of the capitalists, which forgets that even the best reforms do not change the fundamentals of the problem and which, if the need arises, would like to blur the necessity for revolutionary transformations by putting forward reforms instead. We are not 'against' unemployment funds or soup-kitchens. But we refuse to see in them a solution of the social question.

THE 'AID' POLICY OF THE IMPERIALIST POWERS

It must be noted that until now no concrete effort has been made in the two directions proposed by reformist policies.

On the contrary, since political independence there has been a worsening in relation to what was done within the framework of former colonial empires, both in the way of 'aid' and in the matter of guaranteed prices and sales products. Of course, the colonial countries have always been taxed to make a contribution to the 'aid' of which the amount and the destination were imposed by the colonial power.¹⁰

Political independence is today easily seen as a pretext for making the 'aided' countries supply the contributions which were formerly in part supplied by the colonial mother country.

The last report of the World Bank (B.I.R.D.)¹¹ indicates that the volume of aid has been stationary for the last five years, in absolute figures. As a percentage of the national revenue of the countries giving

¹⁰ 45 per cent of the funds of the 'F.I.D.E.S.', from 1946 to 1958 were supplied from the budgets of the recipient countries.

¹¹ International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, a body dominated by American monopolies.

'aid' it is falling, dropping from 0.8 per cent to 0.6 per cent in 1965.¹² At the same time, the *debt* of the 'underdeveloped' countries continues to increase, rising from 9,000 million dollars in 1955 to 33,000 million dollars in 1964. The rate of progression of the debt slowed down in 1965 (10 per cent as against 15 per cent per year average in the years 1955-1963); but this slowing down merely indicates 'a reduction in the volume of the loans from the creditor countries to countries that the problems of the debt put in a difficult situation'.¹³ Certain countries are thus obliged to devote most of the 'aid' received to repayment and to the payment of interest on former loans.

At the same time, the conditions of the 'aid', and particularly of credit, have become more rigorous.

Within the framework of political independence and neo-colonialism, the forms of international 'multilateral' aid have progressed at the expense of 'bilateral' forms (from one country to another).

But this 'multilateral' aid given by the 'World Bank' and its associated organisations (A.I.D.: International Association for Development; S.F.I.: International Financial Society) in actual fact under American control, or by the 'European Development Fund' (F.E.D.) emanating from the 'European Common Market' or finally by the United Nations and its specialised organisations such as the F.A.O., is granted under conditions which are generally more strict and onerous.¹⁴

Things have come to such a pass that the technicians in the service of the World Bank fear a slowing down of transactions because the required conditions are discouraging would-be borrowers.

But the 'bilateral' aid, the amount of which is tending to diminish (although this form remains preponderant), is itself also subject to conditions which are increasingly precarious and strict. The 'gifts' which in 1960 represented 70 per cent of the total amount of this aid, made up less than 52 per cent (out of a lower total figure) in 1965.

¹² *Le Monde*, September 27th, 1966.

¹³ *ibid.*

¹⁴ When the conditions are less onerous, they concern credits distributed in minute amounts and calling for rigorous 'guarantees'. A.I.D. grants loans at rates varying from 1 to 3 per cent, while the B.I.R.D. requires 5.75 per cent but the limited capital of A.I.D., which is almost entirely out on loan, means that '*the intervention of this body can only be marginal*' (S. Reicher—SGRADI. Introduction à l'Aide Internationale aux Pays Sous-développés, Paris, 1966, Vol. 1, pp. 18-19).

This year the World Bank (B.I.R.D.), '*although its assets had increased substantially*', reduced its endowment to the A.I.D. to 10 million dollars, as against 50 million in 1963-64 and 75 million for each of the two following years. '*The resources of the A.I.D. being almost used up, it is probable that the activities of the A.I.D. will be reduced to almost nothing next year*'. *Le Monde*, August 24th, 1967, p. 13.

The average interest rates on loans from the public sector, granted within the bilateral framework, rose from 3 per cent in 1964 to 3.6 per cent in 1965, whereas the average period of repayment has been cut from 28 to 21 years.

The Geneva recommendations for the stabilising of prices have in no way been applied; on the contrary, the fluctuations, and in some cases the collapse of prices for certain tropical products have been intensified.

In former French Africa, integration into the European Common Market has resulted in lining up prices of certain products with world prices. This has done away with the privileged conditions some countries formerly enjoyed on the French market (Senegal, for example, for ground nuts) and created a more difficult economic and financial situation for them.

GAULLIST 'AID' POLICY

Gaullist 'aid' policy, which sets itself up as an example, is in fact no exception to the rule. According to official reports,¹⁵ French aid is 'stable'. In 1964 the total was slightly higher than in 1963 (1,364 million dollars as against 1,240 million dollars); but the amount in 1964 was less than that of the years 1961-1962 (1,400 million dollars). The 'stability' is in fact a decrease.

The 1967 budget emphasises this tendency even more.¹⁶ There has been a massive drop in grants to Algeria, which have been halved from 1963 to 1967 (from 1,130 to 569 million).

It was stressed when the budget was presented that projects for which money would be given would be subjected to 'stricter selection'. The Secretary of State for Co-operation made it clear that projects financed by F.A.C. (Fund for Aid and Co-operation) must have a more 'commercial' nature, favouring French firms. This indicates the nature of the 'selection'.

To cut the cost of technical assistance, much more use is made of army conscripts instead of civil servants—bringing the annual average cost down from 52,300 francs to 20,000 francs. There is to be

¹⁵ *French aid to development*. Memorandum from France to the Committee on Aid and Development of the O.E.C.D. *French documentation*. Notes and documentary studies, No, 3,303, June 27th, 1966.

¹⁶ It is extremely difficult to evaluate the amount of this 'aid' by means of budget documents. It is dispersed between different Ministries: Finance and Economic Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Co-operation, Overseas Territories and Departments and, until last year, Algerian Affairs. In addition, according to a procedure which aims at creating an illusion of parliamentary control, these documents are presented in a more and more confused way which makes their interpretation very difficult, even for experts.

a speedier recovery of the contributions of the 'recipient states' at the expense of technical assistance. On the pretext of a shortage of specialist officials, all kinds of functions have been handed over to private companies.

There is no increased allocation for scientific research, already grossly under-endowed in comparison with 'military aid'.

THE NATURE OF 'AID' FROM IMPERIALIST COUNTRIES

It would clearly be false to consider as 'aid' any sum of money which goes from the imperialist countries to the 'underdeveloped' countries, without considering its nature and purpose. Where large private firms invest capital, or when a state or private loan is granted to be repaid later at average rates of interest, these are means of exploitation of the labour force of the 'recipient' country, to the profit of the capitalist investors, and clearly cannot be regarded as 'aid'.

Are things very different when it is a matter of public 'aid' under privileged conditions, or even in the form of a gift? In actual fact, in both cases, what is involved is an investment, an export of capital which Lenin has shown to be a phenomenon characteristic of contemporary imperialism. There is no difference in *function* between the exporting of private capital within the colonial or neo-colonial system of imperialism, and a 'gift' out of public funds.

In the case of a public grant, capital, instead of being invested by capitalists themselves is supplied free of charge by taxpayers—both of the 'donor' country (i.e. in view of the structure of the tax system, essentially by the workers) and also of the 'recipient' country, who have to pay for redemption, working costs, etc. a fact all too often forgotten. In the French colonial area of 'F.I.D.E.S.'¹⁷ the 'recipient' country has always to pay a fixed proportion of 45 per cent for grants.

In every case, the benefits or interests of this normally productive capital¹⁸ go essentially not to the people of the 'recipient' countries but to the imperialist monopolies who dominate their economies. The grants are mainly directed towards the sort of infrastructure development which is intended to ensure high profit rates especially advantageous for the private capital invested by the monopolies.

These transactions do not really differ from current economic devices within such imperialist countries as France, whereby the state bears the

¹⁷ 'Fund for Investment and Economic and Social Development', set up in 1946, to finance out of the State budget the renewal of equipment for the 'Overseas territories'.

¹⁸ Except in the case of waste, thefts, lavish expenditure, etc., the 'beneficiaries' of which—because they always exist—are none the less the same: the capitalist monopolies, their satellites and their agents.

burden of ever-growing investments for the profit, essentially, of the capitalist monopolies. It is they who benefit from the provision of free infrastructure and equipment, from loans and grants in the most varied forms, from the use, at low cost, of public services, nationalised undertakings and other veiled subsidies.

These practices are characteristic of *state monopoly capitalism*.¹⁹ They date from the period after the Second World War (F.I.D.E.S. was set up in 1946). They reveal the general crisis of capitalism which can no longer 'work' (i.e., ensure the necessary flow of profit) without more and more state intervention, without an ever-increasing and massive grant of 'free' capital supplied by the state at the expense of the taxpayer. They expose, in an increasingly harsh light, the parasitic nature of contemporary monopoly capitalism.

The so-called aid to the underdeveloped countries from the imperialist countries is only a modern form of capital export, under conditions of state monopoly capitalism.

Like any form of investment, such 'aid' can contribute to development and stimulate production. But it is a form of development which maintains and aggravates the dependent, unbalanced and distorted nature of the economy of the country concerned. Such investments, whether private or state, are in practice orientated not towards the needs of the people, the nation, but towards the interests of foreign monopoly capital.

Such 'aid' is directed towards extracting the profits from the labour of the toiling masses in order to accumulate them in the hands of foreign monopolists; the accumulation almost invariably takes place outside the country being 'aided'.

Essentially, this is a means of exploitation.

THE 'REVERSE FLOW'

It is noteworthy that, while the flow of values from the imperialist 'metropolitan' countries towards their colonies or ex-colonies is considered as 'aid', this description is never applied to the flow in the reverse direction. But statistics show that this flow is at least equal, if not higher.

Between 1952 and 1958 63,200 million francs (C.F.A.) were transferred from France to French West Africa—mostly 'public aid'. But in the same period France received from the same area, mostly in taxa-

¹⁹ See in this connection the issues of *Economie et Politique* for June-July and August-September 1966, on the reports and discussion at the International Conference at Choisy-le-Roi on State Monopoly Capitalism.

tion and private profits, 67,600 million.²⁰ A balance of 4,400 million in favour of France.

In the year 1963, similarly, transfers from France to the 'Monetary Union of West Africa' (former French West Africa, excluding Guinea) were 33,827 million francs. Transfers in the reverse direction were 38,322 million.²¹ A net money loss to the African countries of 4,495 million.

Again for the seven-month period November 1961-May 1962 (no more recent data had been made public at the time of writing) a similar comparison between France and the 'Equatorial African Monetary Union' (formerly French Equatorial Africa plus Cameroun) shows an amount of 7,500 million francs from France and 20,500 million to France—a gain by France of 13,000 million.²²

The Jeanneney Report itself admits that '*the balance of private transfers is almost equal, in the reverse direction, to the balance of public transfers.*'²³ But it is quick to add that it would be 'a serious mistake' to conclude that these 'reverse transfers' compare as a total with the amount of aid given by France and its benefits for the aided country.²⁴ Jeanneney's reasoning is not very convincing.

