

# The African Communist

NUMBER 26 THIRD QUARTER 1966

## CRISIS IN AFRICA

Behind the Military  
Take-overs

A. ZANZOLO

BA 320.53205.

AFR

S. 83/104

RECEIVED BY

1993 -10- 12

## **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*

**No 26    Third Quarter 1966**

# Contents

---

## 5 EDITORIAL NOTES

### REBELS AGAINST THE CROWN

*Ireland, 1916; Rhodesia, 1966.*

### INDEPENDENCE FOR LESOTHO

*On the eve of Independence, the smouldering crisis between the minority, Verwoerd-backed government and the patriotic Basotho nears flash-point.*

### . . . AND BOTSWANA

*Formal Independence is the beginning of the real struggle.*

### THE COMMUNIST PARTY: 45 YEARS

*The proud record of Africa's pioneer Marxist Party.*

## 15 CRISIS IN AFRICA

### A. ZANZOLO

*Military coups in many countries, assassinations, colonialist plots and economic penetration; attacks on African unity and independence; internal weaknesses and class factors . . . A. ZANZOLO analyses the contemporary African scene in the light of the scientific Marxist-Leninist approach to problems of democracy and state power in conditions of our Continent.*

## 28 BENDING THE COLOUR-BAR

### Z. NKOSI

*Economic apartheid means reserving highly-paid skilled jobs exclusively for Whites. But the expanding South African economy with its chronic labour shortages makes it impossible to maintain this policy rigidly. This article describes new developments in this field, and the reactions of employers, politicians and the segregated White trade unions.*

## 47 SHOWDOWN IN KENYA

### A. LERUMO

*Reactionary and imperialist intrigue against former Vice-President Oginga Odinga and other progressives have led to a split in the ruling K.A.N.U. and the emergence of a new, militant opposition party. The writer discusses the background to these events and the challenging new programme of the Kenya People's Union.*

## Contents (continued)

---

### 58 **SHORTCOMINGS OF MILITARY RULE**

Y. USMAN

*A Nigerian contributor describes the neo-colonialist economy of his country, and expresses scepticism that the officer corps now in power will be capable of effecting the radical reforms needed to solve the pressing problems of national regeneration.*

### 62 **THE SOVIET UNION AS I SAW IT**

Y. NGOMEZULU

*A South African political refugee's notes and impressions of a recent visit to the U.S.S.R.*

### 68 **AFRICA: NOTES ON CURRENT EVENTS**

SOL DUBULA

*Uganda—The Coup that Failed; Ghana: Imperialist Manipulation; Kenya: Oneko's Statement; Mozambique and Angola: Guerilla Campaigns; Nigeria: Forward March or About Turn?; Trade Union News. And Notes on Senegal; Congo; Malawi; Sudan; Swaziland; Sierra Leone; South Africa.*

### 81 **BOOK REVIEW**

Helen Joseph's *Tomorrow's Sun*.

Reviewed by S. Azad.

### 84 **WHAT OUR READERS WRITE**

Letters from Nigeria, Zambia, Britain.

### 88 **DOCUMENTS**

PRESIDENT NASSER'S MAY DAY SPEECH

*A shortened version of the speech of the President of the U.A.R. delivered to factory workers on the 1st of May, 1966.*





Editorial Notes:

# Rebels against the Crown

IN 1916, AT EASTER, a body of Irishmen, headed by the poet Patrick Pearse and the workers' leader James Connolly, raised the banner of independence in Dublin. They marched, armed, into the general post office and occupied it. They issued a stirring proclamation declaring Ireland a Republic, free of English rule after centuries of alien domination.

Britain immediately declared that they were rebels against the Crown.

Although it was in the middle of the first world war, troops and resources were found to crush this 'rebellion'. With the utmost severity the rising was put down. Pearse, Connolly and the other leaders who were captured were executed.

It took many more long years of struggle and sacrifice before Irish independence was won and the Republic recognized.

Even today, Britain occupies the six northern counties of Ireland.



In November 1965, a group of European adventurers in Salisbury issued a grotesque parody of the American Declaration of Independence. Smith and his fellow-conspirators represented less than one sixteenth

of the inhabitants of the African territory they were supposed to be administering on behalf of Britain.

The British government declared that they were rebels against the Crown.

Apart from the usual colonial operations, Britain was engaged in no war at that time, and still is not.

The total white population of 'Rhodesia' is less than that of a medium-sized English town; its armed forces, by world standards, are negligible.

Yet no military measures whatever were taken by Britain against the 'rebels'. No steps were taken to arrest Ian Smith and his so-called Cabinet and put them on trial for treason.

Instead the British government has entered into a long series of secret negotiations with representatives of the Smith usurpers.

\*

It may be objected that there is no real parallel between the Irish and the Rhodesian events. Of course, in many senses that is true.

The Easter Rising of 1916 was a heroic and patriotic action, expressing the will and aspirations of the great majority of the Irish people and enjoying the sympathy of freedom-loving people throughout the world. The Smith gang are acting from ignoble motives of greed, to preserve their unjust privileges. They are regarded with hatred and contempt by the overwhelming majority of the people of Zimbabwe and the world.

But the parallel is that both in 1916 and now we are dealing with what are declared to be acts of treason and rebellion against the British Crown.

Why were there bullets and fierce repression for Connolly and Pearse; mild reproaches and half-hearted, ineffective 'sanctions' against the Smith gang?

Is it that times have changed; that the imperialists have become 'soft' and are no longer prepared, for humanitarian reasons, to use force? One has only to recall what happened yesterday in, say, Malaya or Kenya or Cyprus; what the British are doing now in Aden; what the Americans are doing in Vietnam with British backing; to realize that these people have by no means become pacifists.

\*

Treason and rebellion are supposed to be serious crimes, far worse, say, than theft and robbery.

Could one imagine a Government entering into private 'talks' and 'negotiations' with the representatives of a gang of robbers who had



just pulled off a big haul? Talks about what? the public would ask. About sharing the loot? Surely the only negotiations could be about when and where the gangsters would surrender to be tried in Court; anything less could only cause the collapse of the government in a storm of ridicule and contempt.

Yet the Smith gangsters have pulled off one of the biggest 'hauls' ever; an entire African country with four million enslaved people and considerable wealth and assets. Instead of arresting these super-criminals, the Wilson government is negotiating with them. What about? Smith has publicly declared that he is not prepared to discuss any relinquishing of the power he and his accomplices have assumed, to rule Zimbabwe, to seize African land, to suppress Africans and lay violent hands on their leaders.

The only thing they could be negotiating about is the terms of a suitable 'formula'. A formula that would serve two essential purposes—Firstly: Smith and the white minority to retain power. Secondly: some sort of minimal face-saving formula for Britain—the gracious recognition by Smith, perhaps, of the Queen as titular head of state and the British Governor-General as her representative.

In return for these meaningless 'concessions' Britain would be enabled to call off sanctions, restore the profitable trade with Rhodesia, and declare the crisis of U.D.I. at an end.

Everybody knows that such talks and such an agreement would solve nothing. The essence of the problem is not the constitutional relationship between Britain or the Queen and the so-called government of Rhodesia. It is the arrogant assertion by a quarter of a million whites that they are a master race entitled to hereditary rule in perpetuity over four million Africans.

But the talks do serve a useful purpose for Smith and the British. Like the futile 'sanctions'—made into a farce by the steady stream of oil and other essentials pouring across Beit Bridge from the Republic—they are a means of postponing any sort of decision. They prolong the status quo and buy time. And—with returns on Southern African investments running at over 25 per cent a year—time is money; big money.

For 25 per cent profit Labour Britain is prepared to overlook a small matter like treason against the Crown.

They are prepared, also, to forget all the admirable sentiments they once expressed about the moral abomination that is apartheid, the threat it poses to peace, the need for international sanctions and other action to end it.

Fortunately there are still some principled Labour people in Britain who stick to genuine socialist principles. The British Communist Party

and Lord Brockway, on behalf of the Movement for Colonial Freedom, have both condemned the negotiations with Smith, and demanded genuine independence under a constitution based on universal adult suffrage.

As far as Africa is concerned, there is no patriot anywhere in our continent who does not regard the talks and all that went before them as a betrayal of British promises to defend African interests in the South.

## **Independence for Lesotho**

THE INDEPENDENCE OF Lesotho on October 4th should be the occasion for general rejoicing and celebration. Unfortunately this notable event takes place against the background of yet another betrayal. It sees the handing over of power in Lesotho not to the representatives of the majority of the people, to the leaders of the Basutoland Congress Party and the Marematlou Freedom Party, who together with the Lekhotla la Bafo, the Communist Party and other patriots had fought so long and hard for independence. Instead, power will be placed in the hands of the 'National Party' of Chief Leabua Jonathan, which played no part in the independence struggle, which gained a minority of the votes in the last election, and enjoyed moral and financial backing from the surrounding Republic and Bonn Germany.

The situation in Basutoland urgently demanded the holding of fresh general elections before the transfer of power took place.

At the last elections the B.N.P. polled only 56.6 per cent of the votes cast. The B.N.P. and M.F.P. polled over 51.6 per cent of the votes. Thus the B.N.P. owed its slender majority (two seats in a National Assembly of sixty) entirely to the split between the two patriotic parties, a tragic division which has now, perforce, been healed.

This is not merely a question of which rival group of politicians should hold office in Lesotho's first independence government since the days of King Moshoeshoe I. It is a fundamental matter of whether Lesotho will be able, or will even try, to maintain genuine independence in the face of the major threat—the Republic of South Africa which surrounds this small and mountainous African state on all sides, and which has openly proclaimed its intention of absorbing it in its 'Bantustan' designs.

For Lesotho, formal independence marks the beginning and not the end of the real struggle.

British imperialism, the supposed 'protector' of Lesotho, began its 'protection' in the last century by handing over the most fertile part of the country, the farmlands west of the Caledon River, to the Boer



Republic of the Orange Free State. It has continued in that tradition ever since, sacrificing Basotho national interests to the insatiable appetites of white South Africa.

Complete economic stagnation—not a single industry has been begun under British rule—resulted in chronic unemployment. Half the Basotho men are always away from home, working and being grossly exploited in the Republic, on the mines and farms and in the factories. Every town and village in the country has recruiting agencies for the ‘Witwatersrand Native Labour Association’ (not as some might guess from its name, a trade union, but an ‘association’ of mine owners to transport Africans to work underground).

The only banks in Lesotho are South African banks; the only currency South African rands and cents; the only commodities manufactured in the Republic. The Republic controls Lesotho’s customs and exports.

The British, without consulting the Basotho, agreed to a degrading and outrageous proposal whereby all aircraft leaving the country have to submit to landing and being searched and cleared by the Republican authorities. Since there is no way of entering or leaving the country except through or over the territory of the Republic, this means a virtual veto by the Verwoerd government over who (including Lesotho citizens) can come into or go out of the country. And it has already been used to stop Basotho from leaving for abroad or even returning home.

Britain has countenanced countless infringements of Basutoland’s integrity and sovereignty by the fascist government across the border. The South African police (as in Bechuanaland and Swaziland) have regarded the country as their province, coming and going at will, censoring mails and literature, suborning the loyalty of Basotho citizens, even seizing and abducting refugees. Basotho citizens working in the Republic have been denied any rights or protection, including trade union rights; and treated, in fact, exactly as the Republic treats its own African population, with the utmost contempt for their human dignity which no citizen of a free country would or should tolerate.

**If Lesotho independence does not mean immediate and radical steps to put right this degrading position in relation to the Republic, then it means nothing at all.**

One would have thought that the very first steps of an independent administration would be to begin to redeem the national interests from the abject state to which they have been reduced by nearly a century of callous neglect, downright betrayal and preference for the interests of white South Africa (and its British shareholders) over those of the Basotho nation.



It would be the first concern of an independence-loving administration in Lesotho to rid the country of all the humiliating marks of subjection and subordination, not only by Britain but, above all, and in the first place, by the Republic. Lesotho would have her own customs, currency and financial system; she would embark (with such friendly assistance as would be readily forthcoming in so high a cause) on a crash programme to build industries and other sources of employment; she would insist on the right of her citizens to come and go without let or hindrance—just as, for example, landlocked Switzerland has transit rights for her people over or through neighbouring countries. She would protect her citizens at home and abroad. And she would immediately look to her defences and her borders against any possibility of infiltration or invasion. Such are the hall-marks and essentials of a sovereign independent country.

Unfortunately, one would look in vain to Chief Leabua Jonathan for the slightest sign or possibility that he will embark on any such dynamic programme to secure the independence of his country. It is typical that when his deputy chief Maseribae was insulted at the Bloemfontein bank where he keeps his money, he did not even show the pride of a private citizen, let alone a 'Prime Minister' and an African Chief. Instead of immediately withdrawing his account, he humbly apologized and went round to the 'Natives' entrance. When there was a shortage of mealies in Lesotho as a result of the drought, Jonathan did not, as he easily could, make an international appeal; he appealed to Verwoerd and made political capital for him.

As Mr. Ntsu Mokhehle, Leader of the Opposition, pointed out in the independence debate in the National Assembly:

. . . that independence called for here is not Basotho independence. This is a type of independence that Verwoerd would like to have in order to control this country . . . If you are led into independence by such a friend of South Africa (Jonathan's 'legal adviser') who never forgets in any document he advises you people to write you should state, in most servile and submissive terms, your slavish preparedness for friendship with South Africa, how can we trust that this is a genuine independence you are calling for . . .

. . . You (Jonathan) already have some of your South African friends there behind you, to support you and to hear how fast and successfully you are moving towards their political, economic and military incorporation.

This is the crucial question of Lesotho's independence.

In the hurried 'negotiations' held in London in July, the leaders of the patriotic Parties representing the majority of the electorate pleaded that there should be fresh elections before power was transferred. It was not an unreasonable request; indeed the British have repeatedly refused to relinquish power to minority governments. That was the excuse



on which they rigged the Constitution of Guyana, to remove the Jagan government which they did not like.

In this case the plea was reinforced by the important and highly relevant circumstances.

(1) That since the last elections, the Congress Party and the Marematlou Freedom Party have at last united their forces against the common enemy and would not again allow Jonathan in on a split vote;

(2) That the Paramount Chief, Motlotlehi Moshoeshe II, seeing the grave dangers facing his people, has taken the new and unprecedented step of holding pitsos (traditional meetings) throughout the length and breadth of the country to warn them against the unpatriotic policy of the B.N.P. and its links with Verwoerd;

(3) That in consequence of these events the eyes even of those who voted B.N.P. in the last election have been opened and there can hardly be any doubt whatever that it would suffer a crushing defeat in new elections—if these were held.

Leabua Jonathan and his group, however, are hardly likely to hold anything approximating fair elections once they are in power. Already, even before they got into office, they were found guilty of rigging ballots in some constituencies, in Court proceedings, and new elections were held. Even now, while the British are still supposed to be in control of security, they are using public money to hold party rallies from which opposition supporters are violently ejected. One can just imagine what hope there would be for 'fair elections' once this group has got full control over the police and security; nor is it at all to be excluded that they would call for help from across the border to suppress their town people.

Yet the British colonial office officials rode roughshod over all such objections. They refused to consider fresh elections. Everything had been stage-managed in advance; the presence of the B.C.P. and M.F.P. delegates, though they spoke with one voice and represented the majority, was virtually disregarded and their proposals ignored. As a result they withdrew from the Constitutional Conference, branding it as 'a carefully rehearsed pantomime . . . a travesty'.

Even the Paramount Chief, Moshoeshe II, was not allowed to take part in the discussions. As a result he refused to sign the independence agreement, which now bears the signatures only of the British Secretary of State, Mr. Fred Lee and Chief Leabua Jonathan. This makes the agreement itself of dubious legal validity.

The indecent haste shown in this matter by the British government, and the circumstances surrounding these events, have confirmed the

Basotho people in their conviction, reinforced by their whole history, that yet another betrayal of their interests has been engineered.

The latest move is that Moshoeshe, returned to Maseru, has called at a giant national Pitso for a referendum before independence takes place, and the majority parties have appealed to the Commonwealth Secretariat and the United Nations.

But, in the long run, the winning, consolidation and maintenance of genuine independence for Lesotho does not rest with Westminster or the United Nations. It rests with the Basotho people themselves. It was never Queen Victoria who kept the national soil free from the Orange Free State or the Cape Colony, or from ownership by European settlers. The British 'gave' half the country, as we pointed out above, to the O.F.S., they once 'gave' the whole country to the Cape. If the Basotho were not united under Moshoeshe I, if they had not fought and resisted, up to the stronghold of Thaba Bosiu, their position would have been as that of Zululand or the Transkei is today.

The coming of formal independence in October sees the Basotho in a good position to defend the heritage of the founder of the nation. If nothing else, the events have shown the leaders of the main patriotic parties the wisdom of the advice of the late Josiel Lefela and the Communist Party of Lesotho, and they have in practice taken important steps towards unity. The patriotic and enlightened stand of the Paramount Chief has aroused a new spirit of blazing resistance and determination among the people.

It is this spirit of unity and resistance which has to be reckoned with by the schemers in Pretoria and Maseru. Aroused and vigilant, the Basotho will not be tricked into watching passively the sale of the motherland. If Verwoerd wants to incorporate Lesotho as a Bantustan he will have to fight for it.

And if he wants to try anything like that, he should remember that the sons and daughters of Moshoeshe have twelve million ardent allies in the Republic.

### **. . . and Botswana**

MORE TROUBLE AWAITS the South African racialists on their Western border, when Bechuanaland becomes Independent Botswana on September 30th.

Verwoerd has even less chance of pulling off a 'Bantustan' coup in this vast though thinly populated territory. It is true that, unlike Lesotho, there is a substantial population of white settlers, mostly South African citizens, who could form a potential fifth column.



But, though he can be criticized about many things—and here one thinks particularly of his failure in the pre-independence period to protest against the shabby British treatment of refugees from apartheid—there is no doubt that Premier Seretse is firmly set against apartheid, and determined to better the lot of the Tswana people both in Botswana and under the rule of the Republic.

Seretse Khama also has the great advantage that his territory has at least a bridge to link up with the rest of free Africa, the narrow common border with Zambia. This opens up great potentialities, particularly in the economic field; and no time should be lost in improving communications and links between the two countries.

At the same time there should be no illusions about the reality and the extent of the menace across the border. Although not perhaps to the same extent as Lesotho, Botswana is dangerously dependent on the Republic. The departing British have left it in the same position regarding customs, currency, finance, imports of manufactures, and employment openings. It also lacks any regular defences against military attack.

Naturally the immediate concern of the independence administration will be to take urgent measures to uplift the pitifully low standards of living, health, education and public services to upbuild the young nation.

But no illusions should be harboured that—so long as apartheid and the fascist practice of white supremacy exist in the neighbouring Republic, South-West Africa and Rhodesia—the path to genuine independence will be smooth and unchallenged.

Here, as in Lesotho, the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. And the formal declaration marks not the end, but the beginning of a period of struggle and challenge; a signal to awake.

## **The Communist Party: 45 years**

JULY 29TH MARKED the forty-fifth anniversary of the foundation of the Communist Party of South Africa.

They have been years of bitter hardship for our country and our people.

Whether under the rule of Smuts's United Party, or the neo-Nazi Nationalist Party of Malan, Strijdom, Verwoerd and Vorster, they have been years of pass-laws, landlessness, starvation wages and harsh repression for the great majority of South Africans.

The South African people know that whenever they have stood up and fought for their rights, in town or in country, in the trade union

movement, the national liberation movement, the Communists have fought with them in the front rank.

The Nationalist Party government has declared that Communism is a crime, and that the Communists are therefore all criminals.

But the masses of the South African people, the workers, peasants, democrats and patriots, have learnt to know two generations of Communists from their deeds. Our country will not forget the founders of the Party, men like Bill Andrews, father of the labour and trade union movement; S. P. Bunting, passionate defender of the rights of the oppressed non-white majority; Ivon Jones, brilliant and far-seeing Marxist. It will not forget the men who dedicated their lives to building trade unions and the African National Congress: men like the late Albert Nzula, the martyred Johannes Nkosi, Moses Kotane and J. B. Marks. Nor can the people of our country forget those who are now serving life sentences or other long terms side-by-side with their non-Communist comrades-in-arms; heroic Communists like Govan Mbeki, Ahmed Kathrada, Bram Fischer and scores of others.

To mark the forty-fifth anniversary of the foundation of the Party, thousands of copies of the underground bulletin *Freedom* were distributed throughout the country. The bulletin appeals for unity of working people in town and country; unity of Africans, coloured people, Indians and all democrats; unity of Communists and non-Communists, to resist apartheid and win the fight for freedom.

From the leaders of the Communist Parties in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries; from Britain, France and other capitalist countries, warm messages of solidarity and tribute to its unflinching struggle were sent to the South African Communist Party on the anniversary.

Such a Party, which has become a part of the life and the history of our country, will not be destroyed by persecution, nor will it ever submit to the brutal despotism of the race-obsessed thugs who hold power today.

Long after the victorious people of South Africa have swept apartheid and white supremacy from the face of the land, the record and the achievement of the Communist Party will be honoured and celebrated.



# CRISIS IN AFRICA

---

**A. ZANZOLO**

THREE YEARS AGO, Africa seemed on the threshold of a great new advance. Patriots throughout the Continent had been inspired by the first Summit Conference, held in the old City of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in May 1963. The Conference had been a triumph of organization, and an extraordinary demonstration of the tenacity with which Africa fought for unity and influence in the world. Never before, we felt, had the people and leaders of an entire Continent, felt and expressed so strongly their identity of interests and purpose. Language, ethnic, geographical, religious and even ideological differences which the alien intruders had for so long made use of to divide, subjugate and dispossess us of land and liberty, were set aside. Nasser, Nkrumah, Selassie, Keita, Senghor, Balewa, Nyerere, Ben Bella, stood together as brothers and spoke one language: the language of African patriotism and renaissance.