He argues that the private transfers to France which go to make up the deficit in the trade balance of the 'recipients' are 'the result of aid'. They are 'one of the measures . . . of the burden on the helping country and of its benefit to the "aided"'.²⁵

This is, to put it mildly, a bold affirmation. It implies that the trade deficit results from the importation of goods which materialise the 'aid'—something which remains to be proved. In fact the trade deficit, where it exists, makes up only a fraction of the money transfers, which, for the most part, comprise returns of private profit. Jeanneney in fact admits that public transfers below the level of these returns 'do not constitute an aid for the recipient country'²⁵. But he then carefully avoids making the necessary subtractions when calculating the amount of 'aid.'²⁶

The facts are there. The so-called aid is made up for, and sometimes exceeded, by private transfers in the reverse direction. Even if one takes into account only the money aspect of this question, it is clear that the

²⁰ Suret-Canale, *Economie et Politique*, September-October 1958: 'Franco-African Economic Relations and the Problem of Independence'.

²¹ Bulletin of the Central Bank for States of West Africa, No. 112, November 1964.

²² *Bulletin Cameroun-Afrique Equatoriale*. Central Bank, issues from February to August 1962.

²³ Jeanneney Report, p. 61.

²⁴ *ibid.*, p. 62.

²⁵ *ibid.*, p. 62.

²⁶ *ibid.*, p. 63.

effect of 'public aid' is to enable the return of private, mainly monopoly profits.

But the real balance-sheet of relations between the imperialist countries and their colonial, or neo-colonial, dependencies is by no means fully disclosed by studying the figures of monetary transfers only. Even if there were a positive balance in favour of the dependent countries, this margin would soon be absorbed by two supplementary factors:

(a) deterioration in relative price-levels, which the Jeanneney Report acknowledges '*leads for the exporting countries to losses of income representing an important part of the aid they receive . . . sometimes higher than the whole of this aid*'.²⁷

(b) the excessive prices laid down inside the franc zone—for, though African countries get more than world prices for their exports to France, they have to pay very much higher than world prices for their imports of French manufactures and equipment.

For the period 1953-1954, the A.O.F. Director-General of Finance gave the following figures for the whole of the 'Overseas Territories' at that time (figures in former French francs):

Excess prices paid by the Overseas Territories: 58,300 million.

Excess prices paid by France: 31,200 million.

Loss to Overseas Territories: 27,100 million.²⁸

Integration within the European Common Market has not improved the position; quite the reverse. It has resulted in a steady reduction of prices of African products to approximate prevailing world prices. Thus the subsidy on peanuts, amounting to 10 C.P.A. francs per kilo, has been reduced to four francs paid by the European Economic Community, and must soon disappear altogether. But the artificial prices paid by African countries for imports have been fully maintained in practice, if not in theory. The possibility of buying elsewhere than in France is dependent on having at one's disposal the necessary foreign exchange. And this, in turn, is limited by allocations of foreign exchange by the monetary authorities of the franc zone—i.e., in the last analysis, by the French government.

In 1962, for example, prices of French products were 120 per cent above world prices for sugar, 100 per cent for beef, 75 per cent for flour, 30 per cent for rice and 23 per cent for cotton goods.²⁹

Thus a proper quantitative assessment almost has the effect of making the so-called 'aid' disappear into thin air. It still remains to

²⁷ *ibid.*, p. 95.

²⁸ J. Ehrhard: *Destin du colonialisme*, Paris 1957.

²⁹ F. Nicolon: *Economie et Politique*. April 1964: 'Black Africa and its Relations with the External World', p. 90.

be seen whether the nature and purpose of this 'aid' justify the name it is given.

For the most part it is unproductive; devoted, for example to military or budgetary purposes. It is wasted and used for all kinds of parasitical consumption. It is true that certain elements of the African population, creatures of neo-colonialism, derive crumbs and privileges. But those who like to speak of African countries in a derogatory way forget that the principal beneficiaries of these transactions are always the monopolies and their intermediaries.

The central feature of most 'aid programmes' is that they are designed not so much in the interest of the 'aided' countries as in that of the monopolies who benefit, at the cost of the taxpayers, from the profitable markets and increased business opportunities thus opened up.

We reject 'aid with strings' not because it grants loans on the basis of precise programmes—this is not necessarily to be condemned in itself—but because these programmes are worked out in relation to the export needs of French firms, the needs of the 'assisted' country coming second if they are considered at all.

Even 'technical and cultural co-operation' can be subordinated to considerations of this kind. Thus, for example, the report on the French budget for 1967 openly admitted:

The most disinterested initiatives are not the least rewarding. The help given by France in forming cadres in insufficiently developed countries tends to constitute, through the cultural impregnation which it achieves, an environment favourable to the spreading of our techniques and thus of our goods.³⁰

Within the framework of cultural and technical assistance, the desire to create future customers for French industry, and to maintain a certain 'French presence' as a means of intervening in the internal affairs of the country, all too often outweigh the need to train local cadres capable of rapidly replacing foreign specialists and ensuring the raising of the technical level of production in all fields.

Finally, we must mention the use of 'aid' as a weapon of political blackmail. Such aid creates a dangerous situation of economic dependence. A decrease or withdrawal of such aid threatens to paralyse the economy and strangle the development of the dependent country. This blackmailing threat was used against Guinea, and though it did not achieve the desired results it created serious financial and economic difficulties for that country. The threat has been employed

³⁰ Report on the 1967 Budget—Annexure 3—Foreign Affairs—Cultural Relations and Technical Co-operation, p. 39.

against Djibouti. It is frequently employed, though in more discreet ways, against Algeria.

AID FROM SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

Radically different in character to this imperialist 'aid' is the genuine fraternal assistance given by the socialist countries, primarily the Soviet Union, to the countries that have freed themselves from the colonialist yoke.

This assistance takes the form of long-term, low-interest loans (usually at 1½ per cent) repayable in goods currently produced at guaranteed and stable prices, often above world prices.

The purpose corresponds exclusively to the needs of the recipient countries. The socialist economy, geared to the satisfaction of ever-growing internal needs, has no need to create external markets or to export capital. In fact the goods exported represent a sacrifice of home consumption or—if they are production equipment—of internal accumulation stocks. The goods received in exchange are not always priority needs. It is the principle of international solidarity which guides socialist policy in aid programmes which, from a purely economic viewpoint, involve far more inconveniences than advantages.

The aid from socialist countries is directed not to maintaining and aggravating existing structures of dependence, but, on the contrary, to eliminating them. For the most part it is aimed at creating modern production units, raising the technical level of production, and thus helping to replace the unbalanced, distorted and dependent colonial or semi-colonial economy with one that is well-balanced and independent. Cultural co-operation and technical assistance are aimed at creating cadres suited to the country's needs, who will themselves rapidly be able to train new cadres and do away, as soon as possible, with the need for any foreign assistance.

Imperialist propaganda has made much of faults—sometimes real, sometimes imaginary—arising at first from the inexperience of the socialist countries facing unprecedented problems. But if there were initial mistakes or weaknesses, they do not detract from the fact that the aid of the socialist countries is fundamentally different in quality—as even anti-Communists are obliged, sometimes, to admit.

Such aid is granted in a way which will eliminate the source of dependence in the very structure of the aided country. This in turn will lead to a new economic relationship—not between 'developed' countries supplying finished products and 'underdeveloped' countries supplying raw materials, but between equal partners, conducting exchanges within the framework of a normal division of labour on an international scale.

DEMOCRATIC AID AND CO-OPERATION

This is an example that should inspire a genuinely democratic policy of French aid and co-operation.

The general principles of such a policy, drawn up long ago by the French Communist Party, are based on developing economic and cultural exchanges without discrimination, on building up relationships of co-operation with the newly-independent countries free from any colonialist or neo-colonialist content.³¹

1. Correct criticisms of the sort of 'aid' within the present framework should not lead to a sort of 'left Cartierism'.³² Raymond Cartier sets out with an apparent condemnation of Gaullist propaganda—disparaging aid and its waste—but comes to practically the same conclusions as the Jeanneney Report. He does not demand the withdrawal of 'aid'—but its limitation and its subordination to 'French' (i.e. monopoly) interests. He demands that 'aid' should be used to control the 'aided' countries, with a threat of cutting it off if they do not do what the French government wants.

We are for continuing and increasing aid. Even though, in its present context it is a means of exploitation, it is also a condition of the economic survival of the countries concerned. To reduce or withdraw it would face these countries with great difficulties and their people with increased suffering.

But at the same time, we demand a radical change in the forms and content of this 'aid', so that it will cease to be a means of exploitation and enslavement and become true aid—that is to say, a means of economic emancipation of the countries concerned. Such a change would conform to the interests both of the people of these countries and to the true interests of the French nation, whose freedom is incompatible with the enslavement of other peoples, whether open or concealed.

In particular, this transformation should include:

(a) ending of neo-colonialist forms of 'aid' based on the interests of monopoly capital, unequal treaties, discrimination, etc.

(b) reform of the franc zone to ensure that the present members become truly independent financially, and an eventual association based on real and strict equality;

(c) guarantees for the marketing of products at stable and remunerative prices, with commercial and customs measures in favour of the

³¹ Political Resolution of the XVII Congress of the French Communist Party. Cahiers du Communisme, June-July 1964. 520.

³² From the name of Raymond Cartier, ultra-reactionary journalist, author of a series of articles aiming to make French public opinion hostile to aid to the countries of the 'Third World'.

countries concerned, agreed through free negotiation on a basis of equality;

(d) aid to be granted in conformity with the needs of the country concerned to enable it to build up an independent and modern economy. All aid—whether in the form of long-term low-interest loans, repayable in current products, or of grants—to be determined through free negotiation on a basis of equality.

2. We are in favour of such international measures as an overall plan for genuine aid, stabilisation of exchange-rates, etc. on condition that they fit into a democratic framework. But we do not overestimate the possibilities here.

Some people see such measures as a panacea to eliminate 'underdevelopment', but in fact they are only palliatives. Although, as we have seen above, nothing in this direction is being done at the present—quite the reverse!—it would be a mistake to dismiss all such plans as utopian and impracticable.

Clearly there is analogy between such schemes and the Keynesian plan to eliminate the contradictions of capitalism as revealed in the 'thirties. Keynes's proposals for state intervention were eventually put into practice, within the framework of state monopoly capitalism. Although they could not eliminate the contradictions of the system, they did enable their effects to be spread out over a period of time. Such measures were for the most part applied separately within each state or grouping of an imperialist country and its dependencies.

It cannot be excluded that a new crisis, or the threat of one, could induce the imperialist powers, despite their conflicts, to accept similar measures of intervention on an international scale. Without rejecting such measures in principle, we cannot agree to their being implemented at the expense of the workers either of the 'underdeveloped' countries or of the great capitalist powers. And it is obvious that this is just what would happen if they were carried out through international bodies dominated by the imperialist monopolies.

No lasting solution to the problem of 'underdevelopment' can be found without winning true economic and political independence for the former colonies, through the liquidation of all forms of imperialist domination, direct or indirect.

Until this condition is realised there can be no illusions about the overall effects of any general aid scheme. And in the same way it would be wrong to overestimate the chances of a general stabilisation of rates of exchange and prices, at this stage. The worsening terms of exchange—i.e. the growing gap between prices of the products of industrial countries in relation to those of 'underdeveloped' countries, to the disadvantage of the latter—is not the essence of imperialist

exploitation; it is only a secondary manifestation. It does not result only from the pressure of the monopolies—though this is an important factor—it also reflects the growing gap in the *productivity of labour* in each group of countries.

On the one hand there is prehistoric agriculture whose main tool remains the hoe and which does not use machines or chemical manure; on the other, industry at the stage of automation. Under such conditions, the exchange of equal quantities of labour undertaken at far removed technical levels cannot be realised. The average level of value and prices on a world scale is established according to the average work productivity on a world scale: in this average, the share of the production of the industrial countries, and thus the determining role of their level of productivity, plays a more and more important part. This explains the continuing deterioration of exchange terms evaluated at 40 per cent for the period 1900-1950, and at 28 per cent for the period 1950-1960.³³

Measures taken merely at the level of the *circulation* of goods can only modify this process, not eliminate it. The remedy is to be found at the level of *production*, in the raising of the whole of the technical level of productivity in the underdeveloped countries. This requires the liquidation of imperialist domination and exploitation, which prevents the raising of the level of productivity, except in the case of a few privileged sectors.

3) These considerations explain why we place most importance on the reform of the relations between France and the countries which formed its former colonial empire, and with which it still maintains privileged relations.

We are in favour of the development of relations with other countries on a basis of equality. We are for the

extension of political, economic and cultural relations with all countries . . . against any neo-colonialist policies towards Asian, African and Latin American countries . . . for the development of co-operation based on respect for independence, free consent and mutual benefit.³⁴

We cannot accept a 'redeployment' in the Gaullist manner, which would serve as a pretext for a reduction in the aid given to countries which are victims of French imperialism.

In our view, to lay primary stress on measures to be taken on an international level means evading our own *responsibilities*. It can result in doing nothing about the present position, expressing pious wishes and blaming 'others' for stagnation. Unless the character and purpose

³³ Raymond Barbé: 'Le Rapport Jeanneney et le Néo-colonialisme', *Economie et Politique*, October 1964, pp. 58-73.

³⁴ Programme of the French Communist Party, June 1966.

of international aid is precisely defined, it can end up with an aggravation of all the negative features of the present forms of 'aid'. This is precisely what is happening in the case of 'multilateral aid' rendered by international or regional bodies which are, in more or less disguised forms, really imperialist consortiums. The concept that 'multilateral' aid is necessarily better than 'bilateral' aid is an illusion which has been disproved by the facts. It can be better, but it can also be worse.

On the other hand, within the perspective of achieving true democracy, the reform of bilateral relations could be possible *immediately*, and this would have a positive influence on any changes which may take place on the international level—changes which we could not secure without delay, since they do not only depend on us.

For our part, these measures should be the guiding lines of a general policy of democratic aid and co-operation. This is not merely a matter of technical arrangements. It is to be seen within the context of the great struggle of both the people of France and those of the 'Third World', against the monopoly capitalists, for democracy and freedom.

Maj Ernesto Che Guevara

What is a Guerrilla

THE guerrilla is a liberation fighter par excellence: elected of the people, vanguard combatant in their struggle for liberation. Guerrilla warfare is not, as often thought, a small-scale war, a war conducted by a minority grouping against a powerful army. No, guerrilla warfare is war by the entire people against the reigning oppression. The guerrilla movement is their armed vanguard; the guerrilla army comprises all the people of a region or a country. That is the reason for its strength and for its eventual victory over whatever power tries to crush it; that is, the base and grounding of the guerrilla is the people.

One cannot imagine small armed groups, no matter how mobile and familiar with the terrain, surviving the organized persecution of a well-equipped army without this powerful assistance. The test is that all bandits, all brigand gangs, eventually succumb to the central power — and one must bear in mind that for the inhabitants of a region these bandits often represent more than mere brigandage: they represent a liberation struggle, though the sheerest caricature of one.

Each member of the guerrilla army, the people's army par excellence, must embody the qualities of the best of the world's soldiers. The army must observe strict discipline. The fact that the formalities of orthodox military life do not correspond to the guerrilla movement, the fact that there is no heel-clicking or snappy saluting, no kowtowing explanations to superior officers, does not, by any stretch of the imagination, mean that there is no discipline. Guerrilla discipline is within the individual, born of his profound conviction, of the need to obey his superior, not only so as to maintain the effectiveness of the armed group of which he is a part, but also to defend his own life. Any slight carelessness by a soldier in a regular army is controlled by his nearest comrade. In guerrilla warfare, in which each soldier is a unit within himself, an error is fatal. No one can be careless. No one can commit even the smallest slip, as his life and those of his comrades are at stake.

This informal discipline is often not apparent. For the uninformed, the regular soldier, with

a whole complex system for showing recognition of superior officers, seems far more disciplined than a guerrilla, any guerrilla, following his chief's instructions with simple and stirring respect. Moreover, the liberation army is a pure army with no room for even the smallest of man's weaknesses; it has no repressive apparatus, no intelligence service to prevent individuals from falling victim to temptation. Self-control is the operative force. Rigid awareness of duty and discipline.

Besides being a disciplined soldier, the guerrilla is very agile, physically and mentally.

One cannot conceive of static guerrilla warfare. Night is the setting. Depending on his knowledge of the terrain, the guerrilla moves at night, takes position, attacks the enemy and withdraws. That does not mean that he must withdraw very far from the theatre of operations; only that the withdrawal must be swift.

The enemy will immediately concentrate all its repressive forces at the point attacked. It will begin aerial bombardment, send in tactical units to surround the area, send in soldiers to take up a delusive position.

The guerrillas need only present a front to the enemy. By withdrawing a short distance, waiting for the enemy, attacking and withdrawing again, they have accomplished their specific mission. Thus, the army can be exhausted over a period of hours or even days.

The people's soldier attacks from ambush at the propitious moment. There are other basic axioms in guerrilla tactics. Knowledge of the terrain is a must. The guerrilla must be familiar with the place of attack, and he must also know all the paths of retreat as well as all means of access and those that are closed, the homes of those who are friends or enemies, the safest places, those where a wounded comrade may be hidden, those where a temporary camp may be set up — in other words, he must know the theater of operations like the palm of his hand. And this is possible because the people, the great nucleus of the guerrilla army, are behind each action.

The inhabitants of an area are porters, informants, nurses, the source of new recruits —

?



in short, they constitute the highly important assistants of their armed vanguard.

But in view of all these things, in view of the guerrilla's myriad tactical needs, one may ask, "Why fight?" The resounding answer is! "The guerrilla is a social reformer. The guerrilla takes up weapons as the wrathful protest of

the people against their oppressors; the guerrilla fights to change the social system that subjects his unarmed brothers to opprobrium and poverty. He acts against the special conditions of the Establishment at a given moment. And he is determined to smash the Establishment's patterns, with all the force that circumstances permit."

ERNESTO CHE GUEVARA

WHAT A MAN was our comrade Ernesto Che Guevara! Here was a revolutionary for whom the socialist revolution was the spur of a selfless and single-minded passion. Here was an internationalist for whom the brotherhood and liberation of all mankind was an inner flame. Here was a communist whose life will stand as a model even for communists. And a freedom fighter to inspire the whole world's freedom fighters.

'It may be hard to believe,' said Fidel Castro of his comrade-in-arms, 'that a man of his stature, of his prestige, of his character has died in a battle of a guerilla patrol against army troops, though those who know him well realise there is nothing surprising about this. For always, in all the time we knew him, he displayed an extraordinary lack of fear, an absolute disregard of danger, a constant readiness in every moment of difficulty and danger to do the most difficult and dangerous things. And so he did on many occasions in the struggle here in Cuba, in the Sierra Maestra and Las Villas Province.'

Hard to believe. But yet apparently true. Che is dead. He was captured after being seriously wounded in battle. His death, beyond doubt, was an act of murder by his Bolivian government captors. Symbolically, perhaps to erase the evidence of that crime, perhaps to prevent the grave of this great man from becoming a shrine for South American revolutionaries, the Bolivian government cremated his body.

But neither the memory nor the influence of such as Che can be wiped out either by assassin's bullet or by fire. His influence has been greater than perhaps he ever knew. For this man not only set freedom fighters everywhere an inspiring example, but his writings on problems of guerilla warfare, culled from his own experience in the struggle for Cuba's liberation, have become a text for guerilla patriots everywhere. Translated into English, his writings on guerilla tactics and strategy have had their influence even far away in South Africa, where his book has been introduced in evidence in every trial of freedom fighters which

has taken place in our country in recent years. Che has been the inspiration and the guide, everywhere, in Africa no less than in South America.

Che had to learn before he could teach. About guerilla warfare he learnt both from practical experience and from the study of Marxist theoreticians before him. He drew heavily on the great richness of experience and theory derived from the Chinese revolution. He applied himself to the solution of new problems, and new conditions. Unlike the problems of a country still largely locked in feudal backwardness, beset by petty warlordism, Che faced the problems of struggle in a colonial dependency of modern imperialism, with its vastly different social background of wealth and poverty, the destruction of traditional social patterns and cultures, and a strongly centralised, national military dictatorship. His writings have illuminated the road for our times in many countries. Like many brilliant writers and thinkers, like many brilliant political agitators and organisers, Che had the gift of simplicity. Thus it is with his simple yet profound reminder that the 'duty of a revolutionary is to make revolution'. True.

But Che in using the slogan used it as a Marxist. As a Marxist he understood fully that to master society, 'to make a revolution', one must understand the processes and forces at work within that society. One must study objective reality, and adopt those means and strategies which accord with reality. The duty of a revolutionary truly is to make revolution; but the duty cannot be fulfilled just anywhere, anyhow, at all times, by spirit alone.

Those who thus vulgarise the ideas of Che, do him less than justice. For slogan-writing is a task that any copy-writer can do. Che was not such. For him the slogan compressed and popularised a deep truth which has nothing in common with the adventurist, twentieth-century-freebooting with which some of his followers seek to invest it. He was a Marxist, a communist, and his writing no less than his fighting is a testimony to his unflagging Communist belief and spirit.

Our movement, our country and our era will be the poorer for his passing. But yet, even in death, his teachings live on to enrich us.

T.

TOWARDS VICTORY AND PEACE IN VIETNAM

The Political Programme of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation

THE SOUTH VIETNAM National Front for Liberation (N.F.L.) was formed in 1960. Its ten-point programme, in the words of *Nhan Dan*, the Hanoi newspaper (September 2nd, 1967):

rallied all the patriotic and democratic forces into the struggle to overthrow the domination of the U.S. imperialists and their henchmen, to bring about independence, democracy, peace and neutrality in South Vietnam, pending national reunification.

The ten points may be summarised as follows:

1. Overthrow the camouflaged colonial regime of the American imperialists and the dictatorial power of Ngo Dinh Diem, servant of the Americans, and institute a government of national democratic union.
2. Institute a largely liberal and democratic regime.
3. Establish an independent and sovereign economy, and improve the living conditions of the people.
4. Reduce land rent, implement agrarian reform with the aim of providing land to aid tillers.
5. Develop a national and democratic culture and education.
6. Create a national army devoted to the defence of the Fatherland and the people.
7. Guarantee equality between the various minorities and between the two sexes; protect the legitimate interests of foreign citizens established in Vietnam and of Vietnamese citizens residing abroad.
8. Promote a foreign policy of peace and neutrality.
9. Re-establish normal relations between the two zones, and prepare for the peaceful reunification of the country.
10. Struggle against all aggressive war; actively defend universal peace.

In August 1967, after seven years of heroic and determined struggle by the people and armed forces of South Vietnam, the N.F.L. met in

a liberated area for an Extraordinary Congress to review the situation, assess the achievements of the liberation struggle, and adopt a new Political Programme. Delegates from all levels of the N.F.L., from the Armed Forces, from the mass organisations and political parties, the national and religious communities, and from the people of Saigon and other cities were present. The intervening years had seen the mounting tide of victory of the Vietnamese people in their just struggle, the international exposure of the ruthless imperialist aggression of the U.S. and her lackeys and satellites, and the growing maturity and unity of the people of Vietnam forged in the fire of their patriotic fight for freedom. *The New Political Programme of the N.F.L. embodies all the developed experience, wisdom and determination of the movement which has established itself as the sole genuine representative of the heroic South Vietnamese people.* It is a historic document of unusual interest.