Reading the record of the proceedings, the resolutions and the Charter of the Organization for African Unity one cannot fail to capture the moving spirit of the Conference. Measures to liquidate the remaining colonial territories and to replace white minority governments by democratic ones dominated discussions and led to the appointment of the Decolonization Committee of Nine amid high hopes of speedy victory. All-African organizations in the economic, social and military fields were established to facilitate united action for the benefit of the whole Continent. The basis for a strong anti-imperialist bloc in the United Nations was laid. A foreign policy of non-alignment and anti-colonialism for peace was established. Imperialism was on the retreat and Africa was on the march.

It cannot be said that these bright hopes have been fulfilled. Admittedly since the Summit of 1963 more states have achieved independence. Kenya and Zanzibar in 1963. Malawi and Zambia in 1964. The Gambia in 1965. And more are due to be independent this year. Yet the outlook on the Continent is one of crisis and apprehension.

The general counter-offensive of imperialism in the world has hit our Continent very hard.

The first clear sign that imperialism had decided on new tactics in Africa occurred, as could be expected, in the Congo (Leopoldville). The hated Tshombe was imposed on the people of the Congo whose revolution in 1964 was making great strides and appeared on the verge of a breakthrough. This was followed in November 1964 by the astounding invasion of the revolutionary capital Stanleyville by Belgian paratroops with British and American logistic and diplomatic support. This crime was compounded by the fact that at the precise moment negotiations were taking place in Nairobi relating to the evacuation of foreigners from Stanleyville. The indignation of the African states knew no bounds. But to the imperialists the cold-blooded reality was the inability of the Africans to counter the move effectively. The imperialists were emboldened by their success in temporarily liquidating the gains of the revolutionary movement in the Congo with the help of White mercenaries from South Africa. More was to follow.

During 1965 a series of events designed to create disunity and conditions of instability throughout Africa took place. Prominent progressive leaders were assassinated including Premier Ngendandumwe of Burundi, Pio Pinto of Kenya and Ben Barka of Morocco. A calculated and sustained ideological and propaganda campaign of lies and slander against progressive governments and individuals was carried on with increasing vehemence. Any leaders prepared to stand up for Africa were and are being personally discredited in all manner of ways. Elected civil governments have been replaced by military ones in a series of coups that have followed one another with monotonous regularity. Last but not least the most ruthless imperialists history has known—the British—have tolerated a rebellion by the White minority in Rhodesia on the grounds of squeamishness at the possibility of bloodshed! The move was really to prevent the emergence of an independent Zimbabwe.

Tragically, in the face of all these problems the African states have been divided and growingly opportunist.

In such a huge Continent as Africa the background to these events is naturally so varied as to make generalization hazardous. Nor is understanding helped by the veritable stream of analyses and comment from the imperialists and their servitors which aim to mislead rather than shed light on events. From these sources come allegations of the inability of Africans to govern themselves. They speak of 'chaos' and corruption on the part of African politicians. They speak of alleged African predisposition to 'violence'. Such 'analyses' by apologists for the 'Western' way of life—they are, of course, a reflection of



centuries of the colonialist 'master-race' ideology—cannot fail to rouse every emancipated African to furious anger. Of course, we hate and cannot afford corruption in our struggling, poverty-stricken countries—the very corruption taught and imported to Africa from the countries of the West where corruption, the offshoot of capitalist greed and inhumanity, is the very way of life; where Presidents and Prime Ministers and entire Cabinets are notoriously in the pockets of the big financiers and armament manufacturers; where vast scandals involving millions of pounds or dollars, exceeding the entire budget of any African country are cynical newspaper commonplaces. And how dare they speak of 'African violence'—they whose war dead is counted in tens of millions, soldiers, civilians, women and children, bombed and roasted in air raids, gassed in extermination camps; they who rain death from the skies in Vietnam, explosives, napalm, poison gas and chemicals to kill the crops and murder the villagers.

### **NO EASY ANSWERS**

But setting all this odious colonialist propaganda nonsense aside, it is clear that serious new problems have arisen; events which need analysis and which superficial sweeping generalizations cannot explain.

That many of these events are complex indeed a few examples will illustrate.

In Nigeria a pro-Western government with a strong feudal basis was overthrown amid widespread popular acclaim. It is not yet clear who planned the military take-over. The men in charge of the government received their mandate to rule from the former Federal Council of Ministers. The junior officers of the army who are alleged to have mutinied are still in custody. This would suggest that power was given up by the civil authorities to the senior army and police officers to forestall further development of the situation in a really fundamental, political and social change. The feudal land-owning ruling class in the North has handed over power to the growing, more self-confident bourgeoisie centred in West and Eastern Nigeria. Is this really what happened? To the bourgeoisie the essential need is for a strong unitary government, an end to feudalism and corrupt government which are a brake on expansion and business. So there has been some advance. But have the shrewd Nigerian bourgeoisie robbed the people of an even greater advance?

In Algeria the extremely popular President, Ben Bella, was removed from his position on the eve of the Afro-Asian Summit conference by his own government. There has been very little change of personnel in the government at the top. The Algerian revolution seems to be

in a state of immobility, moving neither to the right or left and reflecting continuing sharp conflicts in the leadership of the ruling F.L.N. Widely differing assessments of the events continue to be made even within progressive circles.

In the Congo the government of Tshombe was dismissed by Kasavubu who in turn was overthrown by General Mobutu. In the Congolese political jungle it is difficult to choose between either of these gentlemen. They shared in the murder of Patrice Lumumba and are all incorrigible stooges of Western imperialist interests. The changes of government reflect contradictions within the camp of the imperialists themselves.

In Uganda the feudal monarch of Buganda attempted a coup to remove the government of Premier Obote. In a swift counter-move the Premier removed the Kabaka Mutesa II from his position as head of state and introduced a new constitution establishing the Uganda People's Congress more firmly in power. But the first act of foreign policy of the new regime was to invite Mobutu to pay a state visit to Uganda.

In Ghana the national democratic regime of Dr. Kwame Nkrumah was overthrown by a patently anti-Socialist and pro-Western military and police junta. But supporters of Nkrumah's Ghana have been deeply disturbed by the apparent failure or inability of the masses of working people, or even of the Party members, to rally to the defence of a government which had done so much for Ghana and placed their country in the vanguard of Africa's progress. The defection of many of Nkrumah's senior colleagues, and the lack of mass resistance cannot but arouse questions as to the extent of conscious public participation in democratic processes, and lend weight to Thomas Hodgkin's grave allegation: 'The cult of Nkrumah's personality . . . was used by the Old Guard to cover up deficiencies in party organization and strategy. The committed Socialists within the Party were in a definite minority and . . . they had no effective body of mass support.' (*Labour Monthly*, April 1966.)

These few examples (and one can add many more) will suffice to show how difficult it is to make any accurate assessment of the coups and other events on our Continent; and how dangerous to try to work out an over-simplified generalization that would meet every case.

But in all cases, certain outstanding facts stand out.

The first is that, behind all the recent disturbances on our Continent, and to whatever extent local class and other differences appeared, is an overall strategy of international imperialism designed to frustrate the progressive aims of the African revolution, to re-establish capitalist



patterns and imperialist influence, and—in the long run—to re-colonize Africa.

The second is that the method of military coups and take-overs, and the almost total absence of democratic mass participation, shows a failure thus far, to build real revolutionary vanguards capable of bringing about fundamental transformations and awakening the masses to fight consistently for themselves, their own state and their own future.

The third is that in every case the imperialists and local reactionaries have made full use of the corrosive weapon of anti-Communism. They have taken advantage of lingering prejudices against Communism existing in the minds even of sincere patriots and revolutionaries, or of their opportunist fear to defend the rights of Communists to participate with other anti-imperialist fighters in the vital tasks of national construction and the evolution of policy and concepts. The result has been a blurring of vital problems and realities.

There can be no successful revolution, it has been correctly observed, without a revolutionary theory. The broad ideas of African nationalism and the fight for political independence which sufficed to unite our people and carry them to the present stage of advancement, are not sufficiently precise and scientific to enable us to build up our strength and unity to resist the new counter-offensives of imperialism, to liberate the enslaved areas of Portuguese and White Supremacy colonialism, to assert African unity, greatness and prosperity.

Nor is it enough to proclaim broad generalizations about 'African socialism' which are so vague and undefined as to permit (as in the case of Kenya and Senegal) blatantly capitalist policies and neo-colonialist practices to masquerade in their name.

It is high time that the revolutionary democrats of Africa came together to hammer out the theoretical and practical basis of resistance to imperialism and fresh advances for the cause of freedom, unity and socialism. To any such synthesis the African Marxists—though they do not pretend or claim to have all the answers ready-made—have an indispensable and invaluable contribution to make.

It is understandable that the emergence of scores of new states with their own historical, cultural and economic background should have given rise to much fresh and creative thinking in all schools of thought—not least among Marxist-Leninists. The weakness and even the absence of organized Marxist parties in Africa has meant that much of the discussion has been dominated by trends other than and even hostile to Marxism-Leninism. Inasmuch as the primary responsibility for applying the science of Marxism-Leninism to Africa belongs to African Communists their small numbers have rendered

the voice of Leninism weak on some vital and important issues. The views of Marxist-Leninists on such matters as the Leninist theory of the state as applied to African conditions; the character and nature of the revolutionary party; the meaning of leadership in party and state; the state of transition for the transformation of backward countries into progressive modern ones; the role of the masses in the management of the state and in production have not been heard as clearly as they should be.

But this is changing at a rapid rate. The attempted isolation of Africa from progressive ideas by the imperialists who still control much of communications and publishing on our continent is coming to an end. New Communist and Revolutionary Democratic parties are arising. Parties which began as fronts of national liberation are slowly beginning to realize the need for consistent revolutionary theory without which there can be no revolutionary party. The assertion of the need for an 'African personality' has given way to the realization that our ideas and attitudes must be not only African but scientific . . . international.

### **STATES, CLASSES AND PARTIES**

Much of importance has been written by African thinkers and statesmen on the question of the state and democracy. There have also been interesting practical attempts in some African countries to put these theories into practice.

At the very outset Kwame Nkrumah declared in favour of a state in which only one party was permitted. He described such a state as essential to unify disparate tribes and to foster national unity. Julius Nyerere has not only expressed himself forcefully on these problems but his country has conducted elections recently in terms of his ideas with results which require much study. In reports to the conference of the Democratic Party of Guinea President Sékou Touré has set out his ideas on the nature and character of the Guinea state and party. So have Leopold Senghor, Modibo Keita, Gamal Nasser and others.

But the polemic on state structure and on political parties has been conducted within narrow limits. The arguments used have been largely to counter those of Western political commentators who have tried to foist their concepts and institutions on Africa. Thus, Africans have felt obliged on the one hand to reject the Western model of democracy. The tendency was to deal with the problem of the state and party from an institutional point of view only. Hardly any attempt was made to examine the organization of young states of Africa on



a social and economic—in fact on a class basis. If this was done at all it was limited to two very doubtful propositions. One was the assertion contained in much of President Nyerere's writings on the subject that there was no tradition for multi-party parliamentary institutions in Africa. This went hand-in-hand with the attempt to create an analogy between the single national party with the traditional gathering of the people in tribal times. This argument is contrived. All societies in the world have passed through the tribal stage of customary law in which clan gatherings took decisions and which had no political parties organized as we know them in modern times. Secondly, there was the attempt to deny the existence of classes in Africa and thus to deny the validity of applying a class analysis to present-day African society. This was supposed to be some sort of back-handed slap at Marxism-Leninism. The Marxists did not discover or invent classes in society. What they have done is to describe the consequences of the division of society into classes. There has not really been a comprehensive socio-economic discussion of party and state organization as applied to African states. This is not surprising.

The question of the state is a very complex one. For obvious reasons the capitalists and those who serve them have surrounded this most vital question with much confusion for the deliberate purpose of perpetuating their rule and oppression of the mass of the people.

The state has not always existed in human society. There was a time in every society when there was no state. When there was no special apparatus for the systematic application of force and oppression of people. It is such an apparatus which is called the state. The period when there were no special units of soldiers, prisons, and a bureaucracy to oppress others is one which many of our people in Africa will remember. The period when there is no state is one which precedes the division of society into classes. *But wherever and whenever there is a division of society into classes the state emerges.*

In many parts of our continent before the imperialists came there was a predominance of customary law based on respect and authority of elders gathered in the Kgotla, Pitso, Inkundla or gathering of the people. There was no special category of people set apart to rule over others and who had at their disposal troops, prisons and other means of coercion. Society acted collectively as a whole in protection of itself.

It is generally speaking when slave society developed with the majority of the people oppressed as slaves that the state emerged. The few rulers and slave-owners owned the means of production, namely, the land, the tools and the human beings who worked for them as slaves.



One of the best-known slave societies was in fact established in Africa. In Egypt thousands of years ago a state emerged which was one of the earliest civilizations known to recorded history. This was a state based on slave labour. The state was highly developed and its creations still stand to this day in modern Egypt. The same applied to Ethiopia, where slavery was abolished in the lifetime of present-day generations.

In other forms of class society such as feudalism similarly the state is an essential part. In Nigeria before the arrival of the imperialists great feudal states were to be found. The Emirates of Northern Nigeria owned all the land which was worked on their behalf by oppressed serfs. The Emirs were served by great bands of troops and officials who collected taxes and punished the people. This was the feudal state. Similarly under capitalism the state is an essential part. In other words there is always in class society a special apparatus or group of people engaged in the job of ruling others by means of physical coercion in the form of soldiers, police and civil servants. The chief characteristic of the state (not the only one) is that it is a machine for maintaining the rule of one class over another. This is the essence of all states in the world without exception.

In 1917 the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia resulted in the formation of the U.S.S.R. This state was like all others an instrument of coercion of a class against another. But there was one radical and qualitative difference. For the first time in history there emerged a state of the labouring and working classes which oppressed the capitalists and landlords. This was a state of the overwhelming majority for oppressing the tiny minority. All states prior to 1917 had represented the few rich minority against the vast masses of the people who were poor. The U.S.S.R. was a state of the masses which suppressed the minority of exploiters, expropriated their ill-gotten gains and restored them to public ownership by the people as a whole. It is this which accounts for the insane hatred with which the U.S.S.R. was received by the capitalists who tried to strangle it at birth and failed. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat born in 1917 in the Soviet Union reflects the interests of the vast majority. The exploiters have been eliminated in the country. The state has no class to oppress inside the country and only exists to defend the revolution against external enemies and to assist revolutionary forces in other lands. It is this which enables the Marxist philosophers to do what the oppressors can never do—that is to discuss the question of the state with utmost clarity and frankness. The oppressors are dead scared to tell the people the truth about what the state is for. The more so as socialist states of the dictatorship of the workers and peasants have



appeared in larger numbers and are to be found in all continents. China, Cuba, the Eastern European states, the Asian Peoples' Republics, all these are new types of state which represent the majority and oppress a minority.

Whether a state has a parliament or not, whether there are many parties or one party, the prior question is the class or classes represented by the state in question. Whatever the outward form the reality of class interests will determine the character of the state in any country. This can be determined by objective data which do not depend on personalities or even on the short-term policies or tactics of the government in any country. Wherever there is a state it represents a class interest.

What of classes and parties? A great deal of unnecessary difficulty has been caused by the failure to define what classes and parties are, in much of the writings in Africa. Vladimir Lenin in a celebrated passage described the position thus:

'Everyone knows that the masses are divided into classes; that the masses can be contrasted to classes only by contrasting the vast majority in general, regardless of division according to status in the social system of production, to categories holding a definite status in the social system of production; that usually, at least in modern civilized countries, classes are led by political parties; that political parties, as a general rule are directed by more or less stable groups composed of the most authoritative, influential and experienced members, who are elected to the most responsible positions and are called leaders. All this is elementary. All this is simple and clear. Why replace this by some rigmarole, by some new Volapuk?'

(Lenin: 'Left wing' Communism—an Infantile Disorder)

Political parties combine persons having class interests. All parties represent classes. Sometimes they represent a single class. Or they may represent a coalition of classes with one class holding a dominant position. There is no political party in the world which represents no classes however loudly this is claimed to be the case. In fact the more strenuously class interests are sought to be concealed the more potent the class realities usually are.

## **STATES, CLASSES AND PARTIES IN AFRICA**

Communists have always held that the fundamental truths of Marxism-Leninism will be applied in each country or continent in accordance with the specific historical background, traditions and culture of the people living there. The forms of state, the political parties, the institutions of Africa will inevitably bear the imprint of the African experience. But there are certain fundamental international characteristics which we share with the rest of humanity and to which our continent cannot be an exception.

The vast changes in Africa and the resultant emergence of new states confront our people with the necessity to replace imperialist regimes with indigenous states which truly represent our aspirations. In the African states despite some common features there is a great variety of conditions. One common feature is that the states have emerged in an epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. They thus have an anti-imperialist content and aim not only at political but economic liberation. The commanding heights of the economy are still held by foreign imperialist interests. The local bourgeoisie is weak relative to the imperialist monopoly interests and suffers from the disadvantages of every late-comer trying to muscle into the market. This is a time of general decline of capitalism on a world scale. Hence all the new states including the most reactionary proclaim their aim to be the establishment of socialist society.

So in a number of African states the possibility arises of creating states of national democracy. This is a form of state representing a coalition of classes which are anti-imperialist. The aim of such a state is to control the budding capitalists in the country and to eliminate the positions of imperialism and thus provide a climate for profound social reforms and transform the former colonies into strong modern states. Parties and institutions are arising to lead the struggle for these transformations. It is in that direction that Mali, Tanzania and the U.A.R. are probably moving. It is to prevent just such development that reaction struck in Ghana and overthrew the government of Kwame Nkrumah.

The events in Ghana are a particularly bitter lesson also to show the need for revolutionaries to study the negative features that serve as soil for counter-revolution in Africa. The imperialists still control our best land, minerals, factories, raw materials, banks, insurance companies and trade. In many states independence was achieved by negotiation and did not come about through a victorious revolutionary struggle. The result is that the state apparatus of the former colonial power is taken over by the Africans whose leaders occupy only the top positions in dangerous isolation. The army and security forces are those trained by the former masters to suppress the freedom struggle. The Civil Services are full of those accustomed to serving the imperialists and look down on the masses. Such an apparatus is riddled with enemies of the freedom struggle in Africa and is a potent source of opposition to fundamental progress. Furthermore, the indigenous bourgeoisie although weak, relatively speaking, is growing fast particularly when its very existence is denied by our leaders! The small farmers and traders who abound in Africa engender capitalism and



the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on a mass scale'.

Class differentiation is proceeding. As the imperialists and their class allies within each country feel that the progressives are eroding their positions we can expect them to react violently with plots to overthrow governments by force. This has already happened. The question that arises is whether the states and parties we have in Mali, U.A.R., Algeria, Tanzania and others are effective instruments for the stubborn and ruthless class battles that now appear to be emerging.

National unity of all patriotic classes of workers, farmers, intellectuals and even sections of the capitalists will in most African countries be the basis of the national united front. Such a revolutionary front will in certain cases take the form of single national parties to which all progressive forces can contribute. But a recognition of the limitations of the single party is necessary. At the beginning, because of the nature of the struggle the national revolutionary party contains the indigenous bourgeoisie, sections of which are potentially anti-patriotic, vacillating and unreliable. Therefore leadership should not be left in the hands of this class but must be in the hands of the working class and poor peasants. A distinction needs to be drawn between the rich peasants and the poor. Also the absence of a firm consistent ideological base allows for the co-existence in the single party of different ideologies some of them hostile to scientific socialism. The influence of imperialism can be seen in the attitude adopted in some of the national democratic fronts to the Communists.

The Communists are ardent patriots and resolute fighters against imperialism. It is not for nothing that the enemies of Africa—the imperialists—direct their most vicious propaganda against the Communists. As the standard-bearers of Marxism-Leninism the Communists have inspired the mighty transformations that have occurred in the Soviet Union, in China, in the Peoples' Democracies of Eastern Europe and Asia, where formerly backward states have achieved amazing heights of scientific and technical progress. In the newly-liberated countries, wherever they are, Communists place their ideology at the service of the nation and apply the scientific ideas of Socialism to the building of strong states. Realizing this the imperialists endeavour at all times to isolate the Communists from the people. They know the Communists cannot be bluffed, bribed or diverted from the true path of revolution.

No genuine anti-imperialist has any need to fear the Communists. Those African leaders who join the imperialist game of anti-communism or slander the Socialist countries are in fact working against the ultimate interests of Africa and will gain no honour from the masses



of the people but only from the foreign imperialists. It is a matter for regret that in Kenya at present the K.A.N.U. government of President Kenyatta from which a great deal was expected by African revolutionaries is engaged in precisely such a campaign of anti-communism to the glee of all those imperialist forces which killed over one hundred thousand Africans during the struggle for freedom in Kenya. And it is those who opposed the imperialists and supported Kenyatta who are the object of slander and abuse today.

### **DEMOCRACY AND THE VANGUARD**

It is time, then, for Africans to cast aside the false concepts imposed by imperialists and bourgeois ideologists, which try to contrast different types of state as 'democratic' or 'dictatorships'. Their so-called democracies are nothing but veiled dictatorships of the most reactionary classes, the dehumanized and utterly unscrupulous monopolies. Let us say quite plainly that we do not aim at the sort of 'democracy' which allows exploiters, indigenous and foreign, to do as they please, to corrupt and undermine the masses, to plot assassinations, military take-overs and farcical rigged 'elections'. We are for suppressing them by means of a vigilant dictatorship of the working masses, the urban and rural poor who live by their own labour.

But this dictatorship is a true democracy for the great majority of the people. Only so far as it really mobilizes the people and enables them to participate in the administration of the laws and the economy of the country can it succeed.

Nor can such a plan—the only plan that can really repel imperialism and build socialism—be implemented without a truly revolutionary vanguard Party, inspired with the revolutionary ideas of scientific socialism. Not all the members of such a Party need be Marxists—though it would be absurd to exclude the Marxists from its ranks. But one thing is sure, a Party of a new type is needed. It cannot be composed of every worker or peasant—otherwise it would cease to be a vanguard, a leading body. Still less can its membership be made up of incorrigible bureaucrats, careerists, parlour theoreticians, would-be capitalists on the make, or yes-men and mbongos, praise-singers, whose only talents consist of repeating flattering glorifications of this or that 'messiah' or inspired prophet. We need people who are part of the masses and who can think for themselves; people who can organize and inspire the masses to safeguard the gains of the revolution and march onwards to fresh conquests.

This is not only a question of passing good laws. In the U.A.R. good laws were passed against feudalism and for land redistribution,



but the cunning feudalists seek ways to circumvent these laws and when the poor peasants opposed them some of their leaders were assassinated. Of all societies, none stands more in need of mass participation than the building of socialism, and mass participation can only be ensured by the constant mobilizing, rallying, educating, inspiring role of a band of dedicated men and women who seek nothing for themselves and who study, practise and set an example of socialism in their everyday lives.

Participation of the masses is not satisfied by the holding of mass rallies from time to time at which harangues are delivered by political leaders. Nor can socialism be produced by a flood of propaganda or directives from government or party. Fundamental, social and economic changes are brought about by mass struggle whose every step is explained to the people who from their own experience gain confidence in the state and the leaders. Mass participation imposes severe responsibilities on the leaders of parties in government who must themselves be an example to the people by reason of their honesty, incorruptibility and willingness to make sacrifices greater than those of any in the interests of the struggle. Where the leaders of parties and states are accountable to the people for their mistakes and in public organizations which exercise actual power, the ordinary common people safeguard the gains of the struggle, prevent counter-revolution and lead the way forward.

The difficult period through which Africa has been passing these past three years will not have been in vain, if our people ponder deeply and correctly understand the meaning of these events. The imperialists and their African lickspittles may be rejoicing over some quickly won and easy victories. But these 'victories' run counter to the deepest and most pressing needs and aspirations of Africa. By clearing our heads and showing us the way forward these very reverses may well be the means of propelling the African Revolution forward on its next, far more fundamental and far-reaching phase.

# Bending the Colour Bar

Z. Nkosi

EVER SINCE THE discovery of gold and diamonds in South Africa and the development of the country as an industrial nation, the pattern which has developed amongst the labour force has been one of White Supremacy. The most highly skilled and best paid jobs have been reserved, partly by tradition and partly by legislation, for the Whites, while the Non-White workers have been relegated to the sphere of unskilled and semi-skilled labour.

In 1951 the Industrial Legislation Commission of Inquiry reported the position as follows, based on the number of employees in industries, trades or undertakings in respect of which wage determinations were made during the period 1937-1948:

**Percentage Each Race Constitutes of Class of Skill**

	Skilled	Semi-skilled	Unskilled	Total
Europeans .. ..	83.8	33.8	1.5	35.4
'Natives' .. ..	5.8	34.2	80.8	47.0
Asians .. ..	5.6	11.2	4.5	6.0
Coloureds .. ..	4.8	20.8	13.2	11.6

Baldly, this table shows that 83.8 per cent of all skilled workers were Europeans, while 80.8 per cent of all unskilled workers were Africans. The layman might be excused for thinking this table demonstrated that the White worker was effectively in the saddle, but the Industrial Legislation Commission was not so much concerned with the actual position as with trends. In paragraph 134 of its report the Commission noted:

The foregoing analysis now permits of a clear conclusion being arrived at as to the extent to which Non-European labour has already become an integral part of the national economy. . . . In 1946 Non-Europeans constituted the bulk of the labour force in farming, forestry and fishing, mining, manufacturing, and personal services . . . and a further analysis of statistical data relating to the manufacturing industry revealed that, since the early thirties, the rate of employment of Non-Europeans exceeded that of Europeans. In this industry the proportion of Non-Europeans to the total number of employees advanced from 60.5 per cent in 1932/33 to 71.2 per cent in 1947/48. In the S.A. Railways and Harbours a similar



trend can be detected, as the proportion increased from 39.9 per cent in 1933 to 50.8 per cent in 1950. . . . In addition to these tendencies, it has now been indicated that the unskilled labour market is virtually the exclusive preserve of Non-Europeans, particularly Natives, and that Non-Europeans largely dominate the semi-skilled market and have already penetrated the sphere of skilled labour to a not inconsiderable extent.

Graph 3 in the Commission's report gave the following comparison between work force and share of income:

Europeans constituted 14 per cent of the working population in all industries in 1936 and obtained 74.5 per cent of the national income. Africans constituted 79.5 per cent of the working force and obtained 19.6 per cent of the national income. Asians constituted 1.3 per cent of the working force and obtained 1.7 per cent of the national income. Coloureds constituted 5.3 per cent of the working force and obtained 4.1 per cent of the national income.

Table 29 reports that the average annual income of the working population in all industries, including farming, fishing, mining and manufacturing in 1936 was:

Europeans	..	..	£350 3s.				
Africans	..	..	£ 16 2s.	4.6	per cent	of European	income
Asians	..	..	£ 91 5s.	26.1	„	„	„
Coloureds	..	..	£ 51 4s.	14.7	„	„	„

Despite the fact that the figures produced by the Commission revealed an enormous disparity between White and Non-White wages, and effective White domination of the lucrative skilled labour field, both the Commission and the Government felt that employment trends over the previous two decades indicated a measure of increasing Non-White penetration of traditionally White spheres of employment enough to warrant steps being taken to control future development.

Some measures were already on the statute book giving the Government the powers it wanted, but only in certain spheres of employment. The first Nationalist government, brought to power in 1924 in coalition with the Labour Party (largely as a reaction to the 1922 miners' strike), adopted a so-called 'civilised' labour policy which had the intention and to some extent the effect of promoting the employment of White labour at the expense of Non-White interests. The industrial Conciliation Act of 1924 set up collective bargaining machinery from which male Africans were excluded. The Wage Act of 1925 provided for investigations of industries where workers were insufficiently organised to participate in or benefit from collective bargaining, and for the establishment of minimum wage scales. Though the Wage Act contains no colour bar clauses, the Wage Board determinations have on the whole fixed minimum rates for traditionally White occupations so high that the employment of Africans in these jobs was

rendered practically impossible. On the other hand, fixed minimum wages in traditionally Non-White jobs are so low that no White would ever consider taking on such employment. The Mines and Works Amendment Act of 1926, the so-called 'Colour Bar Act', was the first legal enactment to embody the principle of job reservation. Skilled work on the mines was reserved for Whites and 'Cape Coloureds'. In practice, less than a dozen Coloureds have ever been granted the right to perform skilled work on the mines, and the monopoly of skilled work has been firmly in the hands of the White workers. Already on the statute book was the Apprenticeship Act of 1922 which again, while containing no overt colour bar clauses, laid down conditions of apprenticeship which effectively prevented most Non-Whites, and practically all Africans, from obtaining the opportunity of apprenticeship in skilled trades.

### **NATIONALIST LEGISLATION**

After the Nationalist government came to power in 1948, other Acts were placed on the statute book to bolster the position of the White worker. The Native Building Workers' Act of 1951 permitted the training and registration of Africans as skilled building workers, but for work in African areas only. Under this law, Africans are prohibited from working as odd-jobbers, in urban areas, while whites are prohibited from placing any contract with an African builder. In terms of the Native Building Workers' Act, Government Notices 2137 of 1956 and 1176 of 1956 prescribed a minimum wage of 7s. 8½d. per hour for White artisans and 2s. 8½d. an hour for African artisans. Although training and apprenticeship periods for African and White builders are not identical, African building artisans do the same sort of work as White artisans. A feature article on the building trade in the *Rand Daily Mail* of March 20th, 1965, reported: 'Once given the training, the standard of work of Africans is impressive and there is general agreement that they do their jobs as capably as anyone'. But they cannot get the same rate of pay.

In 1953 the Government passed the Native Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Act, completely outlawing strikes by Africans and establishing a cumbersome machinery for the settlement of disputes involving African workers. The Minister of Labour at the time, Mr. Schoeman, rejected the recommendation of his own Industrial Legislation Commission that African unions should be recognized subject to certain safeguards; Schoeman argued that if Africans were allowed to have trade unions, 'they can use their trade unions as a political weapon and they can create chaos in South Africa at any given time. I think



that we would probably be committing race suicide if we gave them that incentive'.

African trade unions were not outlawed by the Act, but they were not recognized and were therefore unable to use the machinery for collective bargaining provided by the Industrial Conciliation Act. In fact, Schoeman said he hoped that as a result of his Act all African unions would 'die a natural death'.

The Nationalist government's main instrument for entrenching White Supremacy in industry was the Industrial Conciliation Act of 1956, which provided for the creation of separate trade unions, or separate branches of existing trade unions, for White and Non-White workers. Where a 'mixed union' was divided into separate racial branches, the executive committee had to consist of Whites only. Section 77 of the Act introduced the principle of job reservation, and for this purpose the term 'employee' was deemed to include Africans, otherwise excluded from the provisions of the Act. The section gave the Minister of Labour the power to allocate jobs to workers of different racial groups—in other words to establish a racial quota system in industry. The Minister of Labour in 1955, Senator Jan de Klerk, said: 'In practice the Bill meant that the European's economic position in the industrial world could never be lowered by the Non-European. It was also a guarantee that he would never be ousted and that intrusion into his field of work could be prevented'.

Less use has been made of section 77 than might have been expected. Only seventeen determinations were issued up to the end of 1965, and according to a statement by the Minister of Labour on February 23rd, 1965, only two per cent of the economically active population has been affected by job reservation determinations. On another occasion he mentioned a total of 5,000 workers. Most of the determinations reserved categories of work for Whites, but some also reserved jobs for Asians and Coloureds, or fixed quotas as between Whites and Non-Whites. But to date not a single determination has been issued to protect the right of an African to perform any type of job, and the intention of job reservation is clearly in the first place to protect Whites against Non-White competition, and secondly to protect Asians and Coloureds from African competition. In Springs, one of the first determinations reserved for Whites was the driving of refuse and night soil removal vehicles, which, however sympathetic one might feel towards the White workers engaged in this task, one would normally not be inclined to regard as a traditional sphere of employment for Whites.

Nevertheless, the general effect of Nationalist legislation and administrative restrictions has been to reinforce White Supremacy in the



economic sphere. The economist F. P. Spooner calculated that between 1949 and 1954, the real income of Africans declined by 6.5 per cent while that of whites rose by 46 per cent. Official figures quoted in a memorandum submitted by the S.A. Congress of Trade Unions to the Wage Board in May 1959 showed that African wages, which had risen from 19.9 per cent of the European wage in 1935/36 to 25 per cent of the European wage in 1947/48, largely as a result of the greater absorption of Africans in industry during the war period, had declined to 19 per cent again by 1956/57. A similar rise and fall in the wages of Asians and Coloureds in relation to those of Whites was also registered during this period. (The difference between the 1936 ratios given by S.A.C.T.U. and those given by the Industrial Legislation Commission and quoted earlier in this article is probably due to the fact that the S.A.C.T.U. figures are based on Wage Board determinations, whereas the Industrial Legislation Commission's figures are based on an independent inquiry conducted by the University of Natal using other criteria. In any case, the Commission's figures show an even greater disparity between White and Black incomes than those of S.A.C.T.U.) According to Department of Labour figures, covering industries governed by wage determinations, throughout the period 1937-56, 82.6 per cent of skilled jobs were occupied by Whites. An article in *The Star* of February 3rd, 1966, quoted the Deputy Minister of Labour, as saying that 39 per cent of the economically active Africans in South Africa are employed as operatives or semi-skilled workers.

The Minister of Finance in February 1961 estimated that the average per capita income of Whites was £410 a year, of Asians £80 a year, of Coloureds £58 a year and of Africans £46 a year. Estimates of the proportion of the national income accruing to Africans are necessarily somewhat arbitrary, and vary from expert to expert, but the average figure quoted is 20 per cent. It can be seen then that the overall position has not changed much since 1936. In fact, the ability of the Africans to restore their position after the deterioration in the immediate post-war period can be directly ascribed to the tremendous £1-a-day campaign launched by the Congress movement in the late fifties.

## **NEW TRENDS**

It must be emphasized at this stage that statistics issued by the South African government are so meagre that it is impossible to assess accurately developments which have been taking place in the country's economy. No study similar to that of the Industrial Legislation Commission of 1951 has ever been undertaken, and in most cases it is impossible to make direct comparisons between the position in 1936



and that in 1966. However, in recent years certain trends have manifested themselves which indicate that under the surface, and hidden by the statistics, changes in labour relationships are taking place which in time may force significant modifications in official government policy, or at any rate in its application.

The first point of note is that, despite all government attempts to halt the drift of Africans to the towns, the number of urban Africans increased from about 2,900,000 in 1948 to 4,400,000 in the first ten years of Nationalist rule, and is now in the region of 5,500,000. Not all these Africans can be regarded as permanently urbanized—many are still migratory labourers. Nevertheless, the trend is for the towns to continue to attract African labour from the reserves and the White farming areas, and for the proportion of permanently urbanized Africans to increase.

Figures issued in February 1966 by the Bureau of Statistics show that the economic interdependence of all races in South Africa becomes more marked year by year. In the three years up to October 1965 the number of Non-Whites—mostly Africans—employed in mining, manufacturing, construction, transport, communications and public authorities, increased by more than 200,000 to 1,546,000. In the same period the number of Whites increased by only 36,000 to 483,000, making a total of 2,029,000 people employed in the six categories. The manufacturing industry employed 933,000 people, 699,000 of them Non-Whites. The figures for mining were 575,000 Non-Whites out of a total of 641,000; for construction 149,000 Non-Whites out of a total of 186,000; and for the railways 110,000 Non-Whites out of a total of 225,000.

In a policy statement in the House of Assembly on February 5th, 1965, Dr. Verwoerd maintained that there was no danger to the White man's position if the number of Africans in White areas increased for the time being. And subsequently on April 7th, he added: 'We have an economic and social structure here which we cannot remedy in a few years. . . .' As the 'homelands' and border areas were developed and mechanization and automation introduced in the White areas, the flow of Africans to the White areas would gradually be reversed. 'The turning point would come in 1978' (a figure that had been worked out by demography) . . . 'By the year 2,000 we would probably again reach the stage when the number of Bantu in the White area of the country would be equal to the figures for 1950'. In the ensuing debate, the Nationalist M.P., Froneman, said that the Africans 'are only supplying a commodity, the commodity of labour. . . . It is labour we are importing, and not labourers as individuals. . . . Numbers make no difference'. The Deputy Minister of Bantu Administration added that



in the White areas Africans would not be able to develop economically above a certain level. The bar was elastic, but would not be moved all the way up to the top.

The theories of the government Ministers ignore two factors. First, the gap between the White and Non-White populations in South Africa is widening at an increasing rate. According to figures issued by the Bureau of Statistics in September 1965, in the previous five years the African population increased by 1,235,000—six times the increase in the number of Whites. The total all-race population of South Africa had increased by 1,830,000 to 17,832,000 since the 1960 census—the Whites increasing by 6 per cent, the Africans by 11 per cent, the Asians by 9 per cent and the Coloureds by 17 per cent. As the African population increases, the pressure on traditional spheres of employment is likely to increase.

### **'BORDER INDUSTRIES'**

The Nationalist government expresses the conviction that the development of border industries will enable the growing African population to be absorbed. But the figures are not encouraging. The managing director of the Industrial Development Corporation, Mr. G. S. J. Kuschke, told an audience in England in February 1966 that in the last five years ninety-one new factories had been established in border areas and fifty-two old ones had moved there. A total of £90 million had been invested in border development and the new factories alone provided permanent employment for 41,000 non-Whites.

These figures show that the number of jobs created is not keeping pace with the natural increase of the African and Non-White population, so that pressure on the White urban areas must continue. Secondly, the description of 'border areas' is misleading. Many of the border areas are on the fringes of White towns like Pretoria and Durban, and the industries created there are not really 'homeland' industries at all, but industries employing Africans formerly from 'White' urban areas at rates of pay lower than those laid down by industrial agreements operating in the 'White' urban areas.

Secondly, the Nationalist 'border industry' theory ignores the existing demands of established industry, where the bulk of available capital is invested and the majority of the labour force is employed. According to an address in March 1965, by Dr. P. J. Riekert, Deputy Economic Adviser to the Prime Minister and Deputy Secretary of Planning, it was estimated that during each year in the period 1961 to 1963 inclusive an average of 182,000 new posts were created and filled throughout the economy. That was 54,000 persons per year in



excess of the 128,000 annual new entrants of all races to the labour market during these years (including immigrants). By far the greater proportion of the new posts had been manned by Non-Whites.

Dr. Riekert said Non-White workers were not only required in greater numbers, but the demand was becoming more sophisticated. Unskilled and semi-skilled qualifications were no longer sufficient to satisfy the labour market. Dr. Riekert discussed the ways in which Non-Whites could be enabled 'within the framework of Government policy to reach the executive level and even the entrepreneurial class'.

### **SKILLED LABOUR BOTTLENECK**

The shortage of skilled workers is already hamstringing the economy. In his summary of the Government's development programme for the 1965-1970 period released in January 1966, the Minister of Planning, Mr. Haak, stressed that White labour will be even scarcer in 1970 than it was in 1964. The target growth rate of the economy had had to be scaled down from 5.9 per cent per annum to 5.4 per cent per annum because of (a) the shortage of capital, and (b) the skilled labour bottleneck. Unemployed and unclassified persons, whether or not officially registered, would decrease from an estimated 285,000 (of a total economically active population of 6,210,500) in 1964 to 175,100 (of a total economically active population of 7,077,000) in 1970.

Just how serious the shortage of skilled labour is was revealed by the S.A. Reserve Bank in its annual economic report for the year ended June 30th, 1964. It drew attention to the 'insufficient supply of certain classes of skilled manpower' and added:

Such shortages were evident, for example, in the building, iron and steel, general engineering, and motor industries, and these bottle-necks not only prevented total production and income from increasing even more rapidly than they actually did, but, as the year progressed, also give rise to a certain amount of inflationary pressure in the branches of industry concerned.

The Deputy Minister of Labour, addressing the Institute of Personnel Managers in October 1964, revealed that a survey conducted in April 1963 had shown a shortage of 28,662 White workers in all sectors of the economy, which meant 2.6 per cent of available jobs were unfilled. Recent surveys, he said, had shown that the shortages had become more severe. A poll conducted by the Transvaal Chamber of Industries throughout South Africa showed an expected shortfall of 50,000 workers, mostly skilled and semi-skilled, in the manufacturing, engineering and building industries early in 1965.

In April 1964 the Government, because of the shortage of skilled workers, had to ask local authorities to curtail their capital works



programme. Other industries were similarly affected. Mr. H. F. Oppenheimer, chairman of African Explosives and Chemical Industries, said in the same month that his company had been considering expansion projects costing £45 million. 'Some of these projects will quite certainly have to be dropped or postponed because there will not be the men available to carry them out'. Some collieries in Natal had to close down sections because of a shortage of fitters and turners. Similar reports were received from all over the country. The shortage of labour led to demand for increased wages from the skilled workers, thus increasing production costs and adding to the growing inflationary spiral. In the building industry production costs rose by more than 25 per cent between 1963 and 1965.

Ultimately the economy of the country reached a crisis. Between 1961 and 1964 gross domestic expenditure increased at the rate of 11.5 per cent a year, while the gross domestic product increased by only 9.7 per cent a year in monetary terms. A deterioration in the balance of payments resulted. A surplus of R.200 million in 1961 turned into a deficit of R.56 million in 1964 and an estimated deficit of R.360 million in 1965. This deficit could not be offset by a net import of capital, and gold and foreign exchange reserves declined from a peak of R.583 million in January 1964 to R.344 million in June 1965. This led to the Government introduction of credit squeeze and the slowing down of consumption and development, aggravated by the most severe drought of the century and uncertainty of exports to South Africa's biggest market—Rhodesia.

### **PRESSURE AGAINST COLOUR BAR**

Clearly in this context the pressure for a revision of the Government's job reservation policy tended to grow. The employers had always been opposed to it, from the time of the 1922 strike onwards. Free mobility of labour and the abolition of the colour bar meant for them the opportunity to employ Africans at wages lower than those paid to the Whites. The more enlightened employers also appreciated that it was only through the absorption of Africans in industry and the raising of the general standard of living that an internal market could be created capable of providing an outlet for the major portion of South African production. The employers' associations had presented evidence to the Industrial Legislation Commission opposing race separation and job reservation, and they continued to press for a revision of the law in this respect in the ensuing years. As recently as October 29th, 1965, the *Rand Daily Mail* reported that an eight-point programme for easing labour shortages had been sent to the Minister



of Labour by the Federated Chamber of Industries. Main stress of the programme was on the removal of legal restrictions on the training of Non-Whites for more skilled work. The minority European racial group, the memorandum said, was no longer of sufficient numerical strength to provide the manpower to fill all the avenues of employment which up to the present had been regarded as the domain of Europeans only.

On June 5th, 1965, Mr. S. G. Unite, President of the Transvaal Chamber of Industries, said the Government should allow Non-Whites to be trained for skilled work in industry if it wanted the country's economy to grow at the rate planned.

On October 19th, 1965, the Association of Chambers of Commerce at its annual congress in Margate adopted a document calling, amongst other things, for greater Non-White participation in South Africa's skilled and semi-skilled labour forces. The document said the natural increase in the White labour force, even if reinforced by a high rate of immigration, was not likely to supply the necessary labour resources. A similar view has even been expressed by the Afrikaanse Sakekamer.

The attitude of the Government towards the problem of training Non-Whites for skilled and semi-skilled jobs has been ambivalent, to say the least. On the one hand, Government spokesmen have insisted that the traditional policy of job reservation would have to be maintained in order to guarantee the supremacy of the White worker. Job reservation, said the Deputy Minister of Labour, Mr. Viljoen, in Johannesburg on October 6th, 1965, had become a cornerstone of industrial life and had resulted in the unparalleled industrial peace enjoyed by South Africa for the past seventeen years (!).