THE POLITICAL PROGRAMME OF THE N.F.L.

The Programme opens with a historical review of the long struggle for liberation and of the achievements of the N.F.L. since its formation in 1960. The Front has effected a broad union of the various nationalities, religious communities, organisations, and patriotic personalities comprising the people of Vietnam. In addition to consolidating its mass base, it has won over the support of many manufacturers, traders, officials of the puppet administration, and officers and soldiers of the puppet army. It has enjoyed the wholehearted support of its compatriots in the North, the approval of the peoples of Cambodia and Laos, and the assistance of the peoples of the socialist and other countries in the world, including progressive people in the United States. Exposing the sabotage by the U.S. imperialists of the 1954 Geneva Agreement, and their frantic escalation of brutal aggression, the Programme goes on to summarise the political and military achievements of the people, showing that:

The liberated areas have continuously expanded and now already make up four-fifths of the South Vietnam territory with two-thirds of its population. In these liberated areas, a national and democratic power is taking shape and a new life is blossoming. In addition to big military victories, we have also recorded important successes in the political, economic and cultural and diplomatic fields.

Nothing brings out more clearly the popular character of the liberation struggle, and the imperialist character of the U.S. aggression, than the Programme's observation that:

The more the U.S. imperialists obdurately intensify and expand their war of aggression against our country, the more they sustain bitter defeats

and are isolated (and) on the other hand, our people win greater victories and get more friends.

UNITE THE ENTIRE PEOPLE, FIGHT THE U.S. AGGRESSORS, SAVE THE COUNTRY

Under this inspiring slogan the Programme sets out the immediate objectives of the N.F.L. The U.S. aggressors and their lackeys are clearly identified as the enemy and roundly condemned. The N.F.L. pledges itself to strive with the (North) Vietnam Fatherland Front to liberate the South, defend the North and proceed towards the peaceful reunification of the whole country. The N.F.L. further pledges itself to 'take an active part in the common struggle of the world's peoples against the bellicose and aggressive imperialists'; it thus shoulders its international responsibilities in recognition of the fact that the war of resistance against U.S. aggression is an integral part of the revolutionary struggle of the people all over the world. Knowing that only a real independence will bring genuine peace, the people of South Vietnam must stand up to make revolution and wage a people's war to drive out the foreign invaders. To this end,

The Front undertakes to build and develop the political forces of the masses, promote the movement of political struggle, combine armed struggle with political struggle and agitation among enemy troops, thus forming three converging prongs to defeat the enemy.

BUILD AN INDEPENDENT, DEMOCRATIC, PEACEFUL, NEUTRAL AND PROSPEROUS SOUTH VIETNAM

Under this slogan the N.F.L. sets out the policy objectives which will lay the basis for reconstruction, and for the consolidation of the independence and sovereignty of the nation. There are fourteen points, each laying down in detail the concrete tasks that lie ahead*. The points are:

1. To set up a broad and progressive democratic regime.
2. To build an independent and self-supporting economy; to improve the people's living conditions.
3. To enact the land policy, to carry out the slogan: Land to the tiller.
4. To build a national democratic culture and education, to develop science and technology, to promote public health.
5. To guarantee the interests of factory and office workers and other labouring people and see to their livelihood.
6. To build up South Vietnam liberation armed forces powerfully with a view to liberating the people and defending the Fatherland.
7. To show gratitude to the martyrs, to attend to disabled army men, to reward the army men and civilians distinguished in the fight against U.S. aggression and for national salvation.

* The full text of the Programme is contained in *Vietnam Courier* No. 127, September 7th, 1967.

8. To organise social relief.
9. To carry out equality between man and woman; to protect mothers and children.
10. To strengthen unity; to practise equality and mutual assistance among nationalities.
11. To respect freedom of creed, to achieve unity and equality among the different religious communities.
12. To welcome puppet officers and soldiers and puppet officials back to the just cause; show leniency and give a humane treatment to rallied army men and prisoners of war.
13. To protect the rights and interest of Overseas Vietnamese.
14. To protect the legitimate rights and interests of foreign residents in South Vietnam.

VIETNAM MUST BE REUNIFIED

The third part of the Programme asserts the fundamental unity of the country and people of Vietnam, and the goal of reunification. The means envisaged for this is peaceful negotiation between the two zones without foreign interference. Pending reunification, the people in both zones are free to move and reside where they choose.

TO APPLY A FOREIGN POLICY OF PEACE AND NEUTRALITY

Under this heading the N.F.L. sets out its foreign policy. It will establish diplomatic relations with all countries on the basis of respect for mutual sovereignty and independence; abolish unequal treaties signed by the puppet regime with the U.S.; join no military alliance and accept no military bases or personnel of foreign countries on its soil. It will actively support: (i) the national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America against imperialism; (ii) the struggle of the American people against the U.S. imperialists' war of aggression; (iii) the just struggle of Black people in the United States for their fundamental national rights; and (iv) the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress in all countries in the world.

THE VIETNAMESE PEOPLE WILL SURELY BE VICTORIOUS!

Finally, the N.F.L. invites all groups to pool their efforts to bring about the final victory. The Programme ends on a stirring note:

The U.S. aggressors and their henchmen will certainly be defeated!
The Programme of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation is sure to materialise!
Fighters and compatriots throughout South Vietnam, under the glorious banner of the South Vietnam National Liberation Front for Liberation, march forward heroically!

THE LIBERATION STRUGGLE IN MOZAMBIQUE*

The Portuguese Occupation and Settlement

IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY and before, there was a great search for the way to the East by Western countries. The way till then used, the land, was cumbersome and expensive. This search led to discovery of the Americas, and a big portion of Africa; finally the Portuguese succeeded in discovering the sea route, and reached India in 1498.

During the course of the voyage, they set foot in many African countries in West, South and East Africa. They were in a portion of African land on December 25th, 1497, and gave it the name of *Natal* (pertaining to birth), as it was the day observed as the birthday of Jesus Christ. Interested most in trade, in 1505 they sent a Commission to Sofala to investigate the famous gold mines of King Solomon. This was followed by a 'trade' mission which realised it in the form of barter-system, with manufactured goods, mainly clothing, for gold in porcupine gills. The traders were accompanied or followed by Christian missionaries to evangelise the indigenous people and to maintain the religious faith and ethics among the traders and other personnel. As this type of trade did not give them the expected wealth they turned and embarked upon slave trade to Brazil, U.S.A. and other countries. In this trade not only the Portuguese were involved. Angola, due to this trade and killing, was reduced to almost half its population by the Central European slave market in Lisbon. Mozambique and Guinea Bissau were devastated as well. This business in the whole four centuries transaction brought fabulous gains mainly to Portugal and Britain, ending only in 1865 with the action of the Spanish priest, Bartolomeu de Las Casas, the initiator, and the British abolitionists, Wilberforce and others.

* Speech delivered by Uriah T. Simango, Vice-President of Frelimo to the Faculty of Political Science of the University of Zagreb, Yugoslavia, on February 17th, 1967.

Wishing to realise the objectives of gold trade, evangelisation and slave trade, penetration into the interior as far as the present Rhodesia was the only recourse. As they advanced, they met resistance from the people. For the protection of the Portuguese personnel, military garrisons were sent and stationed mainly along the coast where they built defence fortresses.

As time went on, it became clear to Mozambicans that their country was being occupied and their sharp reaction was to try to get the Portuguese out of the country. Battles took place in various forms throughout the country as a sign of refusal to be dominated. Such resistance never ended even after the complete occupation. Amongst the resistance struggles to note are the *Ngungunyana* and *Magigwana* resistance, the *Makombe* and *Zumbo* uprisings, and *Cabo Delgado* (Makonde) independence demand. I will here mostly deal with the *Makombe* uprising due to the nature of the resistance and availability of facts.

This took place in the central part of the country, *Manica* and *Sofala* locality of *Barwe* (Gorongosa). The organisation did not extend beyond the tribal boundary, although it had support from some chiefs in Rhodesia. A great assembly was held to discuss the possibility and desirability of armed resistance against the Portuguese.

Some of the main causes of the uprising were:

The impact of Portuguese colonial rule characterised by the imposition of poll-tax, restriction and control of movement.

The forced conscription of young men to serve in the German East Africa campaign (First World War).

The Portuguese methods of forced labour without payment.

Seizure by force and beating of old men and girls working on roads and other government projects.

The resistance involved a large number of men and spread as far as Zumbo, Tete. The force was great, and determined to crush the Portuguese administration in the region. Faced with such a real problem, the Portuguese appealed to the British Government in Malawi (former Nyasaland), Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) and in London, for assistance in manpower and munitions. The three parts of the British Government responded positively to the request and gave them 400 rifles and some bazookas and 40,000 rounds of ammunition. With this they succeeded in arming additional Portuguese troops and Angonis, a tribe in the Tete that fought together with the Portuguese against the Barwes. It was only with this assistance that they succeeded in suppressing the rebellion. However, it took them four years to realise it.

The *Ngungunyana* and *Magigwana* battle in the southern part

of the country involved as well a huge number of people and lasted some two years, ending with a Portuguese success.

The above accounts are a few of many resistance incidents against colonial rule by the people. Because they were isolated actions from other tribes, they failed to attain their objective and were mercilessly crushed by the enemy.

The Portuguese and the colonial attitude in general had been reinforced and hardened by the grab for and partition of Africa at the Berlin conference of 1884. This was the beginning of an era of suppression, destruction, killing and rivalry. The whole continent of Africa was reduced to satellites of supplies of raw material and free or cheap labour, market of finished goods, settlement (South Africa), spheres of influence and military bases. These and motives of race supremacy and expansionism in Europe and Africa and elsewhere were the causes of the First and Second World Wars whose effect was felt in African societies and they accordingly reacted.

GENERAL SITUATION IN MOZAMBIQUE

The Portuguese permitted no freedom of expression. No legal channels were ever available for approaching the colonial authorities for voicing and putting right grievances of the people. No political activities or political bases were ever allowed to mobilise and agitate the masses to demand independence. The enactment of a clause in 1951 in the Portuguese constitution, to the effect that the colonies were transformed as 'overseas provinces' of Portugal, made it 'treasonable' to demand independence for the black majority of the inhabitants of Mozambique.

The Portuguese Nazi-type police, P.I.D.E., International Police for the Defence of the State, was tightened and its activities reached wider dimensions and as a consequence of this we saw hundreds of nationalists and politicians arrested, imprisoned, killed and deported for life. This augmented the nationalistic sentiments and feeling of hostility towards the Portuguese. The torture applied to political prisoners by this police are of various types including electric shocks, extraction of finger nails and beating to death.

The majority of the African population depends on self-employment due to lack of many industries. Most rely on small portions of land to produce the food they need to eat. These are classified as 'unemployed and unproductive'. Some have large portions of land and produce some quantities for sale. In some areas the people are forced to cultivate certain types of cash crops for sale to the state. The most popular are rice, cotton and groundnuts. Because the work is done

by hand, much time is spent working on them and they do not have time to cultivate supplementary food plots as they are forced to sell the whole production to the state. The prices are so low that nobody can possibly live on money obtained on produce sale; therefore, such people have to starve each year. Such exploitation covers a great deal of agricultural produce by the Africans.

Those employed in the few industries are so badly paid that it is not worth while being employed. This does not make them different from the unemployed and makes them worse off than those who cultivate small plots of land to produce sufficient to eat. The result is that nothing encourages the people to be employed.