To suggest that the present White manpower shortage can be overcome by training more Blacks to enter the up to now White employment spheres may be theoretically correct, but that is definitely all there is to be said for it. Knowing my people as I do, I can state quite categorically that such a development will destroy all goodwill which has been built up with care so far towards the Non-Whites in this country.

In November 1965, the Minister of Bantu Education, Mr. Maree, said the Government would resist the pressure of the private sector for promotion of Non-White labour. The Government was not prepared to deviate from its policy of job reservation as a permanent measure. It would rather put a brake by means of credit checks on the rapid development of the country. (*Star*, November 5th, 1965.)

Some of the wilder Nationalists have seen the 'threat' of Non-White labour so clearly that they have been frightened out of their wits. Dr. Piet Koornhof, M.P., former secretary of the Broederbond, told members of the Transvaal Jeugbond at Loskop last September that



the Afrikaaner nation had exchanged one foreign enslavement, that of Britain, for another much more dangerous, that of Black labour. The choice before the present generation was clear, said Dr. Koornhof: the abandoning of a comfortable life based on the foreign labour of the Black man or perishing as a White nation. 'The present order of a White aristocracy on top and a Black proletariat below cannot be maintained in the modern world'. But instead of drawing the rational conclusion from his analysis, Dr. Koornhof takes refuge in panic action. ' "Work yourself" must be the motto in every house. Industries in White areas must be founded on mechanization and not on Black labour'. Of the same order of panic is the now famous appeal of the Deputy Minister of Bantu Administration, Mr. Botha, to each 'capable' White couple in South Africa to celebrate the Republic Festival in 1966 by having a baby.

### **FACING THE FACTS**

On the other hand, while continuing bravely to proclaim the need for job reservation, the Government has been compelled to face the facts of the South African situation. Despite everything the Government could do, the proportion of Non-Whites to Whites was increasing in every branch of industry, including mining and the Government service. There simply were not sufficient Whites available for all the skilled jobs vacant. The Minister of Labour had issued seventeen job reservation determinations up to the end of 1965, but had been compelled to grant hundreds of exemptions to enable employers to keep in business. In the Transvaal clothing industry, employing 25,000 workers, Government regulations laid down that 25 per cent of the labour force should be White, but the figures showed that the proportion of White skilled labour in the industry had dropped from 20 per cent in 1960 to 12 per cent at the end of 1965, while the African labour force had increased in the same period from 43 per cent to more than 50 per cent. This latter case had so alarmed the Government that it warned the trade union that the entire industry would be declared a border industry and forced out of the White urban areas unless the situation improved.

On January 4th, 1966, the *Rand Daily Mail* reported that industrialists had been compelled to pay out thousands of rands over the past few months for allowing their workers—mainly Africans—to do work normally reserved for Whites. In some cases Africans had been doing 'more advanced' work for several years. Employers in such cases have been 'assessed' by Industrial Council inspectors and 'fined'. One Reef firm had been assessed for R.15,000 alone. An Industrial Council spokesman described the situation as 'explosive'.



The Government went even further than this. It sanctioned the ill-fated experiment conducted in 1965 on twelve mines in the Transvaal and Free State where, by agreement between the management and the union executive, Africans were promoted to more highly skilled jobs while the Whites were 'compensated' by being upgraded to the status of salaried members of staff, instead of daily paid workers, getting increased pay, better pensions and leave privileges.

Under the scheme a newly appointed White worker would earn R.220 instead of R.144.56 a month in basic pay, and a White general miner with twenty years' service would earn R.241.40 instead of R.162.76. An African 'competent non-scheduled person' would earn an extra 50 cents a shift on average.

The experiment had been started because the Chamber of Mines reported a shortage of 2,000 White workers on the Transvaal and Free State mines and had found it impossible to recruit adequate numbers of suitable men either in South Africa or overseas. As a result of the experiment, the Chamber reported a noteworthy decrease in accidents, a saving of manpower and an increase in productivity. The Minister declared that the outcome of the experiment was 'encouraging'. Both African and White workers on the mines participating in the experiment were satisfied.

### **WHITE MINERS REBEL**

But the White miners as a whole regarded the experiment as a threat. The Nationalist front-bencher (and former Labourite) M. J. van den Berg denounced it as a violation of job reservation and said it would permanently upset the Black-White ratio on the mines. An action committee of rebel miners was set up under the leadership of Pretoria advocate Dr. Ras Beyers who told his White audiences: 'The kaffirs are pushing you out. How would the cabinet feel if you appointed a fat, black semi-savage as deputy prime minister just because it would cost the state less?' (*The Economist*, August, 14th 1965.) It was the old, old story all over again.

Soon the unbridled racist agitation had swept the whole White mining force into an uproar and the Government was forced to back down. The experiment was abandoned, the Chamber of Mines declaring that some of the less productive mines would have to close down as a direct consequence.

However, this was not the end of the story. On the one hand, the rebel miners have been trying ever since to remove the union leadership, whom they regard as betrayers of White supremacy. Up to the time of writing, the rebels' call for new elections to enable a new



leadership of the union to be elected has been successfully sidetracked; but the agitation continues.

On the other hand, attempts on the part of the Government and the Chamber of Mines to bring about a change have not ceased. On February 7th, 1966, the *Rand Daily Mail* reported: 'The Government is negotiating with the Mineworkers' Union to relax regulations and so enable Non-Whites to take over some lower-paid White jobs in gold mines'. Whether there is a factual basis for this report, or whether it is a kite flown by the mining bosses to see whether the time is suitable for a renewal of their offensive is not clear. The Minister of Mines, Mr. Haak, was 'not available for comment'. But that something is still brewing on the mines was confirmed by another report in the *Rand Daily Mail* on February 24th, 1966: 'The Free State rebel miners last night rejected a scheme put forward by their former leader, Mr. Abraham "At" van Wijk, aimed at saving thousands of man hours a day. The scheme was an alternative to the experiment tried in some gold mines last year which caused the breakaway of the rebels from the Mineworkers' Union'.

That the powers that be (whoever they are) had in a few months converted one of the rebel leaders to their own way of thinking demonstrates the persistence with which they are pushing for a revision of the pattern of labour relations on the mines.

Nor is this pressure confined to the mines. At the very time that the mine dispute was flaring into the open, the South African Iron and Steel Corporation (I.S.C.O.R.) was telling its workers that it would agree to their demands for a wage increase provided that job reservation be suspended in certain spheres and certain jobs at the bottom of the White labour scale be done by Non-Whites. On July 6th, 1965, the *Rand Daily Mail* reported that the seven engineering unions involved in the negotiations 'did not reject completely the possibility that a labour shortage might justify the advancement of Non-Whites to more skilled work. But it was also made clear that this must not be imposed as a condition for the settlement of the new agreement'. The unions put forward a compromise proposal and negotiations continued.

On October 28th, 1965, the *Rand Daily Mail* reported: 'Reliable sources in the Durban Municipal Employees' Society revealed yesterday that the training and employment of Non-White electrical artisans had been accepted in principle by the society—with certain restrictions . . . that Non-White electrical workers be restricted to fitting and wiring'.

### **EVEN IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE**

The Government was also compelled to upgrade Non-Whites in its own service. Figures issued by the Bureau of Statistics show that in



1950 there were four Whites to one Non-White in the Post Office. By 1965 the proportion had dropped to three to one, and Africans had been advanced to the point where they were delivering mail. Reason—staff shortages were so severe that in some areas mail was being delivered only once a week.

In the past few years an estimated 10,000 Non-Whites have taken over White jobs on the state-owned railways. Non-Whites have been appointed as rivet heaters, coach washers, firemen, flagmen, ticket examiners and chefs on dining cars. In the House of Assembly on March 10th, 1965, the Minister of Railways, Mr. Schoeman, said he was even prepared to allow the use of Africans as shunters if the railway personnel associations agreed—at which there was ‘laughter in the House’.

The House laughed too soon. At the congress of the Spoorbond\* in September 1965, the acting general manager of Railways, Mr. J. A. Kruger, said: ‘Some kinds of railway work are no longer acceptable to our people, and people even speak of kaffir work’. This was work formerly done by Whites under the Government’s ‘civilized labour policy’. Now this work is done by Non-Whites—but at ‘uncivilized’ rates of pay.

The White railway artisans’ association have reached agreement with the Minister of Transport to ‘stretch’ the rules governing the use of Non-Whites in White jobs. The president of the Railway Artisans’ Staff Association, Mr. J. H. Leibenberg, was quoted in October 1965, as saying the agreement came after a realistic assessment of the acute shortage of White labour. ‘We, as artisans, recognize that the use of a certain proportion of Non-Whites in graded jobs under existing conditions is unavoidable’.

Even the secretary of the Spoorbond told a *Daily Mail* reporter in March 1965:

The reservoir of White labour is hopeless because the cream has been skimmed off. . . . We accept that the reservoir can no longer serve the future needs of the Railways. We accept also that Non-White labour is the answer. We are quite prepared to have the railworker jobs go to Non-Whites, with Whites moving into higher categories.

In January 1966 it was announced that the Minister of Transport and the Artisan Staff Association had worked out an ‘equitable basis’ for remunerating the Non-Whites employed in White jobs. The Non-Whites are to be paid not less than 40 per cent of the minimum paid to White workers for similar work. The Johannesburg *Star*, reporting

---

\* Railway Workers’ Union.

the agreement on January 4th, said that in some cases Non-Whites were already receiving up to 52 per cent of White wages.

In the House of Assembly on February 1st, 1966, the Minister of Transport, Mr. Schoeman, giving details of the agreement between the Administration and the Railway Staff Association, said two Coloured, fifty Indian and 634 African employees were performing work formerly reserved for Whites. The duties appertained to the following grades: stoker and deckhand on tugs and dredgers, flagman, lampman, carriage and wagon repairer, class 3; trade hand (unclassified); striker, shed attendant, crossing attendant and messenger. If the number of jobs taken over by Non-Whites in terms of the Minister's reply seems small compared with the press estimates, this may merely be due to the fact that the majority of other jobs taken over were never formally reserved for Whites although traditionally performed by them.

Die-hard trade unionists were alarmed by this agreement. The S.A. Engine Drivers' and Firemen's Association and the S.A. Reduction Workers' Association voiced fears that White workers would be undercut. The joint official journal of the unions said: 'Bitter experience has taught us that a work category ceded can never be ceded to a Non-White only temporarily'. They accused the employers of spreading the notion that there was a shortage of skilled workers purely in order to get labour as cheaply as possible by using Non-Whites.

Questioned about Government policy in this regard, a Department of Labour official said the Department's policy of equal pay for equal work had not changed. The Department was bound by wage-fixing legislation which did not discriminate on race lines and it would never agree to an arrangement of the sort which had been reached on the Railways. 'The Department of Labour has nothing to do with the Railways Administration whatsoever. They have their own rules'. (*Star*, January 10th, 1966.)

Only a few weeks later, however, the Minister of Labour, Mr. Trollip, sanctioned the publication of a new agreement for the Transvaal building industry in terms of which job reservation was once again relaxed and Africans were to be allowed to do all categories of work except those specifically reserved in the agreement for artisans. A whole range of new jobs in the industry is now open to Africans, who will be known as 'operators' and paid up to 60 per cent of an artisan's salary. Weekly wages for these workers are expected to range between R.20 and R.30—or about R.100 a month. (*Rand Daily Mail*, February 3rd, 1966.)

Commenting on the agreement, the outgoing president of the Witwatersrand Master Builders' Association, Mr. W. M. Parkinson, said



it was all very well for the government to sanction the use of African labour in more skilled work, but the industry was faced with a critical shortage of both skilled and unskilled workers, and the government's migratory labour policy made it difficult to see where the additional labour was to come from. The government was justifying its new policy to its followers by claiming it would not mean more Africans in towns but only more productive use of those already there. Mr. Parkinson stressed the industry had to have more African workers to ease the strain on the White workers, and this would inevitably mean more Africans in the towns.

### **CRISIS IN WHITE UNIONS**

If, on the one hand, the Nationalist government is having difficulty reconciling its apartheid policies with the economic needs of the country, on the other hand, the trade union movement is also going through a crisis. The skilled aristocracy among the White workers still stand for no concessions to the Africans and the total maintenance of job reservation. The more hypocritical and opportunist, such as the leadership of the Trade Union Council of South Africa, on the one hand attack job reservation as 'harmful to both White and Black workers' (T.U.C. President Murray at T.U.C.S.A.'s annual conference in March 1965) and on the other, demand the maintenance of the policy of 'the rate for the job', which over the years has successfully prevented the African worker from advancing in industry.

'There should be equal pay for equal work', said Mr. Murray. 'This was not only morally justifiable for the Non-White worker but was also the only effective means of protecting the White workers' standard of living against employers willing to give work to Non-Whites at lower rates of pay'.

Mr. Murray wanted recognition of African unions and effective representation of African workers in wage negotiations if the registered trade union movement 'is not to be bled to death'.

During the last two years the T.U.C. has returned again and again to this theme. On December 29th, 1965, T.U.C.S.A. issued a strong call to 'unity' in the White trade union movement. Unless the workers stood together, said T.U.C.S.A., many were going to be priced out of the labour market. South African industries were converting to advanced mechanisation. The consequent fragmentation of skilled jobs had reached the point where untrained operators were taking over at rates much lower than those acceptable to skilled men. The call was seen as a direct appeal to the right-wing Confederation of Labour and its 90,000 members to drop past differences and allow the country's White

workers to speak with one voice. 'The workers can no longer afford the luxury of ideological dissension', said the T.U.C.

It is as well to remember that the issue on which the unions of the Confederation broke from the T.U.C. in the 1950s was the Nationalist Government's policy of trade union apartheid and no recognition of African unions. This the T.U.C. now calls 'ideological dissension' as though it were of no real significance. But once again the opportunism of the T.U.C. leadership and its abandonment of the principle of true workers' unity is failing to achieve its purpose.

On the one hand, the failure of the T.U.C. to tackle the problems of the African workers is leading in turn to inability to win their support—a failure emphasized by the dissolution of the T.U.C.-affiliated Federation of African Trade Unions of South Africa (FOFATUSA) in January 1966.

On the other hand, the lip-service paid by the T.U.C. to the concept of multi-racialism is antagonizing the right-wing White workers. In April 1966 the largest single member union of the T.U.C. with 20,000 members, the Amalgamated Engineering Union, decided to disaffiliate because it disagreed with the T.U.C.'s colour policy. Earlier, one of the A.E.U. members who had taken a leading part in the disaffiliation campaign was reported as saying the A.E.U. should be a non-aligned union, without political bias for or against the government. (*Sunday Times*, February 27th, 1966.)

Despite this blow, the T.U.C. at its annual conference in Durban in May 1966 reaffirmed its traditional policy and a motion that Africans be considered as 'employees' under the Industrial Conciliation Act and be allowed to join registered trade unions was adopted unanimously. As far as the right-wing White workers are concerned, however, the unanimity must be regarded as existing on paper only. Delegates of the Typographical Workers' Union, with 16,000 members, initiated a debate, which was held in secret, that the T.U.C. constitution be amended so as to put an end to its multi-racial character. One or two other unions—notably the Iron Moulders—supported them, but the conference took no vote on the matter, which was referred to the incoming executive for consideration.

And the representatives of the Electrical Workers' Union showed that it was quite possible to vote for 'the rate for the job' while at the same time being bitterly opposed to African advancement. They expressed their determination to fight 'tooth and nail' against the 'racial fragmentation' of their industry, and told the conference that they had declared a dispute in their industry rather than agree to employer demands that because of the shortage of labour Africans



be allowed to take on more skilled work previously restricted to White artisans.

The Electrical Workers said the policy of advancing Africans was threatening White workers in other industries as well, and moved a resolution deploring the fact that the Government was increasingly granting exemptions from its job reservation proclamations in order to allow Non-Whites to do skilled work at lower rates of pay.

The resolution was referred to the incoming executive for consideration, but it seems clear that there will be further resignations if T.U.C.S.A. does nothing to oppose further encroachment of Non-Whites into the sphere of skilled work. On the other hand, once it abandons its multi-racialism, the main reason for its existence will have disappeared.

### **GREATER EXPLOITATION**

Meanwhile, what of the Non-White workers? It is clear that the break-down of old labour patterns is enabling a section of them to advance up the economic ladder. How many and how far they have been able to rise is by no means clear, since no adequate survey has been made and no comprehensive statistics are available. Mr. Harry Goldberg, chairman of the Bantu Wages and Productivity Association, told the *Sunday Times* (March 28th, 1965):

From April to November last year the average wage (of Africans in urban industry) rose from R.37.9 to R.39.4 per month, at a rate of about 6½ per cent a year. The retail price index was rising at about 4 per cent a year, so real wages were advancing at the rate of 2½ per cent a year. The comparable figures for the five years from 1959 to 1963 showed an average increase of 6 per cent a year in money wages and 4 per cent in real wages.

A calculation by the Standard Bank, reported in the 1964 *Survey of Race Relations* gives the Non-White per capita income in various years at constant prices adjusted to 1953 values as:

				Rand	Percentage increase over previous year
1950	..	..	..	56.35	
1960	..	..	..	54.06	
1961	..	..	..	55.26	2.2
1962	..	..	..	56.72	2.6
1963	..	..	..	59.91	5.6

These two sets of figures are not strictly comparable. The first is for the wages of urban African workers only; the second is the per capita income for all Non-Whites in all occupations. But both sets of figures indicate an extremely low standard of living, with advancement so far having brought only minimal benefits to a handful. Both sets of figures also indicate that Non-White living standards are far lower

than indicated by the Minister of Finance in his 1961 assessment, quoted in the earlier portion of this article.

**Far too many workers—thought to be more than 45 per cent—are being paid below a poverty datum line of R.48 per month, said Mr. Goldberg in the interview already quoted. Many are living below the ‘dire poverty line’ of R.30 per month.**

On the other hand, the advancement of the African worker in urban industry has been of definite benefit to the bosses. Mr. Goldberg said: ‘The wage increases paid to Bantu industrial workers since 1938 have been accompanied by a greater than equivalent increase in productivity. And a director of the Bantu Wages and Productivity Association, Mr. Raymond Silberbauer, added: ‘The very partial use of our Bantu labour force offers the most startling possibility for productivity increase. Some firms recorded a 100 per cent increase in productivity, and even beyond this to amounts as high as 200 and even 300 per cent.’

Official statistics on productivity in secondary industry in the same *Sunday Times* article show that, taking the 1957 index as 100, productivity per head rose to 110 in 1959, 125½ in 1961 and 140 in 1962. ‘Later figures are not available, but industrialists believe they will have soared further’.

More Africans are producing more goods and more profits for the bosses, but getting less pay in proportion—this is the brutal truth of the so-called ‘relaxation of job reservation’ which has been taking place in South Africa. Latest Bureau of Statistics figures for employment in industry for the period 1962-63 show that total White pay increased by 10.6 per cent and total African pay by 11.7 per cent over the previous year, to R.468 million and R.195 million respectively. *But in the same period the profit rate almost doubled to R.353 million.*

Job reservation or no job reservation, under the Nationalist Government the exploitation of Non-White labour is being steadily intensified. This is one of the gravest problems confronting the trade union and national liberation movements, and demands a speedy answer.



# SHOWDOWN IN KENYA

---

A. Lerumo

---

THE MORE FOREIGN capital is invested in a colony, and the bigger the population of privileged settlers, the more protracted, exacting and bitter will the struggle be to wrest its right to freedom and independence. Algerian independence cost seven years warfare and a million dead. The Congo has been and still is being crucified and turned into a battlefield of imperialist powers for control of its mineral treasures. The greatest struggles of all are still to come in Southern Africa.

Kenya's path to independence, formally proclaimed on December 12th, 1963, has been bloody and tortuous, and for the very same reasons. Much sterile argument has taken place about the relative effectiveness of 'violent' or 'non-violent' methods for winning colonial freedom. Certainly—at a particular period and regarding particular areas—instalments of independence have been won from the British or the French around the conference table. Some people therefore claim that negotiations with the imperialists is the best or the only way to secure independence. They forget that success in those negotiations was only possible because of bitter struggles, mass demonstrations, strikes, armed combat and other forms, lasting over very many years, and covering vast areas of the earth's surface. As the *African Communist* pointed out (No. 25, 1966):

To those Africans who may ask: what has this far-away country of Vietnam got to do with us? We answer—these same Vietnamese peasants, ill-clad and hungry, bought with their lives the independence which so many of our African countries enjoy today.

Kenya independence gave the outward appearance of being the product of protracted and endlessly complicated negotiations between the British Colonial Office and rival groups of Kenya politicians and settlers at Lancaster House, during the late fifties and early sixties. But in fact Kenya independence was bought in bitter struggles of

the workers and peasants lasting over very many years. Not least of these were the protracted guerilla struggles of the early fifties—the so-called ‘Mau Mau’ emergency, in which thousands of African patriots lost their lives and the Kikuyu people in particular were rounded up en masse, dispossessed of their land, and herded into concentration camps (the so-called Emergency villages).

Of this period, Mr. Tony Hughes writes:

Certainly all indications suggest that violence had the support of an overwhelming majority of the Kikuyu and of many other Africans. And, equally, there seems little doubt that violence did much to accomplish the aims of African nationalism in Kenya.—*East Africa: The Search for Unity*.

Kenya was designed by British imperialism to become a second South Africa or Rhodesia. The ‘Highlands’ were alienated from African ownership for exclusively ‘White’ occupation; apartheid and pass-laws prevailed everywhere; various ‘legislative councils’ were set up from time to time in which White settlers dominated. For example, in 1948 the Legislative Council was composed of sixteen British civil servants, eleven elected Europeans, five elected Indians, one elected Arab and four Africans not elected but appointed by the Governor. (By 1959, under the so-called Lennox-Boyd constitution, Africans were allowed to elect fourteen out of ninety-two members. But the franchise was restricted to Africans who had been screened as ‘loyal’.)

But this diabolical plan to turn Kenya into yet another fortress of White colonialism on the continent of Africa failed. The White settlers were not numerous enough to impose a Verwoerd or Smith type regime; they could not rely on economic and military aid from a bordering state. Britain was not prepared or able to sustain them indefinitely in power by force of arms. The war of liberation of 1952-55 had cost the imperialists over £50 million; news of the savage atrocities perpetrated by British forces and authorities had spread abroad and led to storms of protest in Britain itself. Although it failed in its direct objective, therefore, the armed struggle of this period was decisive in proving to the British that continued White settler rule in Kenya was untenable as a policy. They therefore ‘abandoned’ the settlers (many of whom proved their much-vaunted patriotism, by demanding extravagantly large money ‘compensation’ and clearing out of the country they could no longer dominate).

## **FORGOTTEN MEN**

Thus, although the terms of independence were negotiated in the main by political leaders who had taken no part in the uprising, and although those leaders subsequently took their places in the govern-



ment and the leadership of the new Kenya, the foundations of victory were laid by the forest fighters, the detained and victimized; the forgotten men of Kenya today.

Indeed, the whole period of the 'Emergency' has been almost deliberately 'forgotten'; there is a marked tendency not only to avoid or postpone any evaluation of its historic significance, but even to 'bury' any thought or mention of this anguished decade of Kenya's history.

It is not difficult to understand why this should be so. Throughout their period of rule, and more than ever during the settler-fanned hysteria which prevailed during the uprising, the rulers intensified to the utmost the exploitation of every division among the population. They not only exploited inter-racial and inter-tribal differences; their system of loyalty oaths and purges succeeded in creating deep cleavages between those who compromised and those who fought to the bitter end.

To overcome this legacy of bitterness it was important that independent Kenya should start with a clean slate; without the passions provoked and aroused by the alien occupation regime. It says much for the militants that they were big enough to understand this key essential.

K.A.N.U. adopted the slogan '*Harambee*'—let's all pull together. The symbolic personality of Jomo Kenyatta—the revered veteran of the liberation struggle who had spent years in detention for alleged participation (always denied by him) in instigating the rebellion—was powerful enough to unite discordant personalities, and to prevent negative recriminations about the past.

Anyone who was prepared to work for the building of a united Kenya—irrespective of whether he had collaborated in the past with the imperialists, or even whether he had right up till independence played their game of tribalism—was welcomed to play a part in the Kenya African National Union and in public affairs.

No doubt this generous, patriotic gesture by the revolutionaries and African patriots was correct and fully justified. The great wave of national sentiment that carried K.A.N.U. into power spelt defeat for tribalism. Even those compromising politicians who, in the past, had played an opportunist role, seeking personal advancement and accepting bribes from the imperialists, realized that they could not swim against the stream and hastily jumped aboard the K.A.N.U. bandwagon. Had all of them been actuated by a sincere desire to establish Kenya's independence firmly, raise the standards of the masses, and fight imperialism, then there would be no need to hark back to the past, but to concentrate on the present and the future,

in the spirit of '*Harambee*'. And to be just one must say that some were sincere. Others were not. They had for too long been in the service of British, American and other imperialists. Entering K.A.N.U. they did so not in order to further the cause of independence, anti-colonialism and socialism, but in order to advance their personal interests, to undermine K.A.N.U. from within and transform it into the instrument of Kenya's subordination to neo-colonialism.

K.A.N.U. represented a coalition, a coming together of various class forces in Kenya, with different views and ideologies. The same can be said of most of the national liberation organizations that fought for independence in Africa and subsequently formed single-party governments. But the 'coalition' represented by K.A.N.U. differed in important respects from most others. Even after independence, for example, K.A.D.U. (Kenya African Democratic Union) was playing the game of imperialism and the White settlers, trying to delay independence and emasculate it by insisting on a tribalistic federation, on Nigerian lines, which would have made the country an easier prey to neo-colonialism. Others, like Mr. Tom Mboya, favourite of the American State Department-dominated I.C.F.T.U., were career politicians who were determined to steer the country away from the attraction of radical socialist ideas which were popular among the masses and answered the needs of the new Kenya. Many people were in K.A.N.U. to feather their own nests and to keep the country firmly within the 'Western' sphere of influence.

When K.A.D.U. finally in December 1964 merged with K.A.N.U. on its own terms, it was not in order to further K.A.N.U. principles of independence and socialism, but in order to strengthen the right-wing opportunist trend. This was not a step towards national unity, but as events have shown, a move to capture control over K.A.N.U. and thus profoundly to split the nation.

## **ANTI-COMMUNISM**

The 'Westerners' within K.A.N.U. and their imperialist advisers were astute enough to recognize that outright anti-socialist policies had no chance of success among the workers and peasants. They therefore decided on a line of policy which they have followed consistently ever since—to present a policy under the guise of 'African Socialism' which, in fact, would be nothing but a plan of capitalist development.

The beginnings of this strategy were to be discerned in the K.A.N.U. election manifesto issued on the eve of independence. Side by side with much talk of socialism, and promises that 'the agrarian revolution will be accelerated'; 'the problem of the unemployed landless will be



vigorously tackled', there were ominous anti-Communist, pro-capitalist undertones. 'We must avoid any fixation or obsession about imperialism', the voters were told. They were warned that colonialism 'can come from communist as well as capitalist sources', though this nonsensical statement was not and could not be backed up with any supporting facts whatever. Workers were warned that 'the Marxist theory of class warfare has no relevance to Kenya's situation'.

This line of extremely misleading thought was developed by Mr. Mboya in his writings on 'African Socialism' (analysed in the *African Communist*, July-September 1963) and carried further in the government paper on the same theme—drawn up by an American 'expert' in Mboya's Economic Planning Ministry—which was hurriedly pushed through the Cabinet and Parliament, and ruthlessly exposed by Sol Dubula (*African Communist*, Third Quarter 1965).

Running through these documents was an attempt to belittle Marxism as incorrect and obsolete, and to prettify modern capitalism. Their practical proposals were all designed to encourage capitalism in industry, commerce and agriculture, to favour private, as opposed to public, ownership of the means of production, and to placate imperialist opinion and investors.

Of course, like all K.A.N.U. documents, this government paper and the election manifesto had their positive sides as well. Many progressive steps were advocated—in sharp contrast with and even in contradiction to this capitalistic bias. These progressive features were a result of the presence of a powerful patriotic element within the K.A.N.U. leadership which remained true to the interests and socialist aspirations of the masses.

Disappointed in the failure of Jomo Kenyatta to check the steady drift to the right, K.A.N.U. militants rallied around the extremely popular and dynamic personality of the Vice-President, Jaramogi Oginga Odinga. He and his supporters and colleagues constituted a formidable barrier to the plans of the reactionaries and careerists, to make Kenya a secure base for capitalism and neo-colonialism in East Africa.

A furious and reckless anti-communist campaign was therefore launched, master-minded and financed by Western intelligence agencies, and aimed in the first place at Odinga and the men around him.

The ugliest incident in this campaign was the vile assassination in February 1965 of Pio Pinto, M.P. and journalist, the only Asian to have been detained during the Emergency, and able supporter of Odinga. The men who did this foul deed have never been brought to

justice, but it is clear that it was a political murder which admirably suited the purpose of the conspirators of the right.

The capitalist press in Kenya issued smear after smear against Odinga, Minister of Information Oneko, Kaggia and other stalwarts. A convoy of Uganda army trucks carrying arms was 'discovered' in Nyanza, Odinga's home territory—the press rushed in to insinuate that 'the Communists' were smuggling arms to Odinga, and smothered the truth: that the arms were part of a consignment to Gbenye's anti-Tshombe Congo guerillas. Who was responsible for diverting the trucks to Nyanza, and then ensuring that they were 'intercepted' has never been cleared up—though British and American intelligence was widely, and plausibly, held responsible.

The American C.I.A. was openly accused of being behind the circulation of mysterious leaflets purporting to come from Dar es Salaam and advocating 'revolution' in Kenya. But again the right-wing press used the occasion to smear Odinga and the militants in K.A.N.U.

Again, a year ago, wild and sensational 'leakages' and rumours accompanied the arrival of a shipload of Soviet arms in Mombasa. It was implied that the arms were intended for the Vice-President. Actually, the arms were a gift to Kenya from the Soviet Government which had been agreed and negotiated officially by the Kenya Government with Kenyatta's full approval, a year before. But the reactionary wing of K.A.N.U. precipitated a full-scale government and international crisis. The British and American Ambassadors were said to have threatened an end to all aid if the gifts were accepted.

Under pressure from the right-wing elements in K.A.N.U., the government decided to yield to this blackmail and send back the arms, on the pretext that they were 'obsolete and second-hand'. But Roger Milliss, Australian journalist who was working in Kenya at the time, declares that in actual fact

they consisted of the most modern and up-to-date weapons which would have made the Kenya Army one of the best-equipped in independent Southern Africa.—*Tribune*, May 4th, 1966.

### **MANOEUVRES WITHIN KANU**

Meanwhile, the intriguers continued their desperate manoeuvres within K.A.N.U.—in which straight argument was replaced by manipulations and corruption—to remove Mr. Odinga from the Vice-Presidency. They finally—despite his undeniable popularity in the Party and in the country—succeeded in doing so. This 'victory' for the right wing, with the apparent blessing of the President, finally precipitated the split which the militants had for so long been patriotically leaning



over backwards to avoid. It had become clear that with the machinery of K.A.N.U. firmly in the hands of the right-wing splitters and factionalists, there was no longer any prospect of maintaining K.A.N.U. as the instrument of achieving 'UJAMAA', justice and socialism, in Kenya. A new organization was established, ultimately called the Kenya People's Union, and Jaramogi Oginga Odinga was invited to head it as President. A large number of K.A.N.U. militants, including twenty-eight members of Parliament resigned from K.A.N.U.

The reaction of the right-wing K.A.N.U. leadership was to force through a Constitutional amendment declaring that any M.P. who crossed the floor to join another Party would automatically lose his seat. The 'rebel' M.P.s had to face by-elections in June. Odinga himself easily held his seat, but a number of his colleagues were defeated in elections in which ballot-rigging and other malpractices were alleged against the government.

### **KPU's POLICY**

In its press statement of May 19th, issued by its President, the K.P.U.—which for a long time the government refused to register as a party—strongly attacked the Constitution-rigging procedure of the K.A.N.U. government, which it warned was 'probably only the first change to suit the immediate objective of the clique of power-seekers who now control the government'.

Increasing restrictions on individual freedom and on the constitutional right to form political associations are also becoming apparent. Intimidation and terror are being used to silence people who disagree with the government and want to speak their minds. A much more insidious but dangerous form of infringement of constitutional rights is being practised through administrative means—all the familiar practices of the former colonial regime.

For the first time in Kenya, the much-peddled slogan of 'African Socialism' 'in the mouths of Government and K.A.N.U. leaders' was exposed as having become 'a meaningless phrase'.

What they call African socialism is neither African nor socialism. It is a cloak for the practice of total capitalism. To describe the policies of the present government as 'African socialism' is an insult to the intelligence of the people. The deception is obvious, but the leaders of the Government and of K.A.N.U. do not have the courage to admit that they are fully committed to the Western ideology of capitalism.

The actions of the Government and of K.A.N.U. cannot be judged by what its leaders say—words come easily to them and plenty of Western advisers are available to produce suitable statements. The true test of their policies lies in what they actually do or do not do. Socialism as

commonly understood implies several basic principles. Has the Government's and K.A.N.U.'s 'African Socialism' done anything to promote these principles? The answer is a very clear no. In fact, its policies are dedicated to objectives which are quite the opposite. It is promoting vigorously the development of a small privileged class of Africans; the rich are getting richer and the poor poorer. Not a single act of nationalization (with the exception of v.o.k.) has been carried out. On the contrary, its development plan will make capitalism in the country even stronger. The control of the economy by foreigners grows every day.

**The K.P.U. condemns the Government's and K.A.N.U.'s capitalist policies. It is opposed to the creation of a small class of rich people while the masses live in poverty. It will pursue truly socialist policies to benefit the wananchi. It will share out the nation's wealth more equitably among the people, extend national control over the means of production and break the foreigners' grip on the economy.**

The K.P.U. policy statement bitterly attacks the way in which the K.A.N.U. leadership has betrayed African traditions and culture, above all in their acceptance of the values of capitalism; alien values imposed by the colonialists who destroyed many of the democratic and fraternal ways of the people, based on community ownership of land. 'The K.A.N.U. leaders . . . continue to pay lip-service to African traditions, but it is impossible to serve capitalist ideals and honour African tradition at the same time. The two are incompatible.' This is reflected also in the field of culture. Hardly anything is being done to support African cultural activities, but the door is opened wide to admit foreign influence, without discrimination between what is good and what is bad. 'The mass media are devoted almost entirely to the propagation of Western values. Bookstalls are full of pornographic literature imported from abroad.'

## **THE LAND QUESTION**

One of the subjects of the most bitter contention in Kenya throughout the colonial period, and still under independence, is that of land. Land-robbery was one of the most hated features of British rule. Kenya patriots fought for uhuru, meaning in the most literal sense, the return of the soil to its rightful owners. During the war of liberation, the Kenya Parliament set up in the Aberdare Forests in 1953 replied to the question, why are you fighting? 'We are fighting for all lands stolen from us by the Crown. . . . The British Government must grant Kenya full independence under African leadership and hand over all land previously alienated, for distribution to the landless.'



But the greatest disappointment of the 2½ years of K.A.N.U. rule has been the failure of Kenyatta's regime to tackle this problem of land redivision in a bold and radical way, despite many promises and election pledges. Landlessness and unemployment are still the lot of the masses (*wananchi*: Swahili), and even in the limited amount of re-allocation that has come about through the buying-out of a section of the White farmers on the Highlands, the least consideration seems to have been to those who fought hardest and sacrificed most for freedom. According to the notorious *African Socialism* paper the Government has stated that the resettlement policy has accomplished its purposes and will now be ended.

One of the most scathing of the indictments of the Kenya People's Union relates to this very question. It says aloud what very many people have been saying to themselves for a long time. 'To millions of people the end of colonialism meant the return of the stolen lands. They have so far waited without satisfaction.

The Government and K.A.N.U. have betrayed the wananchi's expectations. This repudiation of earlier promises over land is the most serious of the string of broken promises since the end of colonial rule. Tens of thousands of starving and landless people are now tasting with bitter irony the fruits of the Government's 'African Socialism'. In its paper on African Socialism and also in the recently published development plan, the Government has clearly stated the abandonment of settlement schemes on the grounds that the settlement already achieved is 'sufficient'.

Yet, as Mr. Odinga points out, only one-eighth of the land formerly held by European settlers has been allocated for settlement; and even those families who have been resettled are saddled with 'impossible burdens' as a result of the exorbitantly high compensation paid to the former owners. 'The country is in debt to get rid of people it never wanted.' In any case, the substitution of large-scale African farmers for large-scale White farmers is not what the country needs. 'We do not want a new class of big landlords.'

K.P.U. bluntly charges the K.A.N.U. Government—'in its pursuit of undiluted capitalism'—of deliberately neglecting the development of co-operative farms in favour of those privately owned. 'Of all the loans issued by the land bank since independence, co-operatives received only 6.7 per cent. . . . the share of the co-operatives in the loans of the Agricultural Finance Corporation is even less, only 5.3 per cent.' Similarly, it is charged, the system of land consolidation is being used in a way that could lead to a situation 'where many will find themselves without any land at all and at the mercy of a new class of artificially created landlords. And finally the question of limitation of the size of individual land-holdings has been deliberately

shelved. A committee to 'look into' this question was promised over a year ago. It has never been appointed.

Why is the K.A.N.U. Government failing to deal energetically with this burning question of land? K.P.U. gives the answer in blunt and straightforward terms. It is not only the K.A.N.U. leaders' 'ideological commitment to capitalism'. This is reinforced by the ownership by many individual members of the Government of hundreds and even thousands of acres of land. Most of the ministers and assistant ministers own big estates, some of them more than one. This being so, they cannot pursue policies which will benefit the wananchi (the masses). They have become the allies of the settlers who fully appreciate the position. It is an irony of history that European settlers' organizations should be swearing loyalty to the government. They have good reason to support their friends.

'The wananchi cannot tolerate this situation. Not only are many European settlers still sitting on big farms, but we are getting a new class of Blundells, Delameres and Briggs, deliberately created.'

The K.P.U. demands a democratic land policy, and specifically:

1. Distribution of land acquired from European settlers 'to the neediest, including those who lost their lands in the struggle for independence';
2. Restriction of ownership of large areas of high potential land to Kenya citizens.
3. Encouragement of co-operative farming.
4. Limitation of the size of farms held by individuals.
5. Maximum assistance to farmers.
6. Democratic methods of land consolidation 'according to the wishes of the people in particular areas'.

## **A NEW NOTE IN KENYA POLITICS**

The K.P.U. policy statement goes on to demand vigorous measures to raise living standards, eliminate unemployment, and eliminate nepotism and corruption. 'Humble people find more and more often that they have to pay bribes to get things done. . . . Ministers of the government shamelessly solicit directorships. . . . Throughout the country a member of the Cabinet is known as 'Mr. Ten Percent'. Yet he remains a Minister. So far from implementing its promise of free primary education, the K.A.N.U. government has actually raised primary school fees. The K.P.U. demands a big drive for free primary education, a better deal for teachers, expanded technical and university education.

The Kenya People's Union is a young Party, and its first policy declaration restricts itself to fundamentals. Doubtless many details



and additions to its policy will emerge in the course of its work.

But one thing immediately strikes one about this first declaration; here is straight talk, refreshingly free of all the ambiguity, bluff and phrasemongering demagoguery which have increasingly been characteristic of Kenya political tracts during the years of independence. It strikes a new note in Kenya politics.

For the first time a clear voice has come out of Kenya to say what clear-headed Africans inside and outside Kenya have long seen to be true: that all this I.C.F.T.U. and Mboya claptrap about 'African Socialism' was 'a meaningless phrase'; 'neither African nor socialism'; 'an insult to the intelligence of the people'.

It was doubtless a setback to Kenya that the reactionary intriguers should have succeeded in splitting K.A.N.U. and driving Oginga Odinga, Oneko and other honest revolutionary African patriots out of office in the Government. But their 'victory' and that of their neo-colonialist backers may well prove to have been a hollow one. As long as the militant patriots were part of an increasingly right-wing orientated regime, they were to some extent the prisoners of that regime. Now they are free to speak out, and though they have unselfishly sacrificed their immediate personal advancement to do so, Kenya and Africa have cause to be deeply grateful to them. The Kenya People's Union has regained for Kenya the spirit of the Land Freedom Army, of the earlier, crusading Jomo Kenyatta and the trade union pioneers; the spirit that once placed Kenya in the vanguard of the African Revolution—and will restore her to that proud position again in the future.

# Nigeria—Shortcomings of Military Rule

---

Yusifu Usman

THE NIGERIAN ARMY is another ex-colonial institution and has an officer corps with a social ideology identical to that of the senior civil servants, only theirs has a dash of the Sandhurst contempt for civilians. This makes it constitutionally incapable of destroying the roots of Nigerian corruption and apathy. For these roots are deeply set in the status system of the bureaucracies and in the reaction of the clan and family organizations to the existing pattern of productive relationships between the peasantry on the one hand and the bureaucracy and foreign capitalists on the other. The majors who led the revolt, and the colonels and lieutenant-colonels who replaced the politicians, are in the same social class and in fact have extensive personal connections with permanent secretaries, top corporation executives and other managerial staff whose complete replacement as a ruling group is necessary for any real change in the social and political system.

Now to proceed to show this system is a neo-colonialist system. And how any analysis of its corruption always leads back to this basic fact. This fact about Nigeria can, of course, be concealed under all sorts of rhetoric about 'under-development', 'emerging nationhood', 'take-offs', etc. but what it means in terms of the social, economic and cultural existence of the Nigerian peasant and worker is clear and simple. It means exploitation and barrenness. The barrenness of a society in which a luxury-consumer-goods economy is maintained on the back of a poor, diseased, overtaxed and swindled rural population. The role of international capitalism in this system is also quite clear. It is exploitation through industrial and mining activities, trading, contract work for building and roads construction, banking and insurance.

Control of the industrial and manufacturing sector is concentrated in the hands of the United Africa Company, The Nigerian Tobacco Company, John Holts, Taylor Woodrow and a few other German



and American firms. The Nigerian Tobacco Company, for instance, is a subsidiary of the international combine the British American Tobacco Company, and this firm controls about 90 per cent of the supply in cigarettes and an equal size in manufacturing activities. It makes huge profits by fixing low prices for the tobacco farmers, charging high prices for its cigarettes and paying very low wages to its workers. Only recently the workers at its factory in Zaria had to go on strike before they got a long overdue increase. This company with its monopoly of the supply of cigarettes, monopoly in the demand for raw tobacco and in some places even that of seasonal credit to the peasants, exploits the country with an almost callous relish. The other 'giant' in Nigeria is the United Africa Company, a Unilever subsidiary, which has since its withdrawal from a monopoly control of produce-buying established itself in textiles, sugar, beer, vehicle assembly and almost in all fields of manufacturing activity. Shell-B.P. and the American Gulf Oil now control the increasingly important oil industry emphasizing the bureaucratic-capitalist nature of the economy since petroleum extraction is necessarily for monopolies and through royalties concessions and special taxes these monopolies build strong links with the bureaucracy.

Other capitalist firms concentrate on the highly lucrative market of luxury goods and foods. The Greek firm A. G. Leventis with other Indian and Levantine merchant houses specially concentrate on exploiting this need for expensive status consumption of the civil servants, managers, politicians, the comprador and commercial bourgeoisie and the army officers.

Other firms in the trading sector like Paterson Zochonis, C.F.A.O., and John Holts of Liverpool dominate the wholesale market. For John Holts especially this together with a monopoly of hire purchase facilities in some areas has led to high profits. In a statement of accounts published in *The Financial Times* of February 4th, 1966, John Holts raised their annual profits of £604,000 in 1963-64 to £1,059,000 for the year 1964-65. An increase of over 40 per cent in a single year. The Chairman assured the shareholders of 'an increasing flow of profits from this source'. There is little reason to believe that the military *coup* will make any difference to this prediction.