According to the laws classifying the working and the non-working people, those cultivating the land just for food fall under the category of the 'unemployed', thus known as vagrants and liable as well to arrest and forced to accept work contracts either in the country or abroad. Conditions and agreements for sale of labourers to South African mines and firms and in Rhodesia were reached forty years ago, on September 11th, 1928, though they have been modified since. According to the agreements, the Portuguese Government supplies 100,000 workers to South Africa on payment of about £2 per person on delivery and 2s. 9d. per month during the period of work, and South Africa passes through the port of Lourenço Marques 47 per cent of the traffic to and from the district of Johannesburg.

Those working as forced labourers in the country in various government projects and in private enterprises are paid at the end of their service period, ranging from six to twenty-four months, at the rate of 7s. 6d. to £1 10s. per month. On payment at the home administration, the amount for poll-tax is subtracted. There are many other forms of exploitation in the country, legalised and illicit ones.

DISCRIMINATION

Many foreign tourists and government officials have applauded the Portuguese declarations that there is no discrimination in the country. As a matter of fact, one will hardly find discriminatory laws in the sense of South Africa but social practice, the 'assimilation' system, salary differences based on colour, etc. are intended for the same objectives as in South Africa.

The 'assimilation' system dictates that those who have acquired a certain degree of Portuguese language knowledge, can, if they so wish, through application, become 'assimilated', acquire Portuguese citizenship status and thus enjoy the privileges enjoyed by the whites, at the cost of renouncement of living according to their traditions

and customs. These are issued a pass to this effect and thenceforth considered 'civilised' and different from their fellow people, even from their parents and relatives. Despite the possession of the said 'civilised' pass, they are never admitted in the Portuguese communities as equals, for they will never be made different by the pass they possess. In cinemas and in other public establishments and gatherings, there are many incidents of 'assimilados' being discriminated against. By virtue of being assimilated, one does not qualify to earn equally with a white co-worker for the same job.

Almost 100 per cent of white children are in school compared with less than 20 per cent of African children. All the government and good schools are in towns for the purpose of serving white children. Worse than that is the entrusting of African education to the Roman Catholic Church according to the agreement (concordat) of May 7th, 1940, between the Vatican and Portugal. Subsidies received from the Government are not sufficient to run a vast educational programme for seven million Africans. And, the main objective of the church being spiritual and not education as such, it would not sacrifice its meagre means to provide basic and necessary education to the Africans. The Government, in granting this sole right, was aware of the impossibility of realising the educational programme but it was intended to retard the African in real progress but indoctrinate him to accept foreign domination as the will of God and never fight against it as that would mean hindrance to enjoyment and living eternal life in Heaven. A long historical and philosophical policy towards African education, from the period of occupation, can be logically grasped and apprehended from the Government policy statement: 'preservation of the native as principal producing element . . . to avoid ruining his utility by over-instructing him in branches of learning which he does not require, which impairs his utility as an essential instrument and for which his brain is not capable'.

Guided by the principle of using African labour as the chief export product and source of income, through the mechanisms above cited, the Portuguese colonialists closed whatever doors and windows that could be available to permit the African to acquire a rudimentary education. Thus Mozambique has a very high illiteracy percentage. This situation can only be corrected by the African people themselves through winning independence.

AFRICAN NATIONALISM

The Education system, 'assimilation', partly religious persecution, etc.; all these activities were meant to combat and eliminate African

nationalism. The Portuguese never understood the colonised people's mentality. For the sterner the measures of oppression and suppression they took against the 'natives', the more the latter found the necessity for unity and resistance. Such activities in any colonised country inflame animosity, nationalism and ardent desire for freedom. All means and instruments at their disposal ranging from mere passive persecution to deportation to killing were utilised to divide and rule, to suppress African nationalism, but the result was the appearance of the exact phenomenon they feared and wished to suppress.

The situation in the country was such that whoever or whatever appeared as manifesting African nationalism was eliminated by brutal means. As domination could not prevail over the indigenous people, African nationalism appeared and first functioned in a different form. Many social, religious and educational African organisations appeared. Some of these organisations are: Centro Africano de Moçambique, Instituto Negrofilo, Portuguese East African Society, Makonde Association and Cabo Delgado Agricultural Co-operative. These organisations had legal recognition. They were a coming together of nationalists to discuss and scheme social, economic and educational life of their people. Public meetings were sometimes held to explain to the people the programme and the development of the organisations. Sometimes the masses were confused and thought these were liberation movements, thus unveiling their hopes. The uppermost meetings of these organisations undoubtedly discussed politics, devised means through which they could realise political objectives. They served as a medium for political expression, for in depth they had political foundations. Through these organisations, African nationalism got a background for manifestation and consolidation, and the leaders' courage and determination were being tested. They are an exhaustless resource of political leaders for the Mozambique Liberation Movement.

POLITICAL PARTIES

There is one simple question that used to be asked by many countries in Africa and abroad, and that is: 'Why is it that the Africans in Portuguese colonies are quiet while the rest of the continent is demanding, fighting for and achieving independence?' Some even concluded that it was because there were no educated or capable people to lead the masses in the fight. Many countries were not informed about the political conditions prevailing in our countries. While the neighbouring countries were allowed to organise themselves politically, to agitate the masses, to call for boycotts and strikes, etc.

this was not the case in the colonies of Portugal. The British policy allowed a half-way application of democracy by taking into account, though not fully, the interests and demands of their colonised people. While the British and other colonial powers adhered to this policy, the Portuguese maintained and still maintain the policy of 'integration', making everybody and everything Portuguese. The 1951 clause enactment in their constitution to the effect that the colonies were becoming 'overseas provinces' tightened their policy of obstinacy and the separation of these countries from Portugal through independence became a treasonable proposal.

Many Mozambican nationalists were active in the political parties of the neighbouring countries of Tanganyika, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe. With the coming of internal self-government in these countries, the Mozambican nationalists began organising themselves politically. When these countries became independent, Mozambique political parties were declared and their programmes announced immediately. Dar-es-Salaam became the central area. The Portuguese consulate was closed and diplomatic relations severed. Political parties, Mozambique Democratic National Union (U.D.E.N.A.M.O.) and National Union of Independent Mozambique (U.N.A.M.I.), functioning from Zimbabwe and Malawi respectively, came to have their headquarters in Dar-es-Salaam in 1961, where Mozambique African National Union (M.A.N.U.) had long had its headquarters.

In June 1962, the three organisations, through the advice of the governments of Tanganyika and Ghana and PAFMESCA, fused and formed the present Front, the Mozambique Liberation Front (FRELIMO). This was followed by a Congress which discussed and established the policy and programme of action.

The Congress was faced with a tough problem. What road to take to liberate the country? The unapproachable attitude of the fascist Government of Portugal convinced the delegates that since Portugal's position towards the question of granting independence was negative, there was, therefore, no basis for the realisation of a round-table conference to solve the conflict amicably. Also considering that Portugal was arresting and massacring the peaceful people of Mozambique because they wanted to be free and be equal with other people of the world, the Congress decided to take measures to defend and protect the defenceless and unarmed black masses. Under these circumstances, it was considered proper to use violence as the only means the people possess to liberate themselves. The Central Committee was charged with the responsibility of implementing the programme as soon as possible. In adopting this line, all problems and difficulties to be encountered were looked into. Immediately after

the termination of the Congress, the Central Committee painstakingly executed the decisions, military training and acquisition of arms followed.

In Angola and the so-called Portuguese Guinea, the liberation war was going on. The Portuguese, sooner or later, were expecting the same thing in Mozambique. Large numbers of troops had been brought from Portugal and were concentrated on the north. They had begun making their presence strongly felt by harassing and killing in cold blood as a measure to intimidate the masses from joining the liberation army that was in the process of training. Nevertheless, necessary preparations continued with people's full support and participation.

The mobilisation of the African population was a difficult task. The whole undertaking was done underground and with a great risk of lives. Some of our organisers were intercepted and taken prisoners and hundreds of members and sympathisers as well were arrested and imprisoned or deported. It was and continues to be a nasty state of affairs, but that was the road the Congress had chosen.

Two solid years passed while making the necessary preparations. The people's patience and expectation had long gone, we were delaying the action, they said. On September 25th, 1964, the General Mozambique People's Armed Insurrection was declared by the Central Committee. The *war* had begun.

MILITARY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

It is commonly said that Portugal is a weak country and can be defeated militarily within a short time and without much effort.

It is true that Portugal is an under-developed country, the most backward in Europe. It has over 40 per cent illiterates. Most of the industries in Portugal and in the colonies are foreign. It is a semi-colony. Despite all this, Portugal can afford to buy military planes, frigates, submarines and large quantities of various types of weapons from all over Europe and the United States. Until mid-1965, Portugal was spending £125,000 per day on war expenses in Africa and maintains huge armies in Mozambique, Angola, Guinea Bissau, Timor, Macau, Portugal, etc. In Mozambique, Angola and Guinea Bissau, she has over 120,000 soldiers. She has direct assistance from all NATO member states and has loans, investments, from U.S.A., Great Britain, West Germany, Belgium, France, Switzerland and other Western countries. Of the 122 foreign firms that were established in Portugal in 1965, thirty-four were British. Until the end of the previous year, the British invested capital stood at over £90 million. It is well known

that West Germany presently has the largest capital invested. It is alarming to note that 50 per cent of Portugal's import of machinery, vehicles and tools come from this country, combined with loans. In the five years ending 1965 the balance of payments in favour of West Germany was about 200 million marks.

A United States firm, Standard Electric, is manufacturing in Portugal a large amount of military equipment for the Portuguese Army. Recently, West Germany has established a factory in Portugal for arms and ammunition to assist Portugal in its colonial wars. West Germany has over 15,000 soldiers and officers in Portugal, 500 of them on a mission to train Portuguese soldiers and advise the Portuguese army. General F. Becker is commanding the permanent German Military Mission in Lisbon. A U.S. advisory military group (M.A.A.G.), according to American sources, 'formed by capable American officers to give assistance to the Portuguese Ministry of Defence and military services for the training, planning and equipment of the Portuguese armed forces', is also permanently in Portugal. This mission gave in 1965, \$15 million for the building in Portugal of three warships for the Portuguese Navy.

Portugal has the second highest military expenditure in NATO in relation to her national production. In 1965, France was building four submarines and four escorts and U.S. was constructing two at half price. In March 1965, the Federal Republic of Germany bought sixty war planes from Canada for Portugal and at the beginning of last year, West Germany supplied Portugal with forty G-91 bombers. It was revealed last year that U.S. delivered five SC-54 Skymasters, and seven gigantic B-26 aircraft to Portugal to be used in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea Bissau. The U.S. has an atomic military base and France a missile base in Azores for which they pay Portugal huge sums in foreign currency.

On February 22nd, this year, the first NATO unit in Portugal started operations under the command of Admiral Edwin S. Mille of the United States Navy. A big military hospital staffed with West German personnel, was built in Portugal by West Germany for Portuguese soldiers wounded in Africa. Those that have lost limbs are still going to Bonn for treatment.

Portugal is not at war in Europe, neither is it in danger of being invaded by any power. The presence of two Permanent Military Advisory and Auxiliary Groups in Lisbon from U.S. and West Germany has a psychological and physical significance and impact on the Portuguese population. The presence of a NATO unit and West German and Belgian soldiers and officers serves as an encouraging factor to the fascist regime of Portugal and also as a reserve, rear and substitute

force should the need arise to send more Portuguese soldiers to Africa. It is also an intimidating force lest the Portuguese Army and population revolt against their government. There is no other justification for the presence of advisory groups and foreign troops and officers in Portugal.