In building and road construction the big contractors are Costain, Borini Porpno, Cappa Taylor Woodrow and Bogialla. In this sector the profit margins depend directly on the decisions of politicians and civil servants about the location and type of project and the standards of inspection to be imposed when the project is completed. The influence of the foreign governments who provide the loans, grants and other types of 'aid' for these projects is another factor, indefinite



but crucial, in this type of exploitation. A classic example of their type of architecture is the Costain Housing Estate in Kaduna, perhaps the best symbol of the sterility of Nigerian bureaucratic-capitalism.

But a more subtle and pervasive power is in the banks and the insurance companies. They are undoubtedly the most powerful institutions through which international capitalism keeps its grip on Nigeria. Barclays Bank D.C.O. and The Bank of West Africa are the two giants. Their tentacles extend right into the rural areas through their special credit arrangements with the Produce Marketing Corporations. These government institutions guarantee their buying agents for bank loans which are used for the purchase of the cash crops—cocoa, groundnuts, etc.—from the peasants. The interest on these loans is, of course, extorted from the peasantry by weight-fixing or by simply tying a peasant to one buyer through seasonal loans and advances until the last ounce of his produce has been sucked out of him.

This, in brief, is the Nigerian economy. Now the place of the politicians has been taken by army officers. One party, The Northern Peoples' Congress of the Sardauna of Sokoto and Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, seems to have disintegrated. The two older southern parties are still intact.\* They are solidly composed of the bourgeoisie of Ibadan, Abeokuta, Onitsha and Enugu and their spokesmen the lawyers and journalists. The army officers can hardly govern for much longer without their co-operation. The spineless ruling classes of Northern Nigeria have been scared out of their wits by the sudden death of the Sardauna and it will be some time before they organize themselves again. The army together with the senior civil servants has now proceeded to centralize the country's administration and has also taken other measures very comforting to the foreign investor (ref. *The Economist*, Friday, February 11th, 1966). None of its measures seems to have tackled basic problems. And nothing in the personality or proclamations of its leaders suggests that they will do so.

The army is arresting some of the old politicians and might try them for corruption and all sorts of mayhem. But it lacks the mass following, and the discipline and force of a coherent revolutionary ideology to tackle the roots. The army cannot inspire and organize the rural population into a system of producers' co-operatives and later into communes which would become the organs of government in the rural areas, cannot change and expand the educational system; cannot cut down the bureaucracy, reduce its salaries, eliminate all its privileges; cannot reorganize the police force and dismiss most of

---

\* This article was written before the decree dissolving political parties.—*Editor.*



the present officers. And these are only a few of the changes absolutely essential to even the elimination of corruption. The centralization of the administration will certainly increase unity and the cessation of the old political squabbles will reinforce this. But change, change in terms of the social, political, economic and cultural existence of the Nigerian peasant and worker is still far off.

---

### ***Dear Comrade Fischer***

The Bulgarian communists and the working people in Bulgaria learnt with great indignation of the unjust sentence passed on you by the 'court of justice' of the Government of the Republic of South Africa—a Government hateful to your people—for your struggle and the struggle of all patriots in the Republic of South Africa against oppression, colonial bondage and racial discrimination.

Your courageous speech of self-defence, which found deep response among the Bulgarian people, was an indictment against the Verwoerd apartheid regime, which is a disgraceful phenomenon of our time. We, Bulgarians, admired your courageous behaviour at the trial; it reminded us of the undaunted behaviour of Georgi Dimitrov—the immortal leader and teacher of the Bulgarian people—during the time of the Leipzig Fire Trial in 1933.

We are confident, dear comrade Fischer, that the just cause to which you and your comrades have devoted your lives and energies will be victorious.

We hail your struggle and demand that the unjust sentence passed on you be quashed and that all political prisoners in the Republic of South Africa be released.

Wishing you, dear comrade Fischer, good health, stamina and success in your grandiose struggle for genuine liberation of the people of the Republic of South Africa, we are

fraternally yours,

CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE  
BULGARIAN COMMUNIST PARTY.

[Text of a letter sent to Abram Fischer, member of the Central Committee of the South African Communist Party, who received a sentence of life imprisonment on May 4th, 1966.]

# The Soviet Union—

## Travel Notes of a South African

---

Y. Ngomezulu

BORN UNDER THE conditions of capitalism and the very worst form of racial oppression since the defeat of Hitlerite Germany, I was naturally thrilled when I was offered the opportunity to visit the Soviet Union.

As a non-White South African who had spent several periods in prison (under the most abominable conditions imaginable) for having dared to demand freedom and democracy for all in Verwoerd's South Africa, I was particularly interested in seeing for myself what socialism meant—What in reality did the abolition of the exploitation of man by man mean? I wanted to experience the equality of different national groups which, I had read, was the cornerstone of Soviet policy.

This is not, however, an attempt to explain the whole theory of socialism nor is it an evaluation of the Soviet system. It is rather a report of a South African in the Soviet Union.

Moscow airport. New Year's eve. We had informed our hosts by cable that we would be arriving the day before, but having missed our plane arrived twenty-four hours late. There was no-one to meet us and we did not know anyone in Moscow whom we could contact. Once passengers from our aircraft had completed their passport declarations, the airport emptied quickly, the travellers rushing off to their respective destinations. My companions and I soon found ourselves almost alone as it was already midnight and the New Year had begun.

The solitary attendant at the terminal could speak only Russian, and we could not explain our problem to her. We felt tired, depressed and not a little apprehensive. Outside the airport it was snowing heavily. Great blankets of snow covered the ground everywhere. Even this unusual sight—I had never seen snow in all my life—failed to reduce the concern I felt, stranded as we were in the huge airport building.



We were not aware that the attendant, noticing our plight, was endeavouring to contact someone in authority to assist us. About an hour later, a gentleman came over from the rear of the building with a young girl who could speak a little English. Once he understood our problem, he explained that as it was New Year's day it would be difficult to contact our hosts.

Then, as on many, many occasions thereafter during my six weeks stay in the Soviet Union, I experienced Soviet hospitality in action. We were quickly bundled into a bus and were taken to a hotel where we were given coffee and beds. The only passengers on the bus, which appeared to have been sent out especially for us, were my companions and I. The driver got out at the hotel, helped us with our luggage and in bidding us farewell, bowed low on the snow-covered ground and said hesitantly, 'We . . . I . . . er . . . love you!' in English. We excitedly spoke to him only to find that these were the only words he appeared to know.

On numerous occasions thereafter I was to find evidence of the great love and warmth the Soviet citizen has for people generally and for foreigners in particular.

Although I was in a strange world, with the people speaking a strange language and, what is more, all of them white, except for an occasional foreign student or visitor, I never once felt lonely or inhibited as most non-Whites feel in the presence of Whites in South Africa. Any doubts I had, after reading the constant stream of propaganda in the South African press, portraying the Soviet people as being always preoccupied and even gloomy, grave and ill-clad, were soon dispelled. They are a wonderfully happy and contented people. Everywhere I went, in the shops, in the streets, in the restaurants, during intervals at the theatres and cinemas, I saw laughing, happy, well-dressed people. The women were always well dressed with fashionable hair styles. I was pleasantly surprised to find that Soviet women, like women everywhere, were extremely fashion-conscious and spent much time in front of huge mirrors provided in the foyers of all public entertainment places.

Unlike South Africa, where racialism and oppression of the non-Whites is condoned, even encouraged by law, Article 123 of the Soviet constitution establishes the

equality of rights of all the citizens of the U.S.S.R. irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political life . . . Any direct or indirect restrictions of the rights of, or conversely, any establishment of direct or indirect privileges for citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as advocacy of any racial or national exclusiveness or hatred or contempt, is punishable by law.

I doubt if any Soviet citizen has come up before the courts charged under this law in recent years. What I found everywhere, in the cinemas, the theatres, at meetings I attended during the Women's Day celebrations on March 8th, and in the shops was a wholesome love and respect for others so unlike South Africa, where in almost every walk of life we non-Whites are insulted and humiliated, in many cases even when we are spending our hard-earned wages in a White-owned shop.

I spent a few days in Alma Ata, the capital of Khazakstan, where over seventy different national groups, with differing cultures, live and work side by side. This former backward area, inhabited by minorities is now a modern city. Before the revolution one Tsarist official is said to have held the view that, 'there is no other way to manage the Khazaks except through massacres'. The Khazak people on the other hand had a proverb: 'If a Russian travels with you, hold an axe in readiness'.

Today the situation is completely different. The capital seethes with activity with the entire population participating in building their country. The wilderness which once surrounded the city has been transformed into arable land; wandering nomads and small peasant farmers, who barely eked out a living from the land in Tsarist days, are now collective farmers using all the latest techniques and equipment; women, who for centuries wore the veil, are now free citizens and our host in Khazakstan, Mrs. Ramazanov, is a member of the Supreme Soviet. Her mother wore the veil and was never seen in public.

This country which was once torn by national strife has been successfully woven into a family of friendly nations. Where before the 1917 Revolution less than 1 per cent of the population was literate, today illiteracy is unknown. The first train entered Khazakstan twelve years after the revolution. Today the entire Republic is served with the most modern transport.

If one takes into account these facts and the fact that within the borders of the Soviet Union there are 177 distinguishable national groups, speaking some 128 different languages or dialects, and that these minorities elected to join the Union voluntarily and of their own choice, we cannot but agree that the Soviet system has found the key to the problems of national minorities. It has welded together, in friendship and brotherhood, peoples of differing cultures into a united invincible force within a short space of time.

It must be remembered that the young Soviet government achieved these remarkable results despite the fact that, for almost twenty years, there was an effective economic blockade of the country and that the



country lived through the most devastating war against Nazi Germany in which over 20 million people lost their lives.

Another feature of Soviet life that made a great impact on me is the achievements of the Soviet people in the field of education. In each national area of the Soviet Union the schools teach in the native tongue with Russian as the second language and the system of education has enabled the minority peoples to eliminate not only economic but cultural backwardness as well. All the Republics have their own publishing houses; before the Revolution many did not even have written languages! Each Republic has its own Science Academies, its own scientific research institutes.

Women, once veiled and relegated to the kitchen, are now completely emancipated and are working as equals, as deputies, engineers, doctors, state-planners and factory managers.

Education in the Soviet Union begins at the age of three when the child attends one of the 30,000 kindergartens and nursery schools, organized by the state and trade unions. The latter cater for children of parents working in a particular factory or industry. At these nursery schools and kindergartens, several of which I visited in Leningrad, Alma Ata and Moscow, I found children being taught habits of work, neatness and the ability to get along with other children, primarily through games. Music, singing, drawing and rhythmic exercises are part of the methods adopted to develop the child's artistic abilities.

Education is universal, compulsory and free in the Soviet Union. Every child, upon reaching the age of seven years, enters any one of the 250,000 schools which accommodate almost 40 million children. The principal of one of the schools I visited in Alma Ata told me that in the 1914-1915 school year there were only 105,000 pupils in the whole of Khazakstan. There were no colleges. The figures for the 1964-65 term were: 161 colleges and over 10,000 schools accommodating over 2,624,000 children. Between 70 and 76 per cent of the qualified staff in these institutions are women.

I spent an exciting three hours at the Moscow Pioneer Palace, where my guide told me, 'the creative abilities of the children are developed and life unfolded to them'. At the Palace there are over 700 clubs or circles ranging from the study of planets to the circle of ballet dancers. In the radio circle I found boys between the ages of twelve and fifteen constructing radio sets and at the motor car driving circle I found youngsters of about twelve years old learning the mechanisms of a motor-car engine. My guide told me that a child could join any circle of his choice.

University education is not only free, but students are paid while they study.

The education system in the Soviet Union has reached an extremely high standard. If there is any privileged group in the Soviet Union it is the children, and the Soviet State stints nothing in the provision of opportunity for the generation of the future.

Comrade Leonid Brezhnev emphasized this further in his report to the twenty-third Congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. held in Moscow in March this year:

Eight years ago eight-year compulsory education was introduced . . . for all children of school age. That was an outstanding gain for socialism. Now this achievement no longer satisfies the people of our country. We now have to raise education to an even higher level: to complete, in the main, the transition to universal compulsory **Secondary Education**. Large appropriations will be made for the building of schools, since the number of young people receiving a full secondary education in the next five years will be four times the figure for the preceding five years. . . . In the coming five years, four to five million people will annually leave the secondary and technical schools. Naturally, only a part of them can be enrolled in institutions of higher learning. The bulk will take jobs in the economy, and the five-year plan must make provisions that will enable all of them to find their place in life. . . .

Bookshops are plentiful and always full of people. Translated versions of Tagore, Shakespeare, Dickens and a host of other great writers are in abundance. Libraries too, are always full to capacity. At Moscow's Lenin Library, at which, incidentally, I was accepted as a member for the duration of my stay in the U.S.S.R., I always found a queue of people waiting to get into one of the twenty-two reading rooms which accommodate 2,500 people at a time. On the several occasions I went there, I always found the place a hive of activity and large crowds waiting for an opportunity to get in as soon as others got out.

The library is housed in five multi-storeyed buildings covering a whole block. There are 23 million books in 179 languages stored in a nineteen-storeyed building. Each day, I was told, between 7,000 and 9,000 readers come to the library. During exams anything up to 11,000 people make use of the facilities of this huge institution. Special reading halls are provided for youth and students and among the 2,200 employees are specialized librarians, or consultants as they are called, available to assist readers in every field. Ninety per cent of the staff have University level qualifications.

There are 4,000 libraries in Moscow alone and 400,000 throughout the Soviet Union. This does not include libraries in the various high schools.

Lenin Library is open every day including Sundays from 9 a.m. to 11 p.m.



I had the constant feeling in the Soviet Union that the people found life a grand adventure; their zest and joy for life is phenomenal. They gave me the impression of being confident, alert, happy, even gay. The crowds in the streets are animated and always carrying large parcels or bags. In the theatres, which I visited whenever I had a free evening, I found the patrons keen and attentive; clapping and yelling 'bravo!' at the end of any scene which they particularly enjoyed.

True, there are still many shortages in the Soviet Union. You cannot get ball-point pens, for example. But, everyone is warmly clothed—I have never seen an ill-clad person throughout my stay in the U.S.S.R. There are long waiting lists for people wanting larger apartments, and luxury goods such as refrigerators are in short supply. Steps are being taken to remedy these shortcomings. In the new five-year plan adopted at the last Congress of the Communist Party early this year, one of the cardinal tasks set is to raise the standard of living of the people.

According to the plan, 'the acceleration of the growth of consumer goods is to be ensured by **doubling** the output of producer goods for the branches on which the growth of public consumption immediately depends, namely, agriculture, the light and food industries, trade, housing, construction, and cultural facilities and services. . . .'

The important thing is that whatever is lacking or in short supply or below standard today is only a temporary deficiency. Already steps are being taken to remedy the position, standards are soaring to new and greater heights each year, and will continue to do so except if there is a war.

It is this knowledge that makes the Soviet people fight so ardently for peace. Peace is vital for the well-being of the Soviet people and the Soviet system. Given a decade of peace the glittering brightness ushered in by the great October Revolution will glitter even brighter and all those who sincerely believe in peace and abhor racial intolerance will join with me in wishing these warm, friendly and dynamic people every success in their endeavours to build a new society from which a new man is emerging.

# AFRICA

---

## *Notes on Current Events*

by SOL DUBULA

**UGANDA: The Coup that failed** The arrival of Sir Edward Mutesa, affectionately nicknamed 'King Freddie' by the imperialist press in Britain, in London in late June marks the end of stage one in the unsuccessful attempt by backward feudal groups in Uganda, in alliance with foreign elements, to bring down the government of Dr. Milton Obote and to make Uganda safe for neo-colonialist plunder.

In order to create optimum conditions for an unconstitutional take-over the plot began with allegations in early February by Daudi Ocheng, M.P., the secretary-general of the Kabaka Yekka Party (Mutesa's tribal association) that Dr. Obote and two other Ministers had been in receipt of improper commissions connected with the sale of gold and ivory tusks in the Congo. These allegations were made in the Uganda Parliament at a time when Dr. Obote was on tour in Uganda's northern provinces. (In Ghana the absence of Nkrumah was also chosen as the moment to strike.)

On February 10th, unknown to both Dr. Obote and the army commander Brigadier Opolot, mysterious troop movements were ordered which would have resulted in the dispersal of the Uganda army to outlying parts of the country. The swift reaction of Dr. Obote and the loyalty of the armed forces prevented a repetition of a Ghana-type take-over. By February 22nd the constitution was suspended and Dr. Obote assumed full executive powers. On April 15th the Uganda Parliament adopted a new constitution by fifty-five votes to four. This provides for an executive president and for strong powers for the central government.



In submitting the constitution Dr. Obote said 'Let us record that the 1962 Constitution was worked out by citizens of Uganda but in large measure was also worked out by the British Government'. The Kabaka was deposed as President and Dr. Obote elected in his place in terms of the new constitution.

The King's answer was an open call made by members of the Kabaka Lukiko (the Bugandan Legislature which had a limited form of authority in terms of the 1962 Constitution) for a rebellion and intervention by foreign troops and the United Nations. The Ugandan Government has since announced that it has documentary evidence that the Kabaka had already decided on April 12th, three days before the constitution was adopted, to mount a full-scale rebellion against the 'authority and unity of the country'. There was also evidence that even before 1966 the Kabaka had been planning an insurrection. In fact it is not even disputed by him that he asked some Ambassadors for military assistance. The purpose of such an approach becomes clear when it is borne in mind that the Prime Minister, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of Internal Affairs, and the Defence Ministry were unaware of these approaches, which King Freddie's spokesman described as 'a precautionary request'.

For sheer hypocrisy the wail of sympathy in English ruling circles and its press which has been inspired by Whitehall for the Cambridge-trained ex-Kabaka takes a lot of beating. Are memories so short that they have forgotten that when it suited their own purposes they removed and exiled the Kabaka without any ceremony in the early fifties? Already at that stage he was showing his distaste for constitutional reform.

**GHANA: Imperialist Manipulation** According to reports President Nasser believes that the imperialists drove down the price of cocoa with the deliberate intention of creating favourable conditions for the overthrow of President Nkrumah.

Is it a mere coincidence that the price of cocoa which stood at £87 10s. a ton at the time of the recent coup in Ghana reached that low figure after a more or less steady decline in the price which stood at £467 a ton in 1954? But what is of even greater significance is that the take-over by a regime which has become the darling of Western imperialism has coincided with a sudden meteoric rise in the price of cocoa to about £200 a ton. Even the right-wing magazine *West Africa* has this to say about the rise in the price of cocoa:

'Super explanations are available, but it is true that the establishment of the military regime in Ghana and Nigeria has coincided with a significant

rise in the world cocoa price. Indeed, the prospects for next season are such that in both countries a rise in the price paid to producers is conceivable and nothing could give the regimes more popularity than that.'

Another expression of gratitude for the temporary elimination of Ghana as an advance-post of African independence came with the British sponsored fourteen-nation conference which took place in London in June. The result—an easing of conditions of repayment on capital and interest due on loans.

An examination of some of the measures taken by the Ankrah regime shows clearly in which direction Ghana is being led. Could anything be more nauseating than the so-called 'opening' of the Mkawkaw Training Camp for freedom fighters for special viewing by United States and West German diplomats? A noble act of solidarity with the liberation movements by Nkrumah's Ghana was exploited in a cheap, vulgar and sycophantic attempt to please the imperialists. According to newspaper reports 'the camp which has a firing range was adorned with flags bearing inscriptions such as "*Go Ye and Free the whole of Africa*" and "*Down with Colonialism and Imperialism*".'

The Western press is continually comforting itself about the domination in Ghana of the Western-trained elite. All the leading military and police personnel were trained at Chester, Aldershot, Sandhurst and the Hendon Police College. The Economic Committee of the so-called National Liberation Committee is headed by Emmanuel Omaboe an L.S.E.-trained economist. So, too, is the Governor of the Bank of Ghana. The Foreign Relations Committee is headed by Harry Amonoo who was trained in British diplomatic missions before independence.

It is not surprising that among the first economic steps taken by the new Ankrah government was an announcement by the General that nine state enterprises would be handed over to the private sector and also that private participation would be invited in six other state enterprises.

**KENYA** The press statement issued by Achieng Oneko to explain why he decided to resign his post in the Kenya Cabinet as Minister of Information and from the Kenya African National Union deserves to be widely read. It is a moving declaration of why a man, fired by a refreshing honesty, abandons the security and pomp of office and returns to his people to help create a new and more powerful dedication in the struggle against imperialism and for a consolidation of



the gains of independence. His break with his 'old friend and comrade Mzee Kenyatta' was 'agonising and not easy'. Both of them had during the emergency been arrested on the same day and detained and imprisoned for nearly ten years.

The role I have played in the struggle for uhuru is quite clear. . . . I was a colleague of Mzee Kenyatta in the long imprisonment. This long suffering gave me an opportunity to strengthen certain principles which I resolved to respect and have since greatly cherished regarding the future of our country. Many times when languishing in the detention camp I was approached by imperialist agents and advised or blackmailed to denounce these principles. In every case I chose continued detention in preference to a premature release based on denouncing my principles . . .

There is now a danger that the exploitation of our people jointly by foreigners and black Europeans will be deepened and continued. This is a situation which our people will never accept. I will never accept it. I must come out of this party and government and renew the struggle to help fulfil the wishes of our people through policies which are in keeping with the spirit of true African nationalism.

Those who are driven to cynicism or despair by the disreputable manipulations of some of the office-seekers in Africa would do well to mark these words. They point to the future.

**MOZAMBIQUE AND ANGOLA** The communiqués which are issued from time to time by the Portuguese military authorities on the fighting which is taking place in both Mozambique and Angola demonstrate that the activities of the freedom guerillas, particularly in Mozambique, mount with ever-increasing intensity. The latest figures which have been published by Lisbon are that in Mozambique a total of 782 'rebels' have been killed and they admit to fifty-nine Portuguese soldiers having been killed. Between the short period, for example, of May 16th to 31st, the Portuguese authorities report 629 operations involving guerillas in Mozambique.

I do not for one moment accept these figures as reflecting accurately the casualties particularly on the Portuguese side. It is a notorious fact that attempts are made to minimize Portuguese losses in the interests of morale both in Portugal and among their troops. At the same time the figures do show that the drain on Portuguese men and resources has been growing and will inevitably lead to the victory of the freedom fighters.

Eduardo Mondlane, the President of Frelimo, has announced that the liberation forces have grown from an initial group of 200 to 5,000 well-trained military personnel. He states further that a fifth of the country is now under guerilla control.

In an attempt to create more favourable conditions especially in the northern parts of Mozambique the Portuguese authorities have offered South African White farmers land at ridiculously low prices. There can be no doubt that the real purpose is to enrol fighters not mere farmers for Portuguese colonialism.

In Angola the war has entered its fifth year and fighting continues. In a recent statement by the Angolan government in exile the existence of a Hitlerite-type concentration camp at Raffat for political prisoners is exposed.

**NIGERIA: Forward March or about turn?** As from May 24th Nigeria became a no-party state. Decree No. 33 proclaimed by General Ironsi's military government makes illegal 107 organizations. Of these, eighty-one are political parties and twenty-six are tribal and cultural unions or associations. It was made clear by the General that the ban on the formation of new political parties will be of limited duration.

The reason for the ban on political parties is given in a number of speeches made by General Ironsi in which he declared that in spite of warnings, party activities were still continuing either directly or through various tribal societies and organizations. These organizations, he said, will be dissolved and 'will be buried along with the tribal sectional and regional bitterness which they engendered'.

The Nigerian workers' newspaper *Advance* in its comments on the decree states that it understands the reasons which moved the military authorities to bring under control some of the parties which are described as 'unwholesome and divisive'. On the other hand the paper regards it as a retrograde step to include on the list the Socialist parties of Nigeria who 'had only agitated for more democracy and social justice, for cultural advance and for the greatness of our fatherland'.

It is indeed clear that the activities of a party such as the Nigerian Workers' and Farmers' Party could have played an increasingly important role in combating the tribal, sectional and regional bitterness which the military regime claims it wishes to eradicate. An indiscriminate swoop on all and sundry may, in practice, leave the field free to those sinister groupings who rely not on mass public activity but on backroom conspiracy and economic and financial intrigues. Bans, as we know only too well, do not stop political activities.

According to the military government, no prospect is seen of re-establishing civilian rule for another three years. Between now and



then there will not be a political vacuum. Even if parties remain illegal the affairs of state will have to be conducted and in a multitude of ways the military will be called upon to make decisions which, whether they like it or not, involve political assessments and ideological questions. In the absence of healthy national political activity and the political mobilization of the Nigerian people in support of the more progressive postures which the military claim to support, dark forces will find the means and the technique to sabotage their efforts.

There can be no quarrel with the view that the initial take-over marked an important advance for the Nigerian people—an advance which has not altogether been discounted by some of the disappointing actions and omissions of the military regime. At the same time the most grave danger which faces both the government and the Nigerian people is that they will become the captives of the British-trained civil service most of whose ideological and political orientation is pro-capitalist and pro-West. In the absence of political activity amongst the people it will be easier for influences of this type to steer Nigeria along the lines of British Establishment politics.

That Nigeria still faces the danger of a come-back from an alliance between the backward feudal groups and neo-colonialism was dramatically illustrated in the events which followed the announcement on May 24th that Nigeria would henceforth be known as the Republic of Nigeria; that it would cease to be a federation; that her former regions would be abolished; that the country is to be grouped into various provinces and that there would be a unification of the public services.

The violence in the north which followed this announcement is evidence not only of the continuing insidious influence of the feudal Emirs but also of the continuing influence of Nigeria's former masters, the British imperialists. Is it a mere coincidence that the violence in the north happened at the same time as the visit there by Sir Francis Cumming-Bruce, the British High Commissioner in Nigeria? Read for example the following words which appeared in a Northern Nigerian Government-owned newspaper at the time:

'Sir Francis will learn something of the feelings and opinions of the North regarding international and other issues in which Britain is involved and convey these to the British people and if the North has strong feelings on various matters which feature in the headlines, *this is an opportunity to pass them on.*' (My italics.)

Even if Britain had no direct hand in stirring up the hostilities which cost the lives of so many Nigerians, it is abundantly clear on whom those who were the direct instigators rely in their attempts to smash Nigerian unity and advance their sectional interests.

And, of course, in Britain they will find a natural ally and old friend. It was in this very land, Nigeria, that Lord Lugard initiated his policy which passes by the name of 'indirect rule'. The special technique evolved by Britain of ensuring the dominance of unrepresentative traditional elements served the purpose of imperialism not only in the period of direct control but also in the neo-colonial phase. As in India, Kenya, Uganda, and the Sudan so in Nigeria the British imperialists have made certain, before handing over the formalities of state power, that the new nations would be hampered in their advance towards real independence by institutions and groupings representing the past rather than the future.

The immediate reaction to the riots by the military government was to clear up what is called a 'misunderstanding' of the decree issued on May 24th. General Ironsi stated that there had not been a decision to abolish federalism but that the decree had been passed in order 'to meet the demands of the military government under a unified command'.

I can only express the hope that the plots and intrigues of the Emirs and their foreign friends will not be allowed to stand in the way of what must be the desires of the overwhelming majority of the Nigerian people and that is a free democratic and independent Nigeria. What the people surely want from the military government is 'forward march', not 'about turn'.

**SENEGAL: A vast prison** In a declaration issued recently by the African Independence Party of Senegal (P.A.I.), the Senghor regime is exposed not only as 'a permanent attack on the interests of the masses' but as having 'flung the doors of Senegal wide open to U.S. imperialism'. The declaration points out that 'the five years of ruthless repressions have turned Senegal into a vast prison and concentration camp, destroyed all democratic freedom and 'introduced arbitrary rule, torture and massacre as methods of government policy'.

Speaking of the need for the P.A.I. to heighten its vigilance the declaration says 'In this period of serious difficulties pernicious trends find favourable soil for development, and corrupting subversive influences seek to penetrate into the party in order to wreck it organizationally'. It further calls for the maintenance of maximum centralization and strong discipline in the functioning of its underground apparatus.



**CONGO (Kinhasa)** As from July 1st the capital Leopoldville will be known as Kinhasa in furtherance of a declared policy of Africanization.

In May, Moise Tshombe 'The Belgian in a black skin', was removed from his seat in the Congo Parliament by ninety-six votes to three. It was also reported that an international arrest warrant was issued for him on a charge of high treason.

After an allegation that 'politicians were intriguing' General Mobutu was vested with full legislative powers. Parliament's approval is no longer required for any law.

The Congolese Foreign Minister, M. Bomboko, announced that the recent conspiracy against the Mobutu regime which ended with the public hanging of four of the conspirators had been the subject of an approach by the conspirators to U.S., West German and French Embassies—apparently with no success. But in the case of an approach to the Belgian Embassy the Second Secretary, M. Alain Rens, acted in an encouraging manner. He was expelled from the Congo on twenty-four hours' notice.

It could very well be that this attempt is connected with the hard bargaining which went on between the Congo Prime Minister General Mulamba in connection with an economic sell-out by Tshombe to the Belgians of vast share-holding interests in the Congo and the decision by the Congo Government to institute its own merchant shipping fleet and to transfer the headquarters of certain economic organizations from Belgium to the Congo. An attempt in April by two Belgian nationals to kidnap the Congolese Minister of Transport, M. Victor Nendaka, in Geneva was described by him as part of a scheme arranged by Belgian financial interests favourable to Tshombe.

The Congo recruiting officer in South Africa, Lt. D. Sherif, announced that since August 1964 a total of sixty-five South Africans have lost their lives serving in the Congo. Since the beginning of 1966 twelve South African mercenaries have been killed in action. I mourn not for the lives of these adventurers but because the arrogant White herrenvolk are given licence under African patronage to strut about with gun in hand killing Africans—many of whom are patriots of undoubted sincerity. The same sort of disgust is felt when one reads of Spanish mercenaries who captured towns in the Congo from so-called rebels. The sooner these fascist thugs are sent back to their homes the easier it will be to end the imperialist-staged tragedy which is the Congo.

**SOUTH AFRICA: Conversation piece** Mr. Whitaker (Hampstead, Labour) asked whether the President of the Board of Trade would seek to withdraw Imperial preference benefits from the products from South Africa as soon as possible.

Mr. Jay: No.

Mr. Whitaker: Is it not disgraceful that a country which is continually violating our sanctions against Rhodesia continues to receive preference benefits while countries observing them do not?

Mr. Jay: I do not think it is for us to declare unilateral sanctions against South Africa.

(Question time in the British House of Commons)

**MALAWI** In May a new constitution was approved by the Malawi Parliament. Malawi will now become a *de jure* as well as a *de facto* one-party state.

So far the existence of this independent African state so close to two of the citadels of white supremacy in Africa (South Africa and Rhodesia) has worried neither Smith nor Verwoerd.

In April when the whole of Africa was seething about the British betrayal of the African majority in Southern Rhodesia and demanding the use of force, Hastings Banda, the Malawi Prime Minister, made a strong appeal against the use of force to bring down the Smith regime.

'It would be a bloody business' he said, 'and people who urged it are no friends of Africa'. He went on to say that Africans in Rhodesia did not want armies to invade their country because they knew that 'not even the British army could beat Smith in that way'.

No wonder that Verwoerd, according to a report in the South African newspapers, will welcome the appointment of a representative of the Malawi Government in Gaborone as a link between it and Malawi. The man who will fill this post is a certain Mr. A. Phiri who recently spent four days in South Africa as the first representative of a black state on official business to that country. I hope that his visit convinced him that no amount of grovelling before the White rulers will gain either advantage or respect.

**THE SUDAN** The draft programme of the Sudanese Communist Party (just available in English) is a document which merits the attention of Marxists the world over. It demonstrates that this young party (it was formed in 1946) has not only grasped the main theoretical postulates of scientific socialism, but is capable in a most



profound fashion of applying these to the complex conditions of their own country.

The programme abounds with numerous proposals for the creation of a true national democratic state in the Sudan. In the economic field it deals with the balance and relations between the state sector, the private sector, the mixed sector and the co-operative sector. On the much vexed question of the conflict between the north and the south it proposes the granting of regional autonomy to the south which 'should have a legislature and an executive council of ministers of its own and be equitably represented in the national parliament and national government'. It also proposes the establishment of a state council of three, one of whom should represent the southern province.

Typical of its balanced and non-sectarian approach is the attitude which is expressed towards non-communist groups which support socialism.

'It is a fact confirmed, recognized and welcomed by our party, which calls for full co-operation, that new non-communist groups have been drawn to socialist ideas particularly during the last six years. They are made up of intellectuals and many people active in politics. These new socialist schools are sincere in their appeals for socialism. They are thoroughly aware of the importance of the social problems facing the country today and hold that the capitalist path is unworkable for the development of the country.'

The impressiveness of this draft programme accentuates the inequity of the recently imposed ban on the Communist Party of the Sudan and its newspaper *Al Maidan*. The legality of this ban is being challenged in the courts.

**SWAZILAND** Constitutional proposals were published in March to the effect that Swaziland will become an independent kingdom by 1970 within the British Commonwealth. The proposals grant the protectorate internal self-government on the British monarchical pattern under British protection. Sobhuza II will be King. There will be two Houses of Parliament; the lower house will consist of twenty-four elected members and six appointed by the King and the attorney-general; the upper house will consist of a Speaker, and twelve members, six of whom will be chosen by the lower house and six appointed by the King. The elections will be on the basis of universal suffrage without special guarantees for the 2,000 strong White minority.

The Swaziland Progressive Party in a public statement said that the constitution was drawn up by 'reactionaries' and that the whole

system of government 'would be an instrument of imperialists and colonialists'. It demands that the British Government reject the proposed constitution and that it call an immediate constitutional conference to work out a new approach. The Ngwane Liberatory Congress has also rejected the draft constitution. Neither of these organizations was represented at the conference which prepared the draft.

**SIERRA LEONE** The Sierra Leone Parliament has set up a committee to collate and assess views on the plan for a one-party state. At the time of going to press the opponents of a one-party state have made an application to the Sierra Leone Supreme Court to declare the appointment of this committee an unconstitutional proceeding.

**AFRICA AND THE COMMON MARKET** In May an agreement was concluded between Nigeria and the six members of the European Economic Community, making Nigeria an associate member of the European Common Market. Up to now there have been eighteen members in Africa with the status of associate members and most of these are the French-speaking territories which were dragged into the Community without their consent by France when she signed the 1957 Treaty of Rome.

The Havana Afro-Asian and Latin American Peoples' Solidarity Conference pointed out that the European Common Market relations with African countries is a modern example of 'collective imperialism'. To put it at its lowest, one must be extremely suspicious of the real purpose behind economic associations by emergent nations with those which for centuries have used their economic power to bleed Africa dry.

## **TRADE UNION NEWS FROM AFRICA**

**Liberia** The United States-orientated regime of President Tubman in Liberia called out troops to put down a strike of workers at the U.S. Firestone Rubber Co. One worker was killed and many were injured. It also used the occasion to impose fresh restrictions on labour unions, giving as an excuse the allegation that it wished 'to halt foreign infiltrators from disturbing the public order'. The new restrictions were imposed under 'exceptional powers' which President Tubman was given by the Liberian Parliament to deal with the strike.



**Zambia** In contrast to the brutality displayed by the Liberian regime against workers striking for better conditions, Zambia's President Kaunda expressed sympathy with the 30,000 African mine-workers who went on strike on the Zambian Copperbelt. A commission was appointed to go into the workers' grievances and one of the noteworthy terms of reference of this commission is that it was instructed to investigate the disparity which exists between the conditions of service of expatriate labour and local labour. The strike lasted for about two weeks.

**Dahomey** Trade union leaders in Dahomey presented General Soglio with a series of economic and political demands including the revision of the constitution and suggestions for 'an economic stimulus' by cancelling last year's 25 per cent salary reductions. There was also a strong demand for agrarian reform.

**Algeria** Workers in the Algerian oil refinery came out on strike for higher pay and more Algerianization.

**Congo (Kinhasa)** Following a strike by teachers, General Mobutu, the Congolese President, suspended the right to strike. Four of the Congo's most important trade unions urged him to reconsider his decision. In a published statement they said 'General Mobutu's grave decision threatens one of the basic liberties recognized by the Congolese constitution'.

**Nigeria** A new federation of Nigerian trade unions to be known as the Nigerian Trade Union Federation (N.T.U.F.P.) has been formed by the three major labour groups in the country.

**Kenya** Seven hundred workers came out on strike in the Jamal Engineering Works in Kenya.

Thirteen trade union leaders including the secretary-general of the Central Organization of Trade Unions resigned from K.A.N.U. They said their decision was political.

**Ghana** The Western-orientated I.C.F.T.U. made its appearance in Ghana again in the person of Alhaji H.P. Adebola of Nigeria who represented the I.C.F.T.U. at the recent Ghana T.U.C. Conference.

## **SOME INTERESTING STATISTICS**

Adrian Cadbury, chairman of British Cocoa and Chocolate Ltd., announced that the company's group profits (after tax) rose from £4,112,000 in 1964 to £6,319,000 in 1965. . . .

Rowntree's profits rose 18 per cent in 1965 as compared with 1964. Total pre-taxation profit rose from £3.67 million to about £4.335 million in 1965. . . .

Between 1950 and 1958 United States investment in Africa doubled and in 1958 stood at 746 million dollars. By 1960 it was over a billion dollars. In 1964 it had risen to 1,620 million dollars of which 467 million was invested in South Africa.



# BOOK REVIEWS

## **The Banished People —Helen Joseph's Report**

THE STORY OF South Africa's banished people is one of such unbelievable inhumanity that words lose their power to encompass it. House arrest, solitary confinement, torture, imprisonment—these other punishments of political opponents are heard of more but no less terrible is the fate of the banished.

It is a penalty reserved almost entirely for tribal Africans, and because the victims are not well known outside their area, and because their actual number is not large, they disappear into the alien deserts to which they are sent. Few of them can read or write; they have no means of expressing the nature of their lives, no means of communicating with the world from which they have been exiled. Silence covers the lives of the banished.

The law under which people are banished from their homes was passed in 1927. It gave the Governor-General power to remove any African tribe or person from one place to another if 'expedient in the general public interest'; and to order that he should remain there until allowed to leave again. Previous governments had used this power only a few times; but the Nationalists found it a useful way of dealing with political opponents without the need to resort to courts and trials, and with the minimum of publicity. When resistance to Bantu Authorities and other laws flared up in the countryside in the 1950s, many people were banished. Most of them had lived in tribal reserves and their disappearance was not generally known. When one or two prominent Congress leaders were sent into exile, attention was drawn to the banished people.

The victims are taken from their homes, or summoned to appear before the Native Commissioner, and then spirited away. In not one case that is known were their families informed of their fate; they simply disappeared, and weeks, or months, or sometimes years after, their wives and relatives found out that they had been banished.

They are invariably sent to trust farms (reserve territory) far from their own homes, where people living nearby, if there are any, speak a different language; they arrive without furniture, spare clothes or any equipment, to be dumped in small, empty huts set in barren countryside, and there they are left to rot. A few may find work as labourers on local farms; most have nothing to do.

In May 1962, as an order restricting her to Johannesburg for five years expired, Helen Joseph set out in a small car with two companions to visit the banished people. She had been corresponding with some of them through her work on a Welfare Committee which had been established to assist them. The story of this 8,000-mile journey to remote parts of South Africa forms the most substantial part of her book, *Tomorrow's Sun*. It is deeply moving; a story of despair, loneliness, often tragedy, yet at the same time revealing once again the vitality of the human spirit. While Helen Joseph wrote many articles about the banished after her journey, this is the full story of a hazardous trip; enthralling, appalling, and inspiring.

Her punishment for undertaking this journey and publicising the fate of the banished people was to be put under twelve-hour-a-day house arrest—the first person to be served with such an order.

The book is in three parts. The first part is a brief autobiography, which explains how a middle-class English girl came to live in South Africa, and how she became involved in the political struggles around her. This, in itself, was a remarkable journey for anyone to make, from the time when as a student she sided with those who thought it wrong to dance with African students, to the time when she found herself with 155 others, Africans, Indians and Whites, in the four-and-a-half-year long treason trial.

The second part of the book is the journey to the banished.

The third part is a description of life under house arrest. Of the men and women of all races who have been put under house arrest, few remain. They are either in jail now, or have left the country. Helen Joseph has, with enormous courage, been able to endure the tensions and loneliness of this enforced self-imprisonment, because it is her firm belief that white people who dedicate themselves to the political struggle in South Africa have a duty to remain there, whatever the



consequences. She sees herself as a symbol of those pledged to struggle with the people of South Africa 'side by side until liberty has been won'.

The manuscript of *Tomorrow's Sun* was posted out of South Africa surreptitiously, chapter by chapter, with great care. 'As to repercussions after publication', she wrote, 'these are really anyone's guess'. The repercussions have been yet another ban, even more stringent than those that went before, a ban that now prohibits her entirely from writing, and has caused her to lose her job.

The writing is an improvement on Mrs. Joseph's first book, *If this be Treason*. She has allowed the story itself to make its own impact without undue emphasis. 'What I have seen is no more than a portion of the whole picture of persecution and racial oppression that prevails in this land', she writes. It is a portion that must not be hidden, and *Tomorrow's Sun* is a valuable and human record of some of the crimes of apartheid.

S. AZAD

*Tomorrow's Sun*, by Helen Joseph. Hutchinson, London, 35s.



## Our Editorial on Nigeria

### “VERY GOOD”

IN YOUR EDITORIAL NOTE *Reflections on Nigeria* (AFRICAN COMMUNIST, No. 24) you wrote that you were prepared to suspend judgment on the military government until the new constitution comes out. I enclose an attempted social and economic analysis which might interest you for publication.\* However, I think the rest of the Editorial was very good. I am translating the Editorial into Hausa and will pass copies of it around for people to read. In your publication there are a few articles which I feel I can translate into readable Hausa and which will make some impact if circulated widely.

YUSIFU USMAN,  
Katsina, Nigeria.

### “MOST UNFORTUNATE”

In the recent issue of your magazine THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST number 24, First Quarter 1966, the following occurred under your editorial note *Reflections on Nigeria*:

General Ironsi has announced that he and his colleagues are preparing a new constitution. Most Nigerians will doubtless feel that whatever emerges from these deliberations, it can hardly be worse than what went before. Like them, we are prepared to suspend judgment until we see what is proposed, although the first announcement he made, there reassuring foreign capitalists that there would be no nationalization of industry, hardly gives the impression that the Sandhurst-trained Nigerian military men have any deep understanding of political affairs, or are inspired with the patriotic, socialist spirit of the African Revolution. And why should we expect them to be?

\* See page 58 of this issue.—Editor.



It is most unfortunate that you can write in this vein knowing fully well that a preponderating majority of the people of Nigeria gave and still give full support to the Army because Nigerians know that these men were imbued with patriotic zeal when the reins of government were handed over to them in January, 1966.

It is time we tell you to stop all the meaningless doctrines you have always been instigated to write about Nigeria and her leadership. Those who gave you the impression know very well in their heart of hearts that the activities of the military men have met with acclamation because we Nigerians know that they are men with understanding and patriotism.

Do you want them to plunge Nigeria into the same pit into which your darling Dr. Kwame Nkrumah plunged Ghana before his deposition? Do you want Nigeria to drive away genuine investors just as Nkrumah did only to find to his regret that your people, Russians and Chinese, were interested only in ideological warfare and not the development and welfare of Ghanaians? When Ghana had no milk, when Ghana had no matches, your people did not help her, rather your people were planning how they can get themselves entrenched in Ghana only for the purpose of propagation of communist ideology.