This is the situation of the Portuguese and it is this force that the people of Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau are facing in their countries. Portugal is not alone and alone cannot resist for days. It is a combination of fascist race supremacy, political and economic interests, warmongering and reactionary attitudes and forces in various imperialist countries that are a barrier to the realisation of our people's aspirations.

WHY PORTUGAL WAGES COLONIAL WARS

Portugal, as we have seen, is a small and under-developed country, depending on foreign investment at home and in the colonies. Dr. A. Lobato, an expert on Mozambican affairs said the following in the National Assembly in December 1964: 'The complete sell-out of Mozambique to Anglo-American capital has made Mozambique a foreign colony under the Portuguese flag.' What can be said about this country is the same that can be said about Portugal, Angola and other colonies.

The Portuguese colonies of Africa are self-supporting. In 1964, Angola had a positive trade balance of £14.4 million. Mozambique had a trade deficit of £18.1 million, but this was met by the port handling charges of Lourenço Marques and Beira, tourism, sale of forced labour to South Africa and Rhodesia and the railways traffic. There is always a positive balance of millions of pounds yearly. Portugal itself in the same year had a trade deficit of £93.6 million and in 1965 of £117.4 million. Portugal makes a great deal from the colonies in other ways. For example, the transportation of goods to and from the colonies is monopolised by Portuguese ships.

It is to and from the Western countries that the Portuguese African colonies import their needed commodities and export their mineral and agricultural products; the most important being diamonds, gold, copper, iron ore, coal, petroleum, gas, sugar, coffee, cashew nuts, copra, cotton, sisal and peanuts. The countries benefiting most from this evil of exploitation are: Portugal, U.S., France, West Germany, South Africa, Belgium and Rhodesia.

For economic survival and development, Portugal needs the colonies. That is why Salazar has declared many times that he will fight to the last man and the last drop of blood to maintain the colonies. In

all NATO conferences we hear declarations by Portugal and other NATO member states as follows: '. . . the colonial war in Africa is a great contribution to the defence of the free world', 'Portugal has a destiny to fulfil as the first of Europe's universal nations and in protecting her colonies from communist attack would help to carry out NATO's original aims', 'Portugal is one of the bastions of the Western Christian civilisation which must prevail in the world today.' The Sixth International Congress for the Defence of Christian Civilisation held in Lisbon last year had the following as one of its resolutions: 'Communism is a great danger against which one must fight in order to achieve peace.'

THE UNHOLY ALLIANCE

The minority white governments of Smith in Rhodesia and of the diehards of South Africa have signed agreements of co-operation in Africa with the Salazar regime. *The Times* (October 14th, 1964) quoted the South African Foreign Minister as saying that South Africa and Portugal shared a common ideology although the world showed no understanding of their aims. *Diario de Lisboa* quoted the same Minister on March 5th, 1965 as stressing the virtues of the 'good neighbour' policy, particularly the effectiveness of alliance against foreign subversion. The three members of the Unholy Alliance have full support of the Western powers in the adherence to their policy. They exist due to the capitalist investment of the West. Mozambique, Rhodesia, South Africa, Angola, Guinea Bissau, are the remaining strongholds of colonialism and imperialism. The U.S., Britain, West Germany, France and other imperialist powers cannot afford to lose them. They will do everything in their power to assist and protect the Unholy Alliance directly or indirectly. It would be a normal thing to overthrow the fascist Smith regime after its Unilateral Declaration of Independence, but the British government decided not to interfere.

In 1964-5, many military meetings were held in Mozambique attended by Rhodesian, South African and U.S. officers. They together and separately inspected the Portuguese military bases on various occasions. The South African government is recruiting Portuguese people to go and live there. Portugal will never grant independence to anybody but has joined the other two racist regimes to form a bloc to resist the demand of the majority for independence. They will defend their position by military means. The head of the Portuguese Military Academy, General A. M. dos Neves, was quoted by *Diario de Lisboa* (November 3rd, 1965) as saying that the Portuguese Armed Forces should be prepared to wage an all-out war—conven-

tional, nuclear or civil. During the Air Force exercise in Nampula, the Commander of the 3rd Military Regiment, General S. Portugal, threatened that he would bomb with napalm all the Mozambican patriots who opposed Portuguese rule [*D.L.*, December 11th, 1964].

It has become clear through these statements that the whole of the 'West' is mobilised to help to maintain the Portuguese colonies. So, Portugal is not as weak as some have the tendency of saying because Portugal is not alone. Therefore, the struggle is an arduous one.

Nevertheless, we shall prevail. I still remember that when we proclaimed the General Insurrection of the Mozambican People against the Portuguese colonialist government on September 25th, 1964, we had a small number of badly-armed guerillas. When we celebrated the Second Anniversary, we had thousands of well-armed fighters and had annihilated over 3,000 enemy soldiers, downed sixteen military planes and destroyed some 400 military trucks. As a result of these successes, we have liberated a considerable territory in two northern provinces of Cabo Delgado and Nyasa, where normal life is resuming. The number of combatants is increasing daily. When the armed struggle will be developed in all the nine provinces, we shall have thousands and thousands of armed fighters and combined with the mobilised population, the enemy will not be able to cope with the rising waves of resistance.

This can be explained in another way. In spite of assistance, the enemy's economy in the colonies and at home is collapsing. Annual deficits are ascending while the war expenses are increasing. This year Portugal will spend 25 per cent more on war than last year. Those people who have the economy in their hands are getting more worried due to uncertainty of the future, though new investments are coming. Taxes at home and overseas are being increased now, and new ones imposed and opposition to them mounts each day. Those conscripted into the army to defend the Portuguese empire in Africa are killed on battlefields; their parents and members of their families demonstrate against the fascist regime as a protest against conscription to fight in Africa. The discontent and opposition in general are mounting each day.

The Salazar fascist regime is facing opposition and becoming unpopular before the Portuguese people while FRELIMO on the other hand is enjoying open support from some Portuguese progressive elements. The revolutionary and the progressive forces and the Democratic and Communist parties are rallying the Portuguese masses against the Salazar regime. One day these forces will be victorious. The attempt to convince the Portuguese people that their country is too poor to stand without the colonies is being discredited. The

intellectuals and the students understand that the more they get loans to carry on the war, the more they become dependent on foreign countries and gradually lose the political and economic control of their country. They realise that they are being led to a national crisis. The enemy's chances of winning the colonial war are non-existent. The contradictions within the opposition to the fascist regime are growing.

INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

When the world war came to an end, the world became conscious of the right of all people to be unconditionally free and independent, the necessity of acknowledging the sovereignty and equality of free states, big and small. Though the world body, the United Nations, is not as effective as it should be, the famous 1960 declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, approved by the General Assembly has created an atmosphere favouring the National Liberation Movement.

During the First World War, the Russian revolution became victorious and established the first Socialist State. Today the Socialist world has grown enormously and all of it supports the national liberation movement of the world. Even in the capitalist and reactionary societies, there are progressive elements that are for freedom, peace, and progress. The creation of the Organisation of African Unity is a phenomenon in world history in this twentieth century. This was followed by establishment of the Liberation Committee to channel the continent's assistance to the African liberation movements. This is an expression in action of the desire of the African to liberate himself from colonial rule. We have the Afro-Asian and the Tri-Continental Conferences which are an expression of solidarity and struggling force of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America. In the European socialist countries, national solidarity committees do a great deal to publicise the activities and struggle of liberation movements and give material support as well.

Mankind in the present phase of evolution, after the hardships and difficulties of the two world wars, cannot coexist with the archaic and obsolete systems of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. These systems have been condemned and will never prevail over the new order. Attempts to go against the objective laws governing historical development are bound to totally fail. The spirit of freedom has spread boundlessly and the desire, cry and agitation for freedom cannot be made to stop, even by cannons and tanks. In our just, armed struggle we contend with the fascist and criminal regime of Salazar in order to attain power and independence

for the democratic and progressive masses of our great society so that they may freely serve their people in the struggle against hunger, disease and ignorance without suffering pressure and hindrance.

The present international situation favours the world liberation movement. The Mozambican people are bound to win in this life and death struggle against Portugal.

The above enumerated favourable conditions will not mature by themselves. We do not expect easily to achieve the goal we have set. We believe in fighting against any opposing force to effectuate subjective conditions. This all calls for our complete dedication and sacrifice to carry on the revolution in full without compromise, and this is the holy task of this generation of ours.

We ourselves have no doubt at all about our defeating the Portuguese and winning final victory. A liberation struggle is sometimes a short or long process depending on the condition of the enemy forces on the one hand, and the liberation forces and the readiness or political consciousness of the subjugated people on the other. It can be said that it is just a matter of time to raise the political consciousness and spirit of the masses, to mobilise all the forces and as time goes on to better or acquire efficiency in war technique. When we shall have an equal or bigger army, we shall concentrate all these factors and forces and finally deal the last blow to the enemy. The present victories of the National armed forces over the colonialist forces is a guarantee of the realisation of this vow.

INDEPENDENCIA OR MORTE—VENCEREMOS!

BOOK REVIEWS

Portrait of A Nazi

Verwoerd, by Alexander Hepple (Pelican Books, London, 6s.).

If Verwoerd's talents were great, they were put to a wretched cause. . . . For South Africa's African, Coloured and Indian population, his rigid white supremacist beliefs were merely a variation of Fascism, clothed in fine phrases and altruistic pretensions, with the ornaments of a parliamentary democracy.

THIS QUOTATION is an example of the discernment and precision of this study. Alex Hepple pares away the philosophical, religious, racial and other myths which surround the concept of Apartheid, and exposes the ugly kernel—the maintenance, at all costs, of economic privilege by a minority group. In fact, his study of Verwoerd and the political party of which he became the supreme leader, is almost a textbook illustration of the Marxist interpretation of history; the maintenance of economic privilege through the exploitation of the masses with intensified oppression to counteract every move for freedom made by the people.

In 1924 Verwoerd became a Doctor of Philosophy at a German University, having submitted a thesis on *The Blunting of the Emotions*—a significant subject. His knowledge of psychology enabled him to play so successfully upon the emotions of white South Africans that, by the time of his assassination in 1966, he had become the acknowledged leader of most of the white population, English as well as Afrikaans speaking. He had won over many thousands who had bitterly opposed him in the 1940s and the 1950s. He assuaged their guilt and blunted their compassion. He convinced them not only that South Africa is theirs by inherent right, but also that they are right and the entire world wrong about Apartheid. He won their support of this 'variation of Fascism' which is, in effect, an intricately worked-out system of exploitation and degradation of the non-whites which has no parallel other than with Nazi Germany.

His 'altruistic pretensions' are demonstrated in the travesty of the 'independent homeland' for the African people of the Transkei, the first Bantustan, the showpiece of Apartheid; a poverty-stricken overpopulated, under-developed land, ruled by the white Parliament in Cape Town.

Verwoerd and his small group of fanatics would not have succeeded in capturing South Africa, had they not recognised the need to obtain economic power. Alex Hepple traces in detail the far-seeing, long-term planning of the secret Broederbond, the organisation which brought the Nationalist Party and Verwoerd to power. It was formed in 1919

out of a deep conviction that the Afrikaner nation was put in this land by God and is destined to continue in existence as a nation with its own nature and calling.

Verwoerd was one of the seven members of the Inner Executive, which made the decisions and directed the activities of the movement. The Broeders condemned 'British-Jewish' capitalism and set out to win economic independence for the Afrikaans people. By 1964 they had succeeded in increasing the Afrikaner share in commerce from 8 to 28 per cent, and had also gained complete control of the South African political machine.

It is understandable that the cry of salvation of Afrikaners by Afrikaners had an immense impact during the economic depression of the 1930s, when the majority of white unemployed were Afrikaans. During World War II and in the immediate post-war period, when there was an economic boom and the Afrikaners were being rapidly industrialised and urbanised and when liberal ideas were freely bandied about, the appeal to blood and race feelings was less acceptable. But, as Alex Hepple points out, Verwoerd never lost faith in the achievement of a white supremacist Christian-National Republic and he was largely responsible for holding together and strengthening his Party, throughout the years of his trenchant editorship of *Die Transvaler*, when he openly supported the Nazis, and as an incredibly hardworking campaigner on behalf of the Nationalist Party. He was to die in 1966 at the hands of a madman, but his successor, Balthazar Johannes Vorster, has assured South Africa that he will not depart from Verwoerd's effective measures for the maintenance of white domination.

What of the future? Alex Hepple writes:

The eager body of dedicated Nationalists who have accepted proudly Verwoerd's heritage of uncompromising dedication to separate development, have climbed on the back of a tiger. . . .

Their only consolation is that the white oligarchy of South Africa will remain secure, for the present at least, because of the reluctance of Britain, the United States, and other powers to give practical support to action by the UN which might damage their investment in and trade with South Africa. With understandable realism the Nationalist leaders are using this breathing space to build up the country's military strength in preparation for the final, tragic act of suicidal defiance—the ultimate heritage of Verwoerd.

Their time is running out. The final act began on August 13—the battle has been joined.

The Apartheid Economy

The Political Economy of South Africa, by Ralph Horwitz (Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1967, 63s.).

IN FIVE HUNDRED pages of main text and notes, the author of this voluminous book fails to throw any new light on the South African economy.

The book is an economist's economic history of South Africa. It deals, as it must, with the relationship between the subjective and the objective—between the politics of racism and the development of capitalism in South Africa.

In all those pages there are facts. Fact falls upon fact with such insistence that we would think the author drew his inspiration from the hard-headed schoolmaster of Charles Dickens' *Hard Times*.

There are facts on the so-called political economy of land, food, labour transport. The book also deals with the 'poor white problem', trade unionism and other matters which South African economic historians have traditionally considered to be leading issues. All this is done rather thoroughly—which is admirable.

The book however fails to live up to its title, or rather, misleads by its title.

In the introduction, the author writes:

The distinctive character (of the S.A. economy) arises from the ethos of the political factor with its peculiar dynamism and imperatives, and the special interest from the empirical evidence which the growth of the South African economy from a stagnant society to an adolescent maturity provides for economic development theory (p. 1).

What the author however manages to do is to write about the economics of apartheid. The facts, so diligently dug up, fall into the traditional traps and caverns set up by the bourgeois economist. In the end they fail to come alive. They fail to tell us anything new.

For those that did not know so much before, the sum total of their knowledge will, in quantity, be increased. But that is all.

For our qualitative understanding of capital in South Africa, we shall have to look elsewhere. We shall have to wait for the time one of our revolutionary philosophers and students writes the true history of the political economy of South Africa.

The forces of reaction in South Africa have turned their theory and practice of racism into a fine art. The struggle against white minority domination is the major occupation of the revolutionary peoples; the objective of that struggle is national liberation.

It is the task of the revolutionary intelligentsia to understand this struggle and its origins. It is however their task to explain the process of the South African bourgeois revolution in all its fundamental aspects. On the basis of black, cheap labour, the South African bourgeoisie has managed to achieve a remarkable rate of capital accumulation. This is the basis of what the author calls 'the growth of the South African economy from a stagnant society to an adolescent maturity . . .'.

It is not merely a racial thing, it is also a class thing. Mr. Horwitz is however not an adherent of the philosophy of the working class, Marxism-Leninism. He therefore fails to ask questions about South Africa that he should ask. Thus the experience of the S.A. bourgeois revolution depicted here has the impact of particularity; 'economic development theory' hardly benefits.

The working class in South Africa is divided into two large parts, one sweated and governed by the whip and the gun; the other forms, in essence, what Lenin called 'the labour aristocracy', over-fed and pampered on the super-profits derived from South Africa's 'colonialism of a special type'.

This situation carries contradictions whose study and understanding forms the crucial basis for a thorough appreciation of the South African bourgeois revolution, not only as a particular thing, but also as compared to the bourgeois revolution in general.

There is the contradiction between the incessant accumulation of capital and the poverty of the mass of the people. There is the contradiction between the bourgeois democratic form of government among the white population, in the past characteristic of the bourgeois revolution in Europe and America, and the rise of fascism in South Africa, following in the footsteps of a desperate monopoly capitalism that enveloped Germany before the war.

These are matters, among many others, that properly belong to true political economy. Horwitz does not deal with them.

The bourgeois economist half-understands the South African economy, both the history of it and its present trends. More clearly than many discussions, this book shows that the transition from

understanding the South African situation to changing it, has to be based on the demands of the mass of the workers and peasants. Only in this way can the productive forces be released again to perform the historic task of improving the life of the people as a whole.

Not to be too uncharitable, we must express gratitude at the fact that Horwitz has in his researches provided us with information on a number of books and Commission Reports which contain much valuable fact and opinion.

J. J. JABULANI.

A Stirring Record

The World That Was Ours, by Hilda Bernstein (Heinemann, 42s.).

THIS STORY BEGINS ON the evening of July 11th, 1963, when Rusty Bernstein, the author's husband, an architect, Communist and long-time activist in the South African national liberation movement, failed to return home in time to meet his house-arrest deadline. It ends a little more than a year later with the Bernsteins flying in a small chartered plane high 'into the white-hot blaze of the African sky', safely on their way to Zambia. In the intervening year Rusty Bernstein had been arrested at Rivonia, held for three months in punitive and degrading solitude, placed on trial for his life, acquitted, immediately re-arrested, released on bail and returned to nightly house-arrest.

The author herself had not been a meek observer of events. After helping to re-establish underground contacts, she had assisted with the escape of four key political detainees, found a means of communicating with her husband, attended the drawn-out proceedings of the Rivonia trial from first to last, and finally fled into hiding only moments before the police had arrived at her house to take her into custody. All these incidents are described in lively narrative prose, and the book ends with an appropriately dramatic record of the Bernstein's secret journey out of Johannesburg and arduous trek across the sandy, wind-swept, police-patrolled border into Botswana.

This is a full book. It is crowded with things that happened and with brief but alive portraits of the personalities involved. There are also strong descriptions of landscape and mood, and a convincing statement of the moral-political dilemmas facing a wife and mother at a time of intense police persecution. Should she continue with underground work after her husband had been caught at Rivonia? Should she say goodbye to the two youngest of her four children, and thereby jeopardise her chances of remaining hidden from the police? Should she and her husband try to escape from the country when so many of their friends and associates were in prison? The answers to these questions are given

as they were worked out in practice—not according to abstract rules, but in the light of painfully acquired experience and honest analysis.

The world that the author describes is a world of police spies and hidden tape-recorders, a world in which it is unsafe even to whisper in your own home; but it is also a world of people prepared to give rooms to be used as hide-outs, of secret messengers and of brave individuals and groups carrying on resistance at a time of great danger. Closeness to the accused in the Rivonia trial enables the author to mention facts about them which are not widely known and which provide yet further testimony to their nobility and seriousness of purpose. One learns from the book, for example, of the decision of Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu and Govan Mbeki not to lodge an appeal against their sentences even if they were condemned to death. Had such a sentence been imposed, Mandela would have told the court that he was prepared to die for what he believed in and that he hoped his death would be an inspiration to his people in their struggle.

The jacket of the book declares that all the author wanted was to do ordinary, prosaic things and enjoy the security of home and children. In fact, her anger at the inhumanity of apartheid compelled her to do extraordinary and unprosaic things, and now, with characteristic warmth and vitality, she has written a stirring and unprosaic book.

Reluctant Hero

A Healthy Grave, by James Kantor, (Hamish Hamilton, 35s.).

THE 'TENTH MAN' in the Rivonia Trial seemed strangely miscast. Debonair playboy, Jimmy Kantor, was the head of a successful firm of lawyers, specialising in divorce proceedings and sensational criminal trials. Nelson Mandela and his eight comrades in the dock had chosen the hard and dangerous path of revolution; Kantor had not. Yet he found himself with them in November 1963 facing a possible death sentence, in his own, characteristically sardonic words, 'certainly the most reluctant of all men on trial for alleged political crimes'.

His brother-in-law and partner, Harold Wolpe, had dramatically escaped from prison and the country on the eve of the trial, in which he was due to play an important role as one of the accused. Fuming, the authorities arrested Kantor and charged him instead. The frame-up failed—he was found not guilty and discharged without a word from the defence at the end of the prosecution case. But he had suffered months of imprisonment under brutal conditions, and a nervous breakdown. 'Not guilty'—but his practice was in ruins, and himself, like so many anti-apartheid South Africans driven to cold exile far from home.

One revenge he could, and did, have. He wrote down everything that happened to him, and had it published as a book.

It's a rich revenge.

Unlike many lawyers, James Kantor turns out to have a splendid command of readers' English—unconstipated, amusing, self-deprecatory, compulsorily readable.

A Healthy Grave (title from Sydney Smith—'I have no relish for this country; it is a kind of healthy grave') contains some devastating character sketches of such gentry as Prosecutor Yutar and Special Branch policemen Dirker, Viktor and Swanepoel. It provides fresh, and utterly convincing insights into prison conditions for politicals and the hysterical atmosphere of the Rivonia Trial, seen through a lawyer's eyes, but this time from the dock.

Above all this book gives us warm, human pictures of Mandela and the other freedom fighters in the trial. Jimmy Kantor prevailed on each of them to write a thumbnail autobiography of himself, during the course of the trial, and these are reproduced in the book, together with photographs of the accused and other prominent figures in the case.

He had no doubt met most of them before as clients of his firm, but now for the first time in close daily contact with them, one sees his affection and admiration for them growing throughout the story. They emerge in their full stature as true heroes of our time. Nelson Mandela becomes godfather to Tanya Kantor, born during the trial, and the author concludes his book with extracts from Mandela's famous speech in court, words, he writes, 'that will be remembered for centuries to come wherever men talk of the basic concepts of freedom'.

Despite his personal modesty and his acknowledged 'reluctance' to feature as an accused in a political trial, the author himself emerges with no little credit for his courage and integrity. At all stages of the proceedings, he could have purchased his personal freedom at the price of collaborating with the Special Branch. He honestly admits the temptation. 'But whichever way I looked at the situation or argued with myself, the answer was always the same. I would still have to live with myself. The price was too high.'

A.L.

a land of backwardness, ignorance and illiteracy.

Now the Soviet Union is a great modern power, leading the world in many fields of scientific, educational and other achievements, where all the many national groups enjoy complete freedom and equal rights.

WHAT IT MEANT TO THE WORLD

Before the 1917 revolution the whole world was dominated by a handful of imperialist powers, like Britain, the USA, Germany and France. By force and terror they had seized whole Continents—Africa, Asia and South America, which they ruled, enslaved and robbed.

The Great October Socialist Revolution meant that for the first time there was a breakthrough in the monopoly of the world by capitalism and imperialism. The Soviet Union challenged the very foundations of imperialism and colonialism. It championed the right of oppressed people everywhere to independence, the right of all nations to rule themselves and decide their own future.

The achievements and ideas of the Russian Revolution inspired hundreds of millions of oppressed people in the world to unite and fight for their own freedom.

WORLD WAR II

In the Second World War, the Soviet people and their heroic army bore the main brunt of

Hitler's attack. They played the main part in crushing the fascists, and saving the world from Nazi domination.

This victory led to great changes in the world. In 14 countries, led by their own Communist Parties, the people overthrew the capitalists and took the socialist road. Today one third of the world's population from Czechoslovakia, in central Europe, to China, Vietnam and Korea in Asia, and Cuba in America, live in socialist countries.

AFRICA AND ASIA

After the war, hundreds of millions of people in Asia and Africa rose up in rebellion, refusing to be ruled any longer by foreigners. They knew they could rely on the support and assistance of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

But the struggle is not over. It is still going on. The imperialists, led by the United States, are trying their best, to bring back the bad old days of colonial slavery.

In *Vietnam* the American imperialists are engaged in brutal aggression and mass murder to enslave the people.

In *Southern Africa*, backed by the imperialists, the fascist, anti-African regimes of Vorster, Ian Smith and Salazar of Portugal are viciously oppressing the people, jailing, torturing and murdering our leaders.

But the people are fighting back and winning.

The small Vietnamese nation is bravely standing up to the American army of half a million troops, armed with the latest horror weapons of bombing planes, napalm, gas, chemicals to kill women and children in the villages. They are fighting back and beating the Yankee invaders. In Mozambique and Angola African freedom-fighters are standing up to the Portuguese troops and winning more and more areas for African rule. In Zimbabwe (Rhodesia), fighting is taking place between the armed and heroic young men of ZAPU and the African National Con-

gress of South Africa, joined in a fighting alliance, and on the other side, the security forces of the illegal Smith regime, backed by Vorster's brutes of the S.A. Police whom we know so well.

The war is beginning for the liberation of our country.

The people of Vietnam will win. The people of Angola, Mozambique, and South-West Africa will win. We shall win. Our cause is just. It is supported by the workers, peasants and freedom-loving people of the whole world, including the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

We South Africans join in the world-wide celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the Russian Socialist Revolution. It marked the beginning of a process that will not stop until the whole world is free, including our own beloved South Africa, now ruled by white racialists and fascist thugs.

The South African Communist Party says:

LONG LIVE THE SOVIET UNION!

DOWN WITH IMPERIALISM AND WHITE SUPREMACY!

LONG LIVE THE SOUTH AFRICAN REVOLUTION!

THE FIGHTING IN ZIMBABWE

African freedom-fighters, including the brave young men of Umkhonto We Sizwe have engaged in a number of hard and prolonged battles with the forces of the Smith regime, backed up by white South African troops, planes, helicopters and armoured cars, illegally sent into the British colony of Rhodesia by the Vorster government.

The Freedom Forces have already inflicted heavy casualties

on the enemy, killing and wounding many of them.

For the first time an African army, well-trained and armed with modern weapons, is challenging white minority domination in Southern Africa.

This fighting in Zimbabwe is only the beginning. It is the beginning of a war for freedom that will spread all over Southern Africa, including the Republic.

This war involves every one of

us. We must support the peoples' force in every way we can. They call them 'terrorists'. But the real terrorists are Vorster and Smith. They have banned leaders, organisations, meetings, newspapers. They have left no way out but to fight if we want to win freedom, to end apartheid and oppression.

This is a just fight. It is a fight for land, freedom and human dignity. It is a fight against pass laws, police terror, starvation wages. Against white monopoly of land, votes, skilled jobs and opportunities. It is a fight for decent houses, schools for our children, equal rights for everyone, black and white.

It will be a long, hard fight. It calls on us all to stand together now to help the freedom fighters, to prepare for revolution, to oppose the oppressors in every way we can, big or small. Africans,

Coloured people, Indians, democratic whites, stand together. Fight traitors, informers, slave mentality. Organise yourselves. Support the African National Congress, the Communist Party and other bodies that stand for freedom. Back up our fighting men!

THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The South African Communist Party is the party of workers and peasants. It was formed in 1921 inspired by the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and the Russian Revolution. It aims at socialism, but fully backs the ANC in the fight to end apartheid and win the Freedom Charter. The Nationalist government banned the Party in 1950. They have many times announced that it is dead. This leaflet proves that they are liars. The Communist Party will never die.

STRENGTHEN ANTI-IMPERIALIST UNITY

LAST NOVEMBER, a meeting took place between delegations representing the Central Committees of the South African Communist Party and the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. The s.A.C.P. delegation which was in Berlin at the invitation of the s.U.P. had talks with Comrades Friederich Ebert and Hermann Axen.

The discussions, carried out in a warm and fraternal spirit, covered problems of international affairs, the communist and labour movement, the situation in Europe and Africa, and joint anti-imperialist struggle.

The celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution were estimated as a striking example of the power and strength of socialism and the working class, and an example of the unity of the anti-imperialist forces and their solidarity with the Soviet Union, the bulwark of peace and progress.

The revolutionary forces have a common enemy—imperialism. They have common aims—the struggle for the interests of the working people, for peace, democracy and social progress. This struggle demands the unity of the efforts of the socialist world system, the labour movement and the national liberation movement.

Both parties emphasised the necessity for strengthening the unity and solidarity of all communist and workers parties as the kernel of the anti-imperialist movement and were in full agreement that the time had now arrived for the preparation and carrying through of a world conference of the Communist Parties.

Full agreement was expressed by both sides on all basic questions.

The delegation of the South African Communist Party was able to convince itself that in the German Democratic Republic the roots of imperialism and of racism have been eliminated. Within the course of two decades, and under the most difficult conditions of struggle against the united forces of the imperialist powers, the socialist revolution has been carried through, under the leadership of the Socialist Unity Party.

The German Democratic Republic arose and has become strong as an anti-imperialist, anti-colonial and socialist German state in which the ideas of peace, proletarian internationalism and the friendship of the peoples have become deeply rooted with the aim of developing the advance of the social system of socialism, and in this way, completing the construction of socialism, the working people of the German

Democratic Republic are carrying out the decisions of the 7th Congress of the S.E.D. in the closest unity with the Soviet Union and other socialist states.

The South African comrades were able to learn about the situation in Western Germany. The reactionary, revanchist Kiesinger-Strauss Government is intensifying its efforts at both internal and external expansion with the help of the Social Democratic Ministers and in line with the global strategy of the U.S.A. Its efforts to be regarded as the sole representative of Germany are a permanent threat of aggression by the Bonn Government against the German Democratic Republic, and its main method of struggle against peace and security in Europe. It crudely intervenes in the internal affairs of other states and assists the neo-colonialist oppression of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

The Kiesinger Government is the closest associate of the most reactionary regimes in the world. It actively assists Israel's aggression against the Arab people. It intensifies its political, economic and military collaboration with the racist, aggressive regimes of South Africa and Rhodesia, as well as with the Portuguese colonial rulers in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea.

The two delegations affirmed that more and more alarming details about the economic, political and military collaboration between Bonn and Pretoria are becoming known throughout the world. This collaboration is centred above all in the conspiracy with regard to the production of atomic weapons and rockets. Both delegations emphasised the necessity for exposing this conspiracy—which is being hatched with the help of U.S. imperialism—through the unity of all anti-imperialist forces.

The South African Communist Party regards the German Democratic Republic as a true friend of the African people in their struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism.

The comrades of the South African Communist Party gave details about the difficult struggle demanding great sacrifices, which is being waged by the democratic forces in South Africa against imperialism and racism, for democracy, national independence and freedom. The apartheid regime is sharpening its terror campaign against all progressive forces, both amongst the white and non-white populations. Thousands of people have been arrested and tortured. The fundamental contradiction between the exploiting minority and the oppressed masses is growing day by day. The masses of the people are fighting back even more impressively against the terrorist measures of the government, against white domination and for the democratic revolution.

The revolutionary spirit of the national liberation movement whose

kernel is the African National Congress, remains unbroken. Anti-fascist opposition is also developing amongst the white minority. In spite of the terrorist measures of the Vorster Government, the fighting unity of all strata of the people is being organised with courage and solidarity.

The Socialist Unity Party estimates the role and struggle of the South African Communist Party, as the leading force in the national liberation movement in South Africa, extremely highly and expresses its admiration and its unlimited solidarity for the heroic struggle of the democratic forces in South Africa.

Both parties were convinced that the imperialists will not succeed in breaking the fighting spirit of the peoples of Africa who are struggling for national independence and social progress.

Both parties proclaimed their deep solidarity with all peoples and all states who are marching on the road of national liberation and social progress firmly and unitedly. At a time when reaction and counter-revolution are becoming active again everywhere—especially in Africa—and are seeking to weaken the united front of the progressive forces, the unity of all anti-imperialist forces has become an absolute necessity.

Both parties condemned in the most forthright manner the barbaric war of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam. They will continue to give the fullest possible assistance to the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people and demand the immediate unconditional ending of the bombing of North Vietnam.

The South African Communist Party and the Socialist Unity Party of Germany agreed to strengthen still further their mutual fraternal relationship.

BRITISH COMMUNISTS HAIL SOUTHERN AFRICAN REVOLUTIONARIES

THIS THIRTIETH CONGRESS of the Communist Party of Great Britain extends warmest fraternal greetings to the Zimbabwe African People's Union, the African National Congress of South Africa, and the South African Communist Party. We greet your leaders, many of whom are in prison or in exile; we greet your heroic freedom fighters now under arms; we greet your peoples in the cities and the villages, in the mines and on the farms, throughout the countries of Southern Africa, now mobilising for a great new challenge to racism and tyranny.

The patriotic war, launched by the new A.N.C.-Z.A.P.U. alliance, which has taken up arms for the national liberation of Zimbabwe and South Africa, has given confidence and hope to the people of Africa, and to anti-imperialists everywhere.

This challenge to fascist brutality, with its encouraging initial successes, has produced apprehension in Salisbury, Pretoria and London.

The A.N.C.-Z.A.P.U. alliance in struggle, based on the devotion and skill of its armed forces, together with the growing support of the people, is the guarantee of eventual victory. We know that these patriots face danger and even death, but we are certain that they will triumph.

This is a decisive testing time for everybody who wants to bring apartheid and white minority rule to an end. It is a testing time, too, for Britain.

The British Labour Government, in open collusion with the apartheid Government of South Africa, continues its efforts to prevent the taking of decisive steps to topple the Smith regime.

From this Congress, we call on the British people to condemn these sordid manoeuvres, and urge them to demand the release of Nelson Mandela, Bram Fischer, Joshua Nkomo, and the thousands of other political prisoners, and to extend active support to your great cause.

All strength to your arms, and victories in your great battle for freedom, independence, equality and human dignity!

INTRODUCTION TO NEO-COLONIALISM

Jack Woddis

In his latest book Jack Woddis gives a detailed explanation of the issues now at stake in the struggle against imperialism throughout the world. He examines the actual development of events and of class relations in Asia, Africa and Latin America and shows how old colonial policies are being continued in new forms and how imperialism works to maintain its dominance. *paper 7s 6d*

THE IMPACT OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION IN BRITAIN

R. Page Arnot

Describes and documents the immediate and lasting effects of the Russian events in Britain—in Press, Government, Parliament, the Labour Movement—drawing on Cabinet papers which have only now, 50 years after, become available for public inspection. *45s*

AIMS AND METHODS OF SOVIET PLANNING

Mikhail Bor

Introduction by Maurice Dobb

Contemporary methods of Soviet planning and the recent changes made in the light of experience are analysed in this book by a well-known Soviet economist. *50s*

LAWRENCE & WISHART