Please leave the Nigerian military men alone, whether they were trained in Sandhurst or not does not matter. They are doing fine work in our own country and they have the support of all patriotic Nigerians.

Yours faithfully,

ALHAJI H. P. ADEBOLA

President,

United Labour Congress of Nigeria.

## **SOL DUBULA'S ARTICLES**

The articles that appeared consecutively in the *African Communist*, by Sol Dubula, are not only of continental importance, but also of world significance. They will undoubtedly clear up the foggy political atmosphere in which the P.A.C., since its breakaway from the A.N.C., managed to hide its demagogic opportunism, characterized by the political bankruptcy of the worst type.

The lucky are those of us, who have come across the articles in the *African Communist*. We are now put in a position where we shall not only be able to know the truth about P.A.C., but shall be able to put it in its right place—the political scrap-yard.

Most unlucky are those who deserve to read these articles but through no fault of theirs or that of the publishers, will not be able to see them. I have in mind, among others, the people of the country like Bechuanaland (my country), where the *African Communist* is one of the banned publications.

These are the most essential type of writings that the new generation of Africa need for the solution of the continental problems facing them, because the articles give the youth the how and why of things; thanks to the papers like the *African Communist*, which are making this possible, by advancing to the front line as a true guide out of the present continental political labyrinth.

Wishing you good health and all the success in all your true writings for the mental emancipation of mankind.

Yours fraternally,

KLAAS K. MOTSHIDISI.

### **A READER IN ZAMBIA**

I am very grateful to you that despite all the odds you have kept on sending me those educative magazines—the *African Communist*. May I again take this opportunity to thank you and all the members of the Editorial Board for the splendid work you are doing. Keep up the work. Victory is on our side. Long live the South African Communist Party! Yours in the struggle for the liberation of Mother Africa.

P. CHAMUNDA.

### **RAJANI PALME DUTT IS SEVENTY**

DEAR COMRADE DUTT,

The Editorial Board of the *African Communist* sends you warm brotherly greetings on your seventieth birthday.

We want to take this opportunity to acknowledge that our journal and our Party are deeply beholden to you. And this is not only because of the valuable contributions you have made to our columns—and we hope you will continue, from time to time, to make.

It is also because your theoretical work—we may mention particularly *India Today* and *The Crisis of Britain and the Empire*—have helped us in very important ways to clarify our thinking; and because for very many years your Notes of the Month and the general tone and style of the *Labour Monthly* have set a standard of original and profound Marxist analysis and literary excellence for all Communist publicists, especially in the English-speaking world.



We know that advancing years have occasioned your retirement from the centre of political activity—another very good example, we think, for Communist and other elder statesmen. But we hope that for a long time still your wisdom and mature experience will continue to enrich our movement.

Very sincerely yours,

A. LERUMO,  
Editorial Board,  
*African Communist*.

DEAR COMRADE LERUMO,

Permit me to thank you and all comrades of the Editorial Board of the *African Communist*, for your generous message of greetings and good wishes on the occasion of my seventieth birthday.

You can be sure that it is a source of great joy and pride for me to receive these greetings and good wishes from the journal which is today performing such an outstanding vanguard role in spreading the glorious message and teachings of Communism to light forward the path of African liberation.

The work and progress of your journal is followed with growing appreciation by comrades and all fighters for national freedom all over the world.

With all good wishes for further success in the advance of your work.

Yours fraternally,

R. PALME DUTT.





Each worker today feels that this stronghold belongs to him and that this industry, this production and these profits are his own. The outcome of the work of every workman will go to him and to the sons of his country rather than to a feudalist.

Each worker now feels that he has a share in the profits realized. By profits we do not only mean the share you receive at the end of the year, but also the profits which are turned into new investments to be used for expanding industry, employ new workers and increase our industrial power.

I remember that wages in 1959 totalled some £4,900,000 for 18,000 workers. Today wages for the 22,000 workers in this industry have reached a total of £6.5 million. This indicates how much the average income for the worker and the individual has increased. I have already said that we are not rich in resources. But we are a nation of powerful workers. We can achieve many things through the power of work. In our socialist transformation we depend on a strong alliance of the people's working forces.

## **WORKING PEOPLE**

What is the meaning of the working people? It is the people where every individual is working to improve his standard as well as the standard of his country. It is the society which is cleansed from exploitation in all its forms and colours; the economic as well as the social exploitation. The working people is the society where equal opportunities are provided for all. Each according to his labour and initiative to serve his country. The working people is the society of masters, not servants or slaves. It is where everyone is master in his own country. It is where the worker does not feel a slave to the machine nor to capital.

The worker toiled just to maintain himself alive and the fruit of his labour was usurped by the capitalists and the monopolists who collected millions of pounds and re-invested them to collect more millions.

The working people can only mean the liberation of the peasant from feudalism. Every farmer should feel that he is his own master, that he is not being dominated by another man; every farmer, whether he is a peasant or a small landowner, should feel that he is his own master, that he is not dominated by the feudalists.

The community of the working people means to get rid of the feudalist and capitalist societies and then build up the socialist society. . . .

Before World War II and before World War I there was a feudalist reactionary society dominated by a corrupt and exploiting ruling dynasty. This dynasty was co-operating with imperialism and reaction. The society developed and some agricultural exploiters established a capitalist and feudal society and thus capital allied itself with imperialism. Where was the working people? The working people was lost. What employment was there? There was but little employment and thus exploiting capitalists and feudalists secured the profits they wanted. They employed some workers but there was a constant demand for employment and the result was that there were many unemployed workers. The capitalists alone ate and enjoyed life, travelled to Europe and raised money. Workers and farmers; the working people found nothing.

The worker farmer or employee scarcely got what would enable him and his family to live. Of course they were always surrounded with groups of opportunists who served feudalism and acted as the whip with which to hit the people and exploit them. The feudal society cannot live; the society all of whose wealth goes to one family and whose people are of no value. Our society cannot exist under a feudalist rule. The people must claim their rights. . . .

The man who gathers a million pounds, two, three, ten or twenty million, how did he get all this money? Any man, living in this world, if he remained throughout his life working, and if we gave him the largest possible return of his work will never manage to gather this wealth or to have an income like this. . . .

## **THEFT**

It is either theft or exploitation.

By theft I mean commission. He builds a block of flats and gets commission, he concludes a transaction and takes a commission, buys aircraft and takes a commission, builds an airfield and takes a commission, builds an army and takes a commission. If he does not get the commission, well the dynasty does. But it is the people's money. It is not his wealth but the people's wealth. . . .

The second thing is taking the result of the sweat of the people, the workers. He pays one quarter of a pound to a worker who deserves one pound, thus taking the three-quarters of the pound for himself. This is what we meant when we referred to the exploitation of the worker. Hence the process is one involving a theft and exploitation. We saw this taking place in our society when we used to be a feudalist and a capitalist society.



Today we are witnessing a socialist transformation in our society, where all means of production are in the hands of the working people. There will be no exploitation in this case, as the people have managed to restore their rights, controlled production and exerted unusual efforts to develop it. . . .

What we pride ourselves upon is that we fought and eliminated the feudalist state, the exploitation of capital and the corrupt ownership. We fought for social justice and succeeded in getting it, and we fought for socialism and achieved prosperity on the path of socialism. . . .

We put an end to feudalism, corrupt capitalism and the agents of imperialism. We have taken steps for the liquidation of class distinction. The people have now control over means of production. At the same time the people put an end to agricultural feudalist ownership. The people drafted their National Charter, the charter of the working people. At the same time the people proceeded towards the realization of socialism based on sufficiency and justice. The people are trying to realize sufficiency by their work in all fields. It is the people that offer both the money and the work.

## **MONEY**

The past development plan required £1,500 million, part of which was borrowed from abroad, but the rest was raised by you, by the people and not by the feudalists, the capitalists or the opportunists. The people offered £1,100 million for the plan and the balance, £400 million, was borrowed from abroad.

The people besides offered work, built factories, constructed the High Dam, dug canals, reclaimed land, built houses, schools and hospitals.

The people not only controlled the means of production but also offered money and work for the sake of development and progress; they exerted efforts to build a powerful, developed, advanced country, depending on its own strength in all fields.

The people advanced to change decisively the shape of life on their land in order to make justice prevail among all classes. But have we dissolved class distinctions, brothers? Have we eradicated domination?

No, we are still working to attain our major objective: Socialism, social justice and equality of opportunity. . . .

The people everywhere will get their rights; farmers will get their rights and the people everywhere will work for the development of the country and for social justice and progress. . . .

But thanks to God, we have liberated ourselves from the community of feudalism, the community of exploitive capital and the community of monopoly and are now proceeding with strength and determination raising the slogans of the working people. We raise the slogan of the people's working power, the alliance of all the people's working forces in face of imperialism and in face of imperialist agents and reactionary powers.

Of course, we have not stamped out reaction yet. Reaction still remains and in 1956 reactionary powers found in the British the hope which might turn the clock backward and restore them their old influence. . . .

The year 1956 showed the people which regained its liberty, declaring it would fight for the rights it achieved. It showed the people—which got rid of imperialism, feudalism, monopoly and the corrupt ownership—standing against the imperialist aggression and defeating it. This people could, then, nationalize all the foreign economic interests in the country, and topple the pillars of exploitation.

It could regain its robbed rights, wealth and the means of production which originally belonged to it. . . .

Neither imperialism nor reaction will ever be able to defeat us in our country. We are undertaking the liquidation of imperialism and reaction around us and we are adopting a policy of 'long-wind' until we finish them. We will never get tired, because we are a struggling, fighting and sacrificing people. We do that for ideals. We are a revolutionary people fighting for socialist ideals. This is what we were aiming at in our struggle for the elimination of imperialism and exploitation.

Someone wearing a beard claims that socialism is atheism and blasphemy. Yet why is it atheism and blasphemy? Socialism restores the right of the worker. Socialism gives equal opportunities to all the people.

Socialism is the remedy for feudalism. It abolishes feudalism and changes the society from a society of slaves to one of masters. Socialism gives man his dignity as well as his life to live. Socialism means that all the people work towards the establishment of a dear and a dignified society. In a socialist society there is no family whose members obtain 170 million dollars or 50 million dollars and keep depositing it in banks. Socialism means that we put an end to poverty, take from the rich to give to the poor. . . .

Brethren, we are building the socialist society where equal opportunities are afforded for all, a society of social justice which is the product of the progressive revolution. In pursuing this goal, brethren, we are applying God's will and the doctrine of His prophet. We are not fooled by the ways of the bearded ones. . . .



## **NATIONALIZED**

Our grown-ups now tell their children about the bearded ones we had who turned this country into a feudal estate. But the people rose on July 23rd, 1952, and plucked their beards. We subsequently regained everything—the land, the means of production, our money and our country; we drove out the forces of occupation, the exploiters and monopolists; we nationalized the means of production and the people became masters over them. The people rallied together and exerted stupendous efforts to build the society of justice and sufficiency—a land of prosperity. We began to invest money and to work. We executed the first Five-Year Plan in which we invested £1,500 million and built more than a thousand factories all of which belong to the people. We have no bearded ones among us who own a single factory. The factories belong to the people—to you and to your children and kin and to your bigger family which is the whole people.

We have emerged from the Five-Year Plan with a very high percentage of production, and this income will not go to the pocket of this or that person.

The President of the Republic is not rich, nor is he descended from a feudal family. No such family will rule us. The son of the President of the Republic is no better than the son of any other person, he is like the son of anybody.

There are no classes in our society; we are dissolving class distinctions in our society.

Who is the President of the Republic? His father was an employee descended from the common people; he used to receive a monthly salary of £25; he was not a king, nor was he a sultan.

Who will tomorrow be the President of the Republic? One of you. Nobody will rule you but yourselves; you have regained your country.

This is what we have achieved and what we are fighting for. . . .

At the beginning of the revolution we planned to invest some £100 million in industry over a two-year period. We later planned to invest some £303 million in industry over a period of three years.

In the first plan of 1960, some £1,500 million were invested over a period of five years, in industry and other branches. This time we shall invest £3,166 million in seven years. Actually, I wanted to make them only five years, but I found out that you showed some signs of weariness. During the last five years some £1,500 million were taken from you for the construction of factories, schools, roads, bridges and hospitals. You naturally got a bit tired, because we took all this money to build factories, but not to buy luxury goods.

It goes without saying that when I say that I want to spend £1,500 million it means that I have to spend at least 40 per cent of such a sum in hard currency. Then comes the question: What shall I give you, factories or meat? I preferred to give you factories rather than meat.

Then when the price of meat rose, you grumbled a little bit. The reactionary elements and people abroad said there is a famine in Egypt. Despite the fact that while passing Al Azhar Street one smells the Kebab along this street, the broadcasting stations of Israel and of those who wear beards, as well as the papers of those with beards, claim that there is a famine in Egypt. Do you ever go hungry?

Instead of supplying you with meat for seven days a week, we made the meat available for four days a week. Since the meat of our country was not enough, we imported meat from China and Australia, Ecuador, the Sudan and Somalia. We also import wheat and maize. Last year when we doubled the production of maize, we did not import maize, or perhaps we imported a small quantity of maize.

## **CURRENCY**

The last plan, in which £1,500 million were invested, had created a number of problems for us, particularly the problems of hard currency.

We then discussed whether it was preferable to invest £3,000 million in five years, six years or seven years. We hesitated between exerting further pressure on you in the coming five years, or to stretch the plan to seven years instead of five. In seven years we will invest £3,200 million instead of just £3,000 million.

One year of the seven years is already past. By stretching the plan over seven years we were trying to relax a little bit to avoid bottlenecks in supply. We do not want to borrow much, because borrowing means paying a 7 per cent interest on the loans we get. We only get loans at a 2 per cent interest from the Soviet Union and countries of the Eastern bloc. On the rest of our loans we pay an interest of 7 per cent which means that after ten years we pay off the loan plus 70 per cent.

In the coming seven years, we need to borrow another £400 million and so limit or decrease the burden of the loans. But the rest of the money, the remaining part of the £3,200 million, that is £2,800 million, how shall we get them? Of course, it is you who will pay this amount. And the foreign currency which we shall need to buy the factories, from where shall we get it? Of course, we shall have to economize here and there and tighten the belt a little.



I used to entertain the idea that we tighten the belt once and for all and carry out the development plan in five years. But we later made it seven instead of five and relaxed the belt a little, in so far as necessities, and not luxuries, are concerned.

And then we are being teased now by the reactionaries abroad who are claiming that we are bankrupt and hungry. But we really do not care. We shall build our country but they will never achieve their objectives. They are the agents of imperialism and we shall pluck their beards for them. The people will never accept reactionary agents or feudalists who claim that they are having all the luxuries we lack since their people are deprived of the very necessities of life. . . .

So in the coming plan we will spend generously on the necessities, not on the luxuries. We will try to have self-sufficiency.

In the past Plan we invested £1,500 million, but in the coming Plan we will invest £3,200 million. Our hopes increase and our ability develops; we have now a solid base, an industrial base, an agricultural base, a production base in everything.

In the new plan allocations have been made for the various sectors: £1,102 million for industry (35 per cent of the plan); £263 million for electric power; £598 million for agriculture (including £41 million for the completion of the High Dam body); £558 million for transport communications, supply and the Suez Canal; £270 million for housing (to build 300,000 new housing units in towns and 600,000 new others in rural districts).

In addition, there are several other million pounds for investments in public services; health, education and public utilities.

Naturally, many of those present here are inquiring if we will be able to do all this. Yes: With action, money and determination we can achieve it all. I am telling you today that during the past few years, you in Mehalla have managed to expand your factories at a rate of 200 per cent. We tried ourselves, and experience is the best proof. We succeeded and can still achieve more successes. . . .

In order to establish the society we are aspiring for, we must double our national income in the shortest possible time. We must spend and even spend more than we can afford, and in so doing, we will be faced with problems and difficulties. Meanwhile, let us consider the other equation; the easier equation: if we do not spend and if we do not set up factories nor reclaim land, there will be no work and your sons and brothers will be unemployed and the country will remain undeveloped. In this case those who earn enough to eat, will eat and those who don't earn enough will starve. Why is there a greater demand for meat today? It is because people now earn more money than ever before.

Wages rose from £350 million in 1952 to £879 million today. The volume of employment rose from 4.5 million to 7,300,000.

Wages by the end of the Second Plan will reach £1,191 million and employment will reach 8,700,000 workers. Of course, we do not mean to employ more people without increase in production. For the more money people get, the more they buy and the more they demand.

We have faced many problems and we are apt to face other problems. If a certain factory faces trouble due to shortage in technicians, reactionary people and capitalists would blame it on socialism.

How shall we act in such situations? Is it possible that we may return the factory to the capitalist? Of course not. Under the capitalist management there were many problems, but nobody cared since these factories were considered the private property of a certain Pasha or Bey. You all know what boards of directors were like before.

For this purpose I say that we must study the past Plan and its circumstances and our capacity for work under these circumstances. . . .

The important thing is that we should learn a lesson and make a 100 per cent achievement in the Second Development Plan; we take a lesson in self-confidence and capacity for achievement. If we managed to benefit from the experiment of the first plan, then we can carry out the Second Development Plan and make up for the deficiency in the first. This means that we increase the production over the targets of the next plan.

We really benefited much. It was our first work in planning. Formerly, we were working in a vacuum: there were no accurate accounts and the number of experts was limited. We undertook a variety of projects. I wish to point out that we invested £400 million in the first Plan which gave us no cash return. The money we invested in the High Dam has not yet yielded any cash return. The same is the case with the land we reclaimed.

We have invested money in turning basin-irrigated land to perennial irrigation which has still not yielded any cash return. Money has also been ploughed into industries which have not started production.

But today we are more confident in our work and in our figures. We are working with greater force than before and the people working have increased. We have gained experience and enhanced our efficiency. The socialist system has been established in our labour unions and boards of directors. There is no conflict between management and labour; whatever there may be in this way is but a residue of the past. As we study the first plan and evaluate it, we must co-operate in order to bring management and labour even closer together. The success of the new plan and the achievement of its goals requires full



and enlightened mobilization of all efforts and not just enthusiasm. We need conviction besides enthusiasm, because enthusiasm which springs from conviction never wanes.

### **THE ASWAN HIGH DAM**

Ten years ago, we were seeking loans from the International Bank, America and England, so that we could build the High Dam. After two months they withdrew their offers to finance the High Dam; but we did not stop.

I told Abdul Hakim Amer that if the High Dam needed ten years to be built, we will build it in twenty years and will use primitive equipment instead of machines. I asked him to form a committee to undertake the building of the Dam in this way. We declared that we needed no loans for we were determined to have it built under whatever conditions. We did not stop and then we found people ready to help us.

But it was our workers who shouldered the burden. The Upper Egyptians are there in Aswan working side by side with Russians from Siberia. I always thank them for they are living under temperature of 40 centigrade. Our Siberian brothers, like our Upper Egyptians, do not bother about temperatures reaching 40 or 50 or 60 centigrade. They are used to this as you all know.

The Soviet Union extended to us all assistance; she extended to us facilities in the form of loans for the High Dam. We started with these and to them we added from local capital.

We have so far paid our instalments of the cost of the first stage; that is what we have so far paid to the Soviet Union. It is the Egyptian people who eventually pay, and this is natural; nobody will pay for us or on our behalf. Our work alone guarantees repayment, our work and our pockets, of course.

It was beyond their imagination that we would build the High Dam.

In August next year, we will obtain electric power from the High Dam; the first turbine will get into operation.

Those who fight us are not new to us; they are the forces of reaction and imperialism; we have become experts in fighting such forces.

They imposed a blockade on us and they failed; they set up anti-U.A.R. radios and they failed. They assembled the forces of reaction and it was no use; they installed Nuri el Said, but without avail. They set up bases, but without result; they brought their fleets to strike at us, in 1956, but in vain.

We have become accustomed to such matters. If we get up in the morning to find it calm and peaceful, we feel suspicious. We have been accustomed to the whole business since July 23, 1952. They have

never left us alone; they have paid money to kill us, to stage coups; they have paid money to the Moslem Brotherhood; they have sent arms to the Moslem Brotherhood, as you have read in the trials. They have bought the Moslem Brotherhood, but no use, no use.

It never happened that they managed to stop our work. Since the beginning of the revolution and till the present, our work has always been many-sided, despite all the attacks which were launched against us. A little earlier I was speaking of the 100 million pound programme of industrialization. Did they leave us in peace in 1953 and 1954? Weren't we fighting a political battle for evacuation and at the same time socially fighting the rule of the corrupt monarchy and the higher class and applying the first agrarian reform law?

The second step was the 303 million pounds programme of industry between 1957 and 1960. Of course, in 1956 they launched their aggression against us; they did not spare us for one day, one night or one month. No, between 1957 and 1960, we were in the thick of the battle against pacts, after the tripartite aggression, and we were in a battle against economic blockade.

We were never left alone, as we fought for Arab nationalism and unity, and during the First Five-Year Plan. We were operating at various fronts. We invested more than 1,500 million pounds, but at the same time supported all liberation movements everywhere. We were facing the setback of secession, holding the conference of popular working forces, issuing the Charter, going to Yemen to fight, and working for non-alignment and Afro-Asian solidarity. We faced all sorts of psychological pressures, built and armed a strong army, and got ready to face a confrontation with Israel some day. We never stopped working. . . .

## **CHANGES**

Some say that today there are changes and there is a reactionary tide whose effects we have witnessed in Asia and Africa. There is no doubt that imperialism has allied itself with reaction and that both are seeking day and night to hit us. Yet this dream of theirs would never come true on this land. Why? Because a struggling revolutionary people are living on this land. The Egyptian people will always hold out and this will cause the reactionary tide to recede. This is the inevitability of history. The reactionary tide will recede until reaction is completely defeated in the Arab world. . . .

We have two things before us: the formidable objective we are trying to achieve through the plan, and the bitter battle we are facing and which is represented by the imperialist reactionary tide. All this



would not hinder us and as in the past, our people will fight the two battles simultaneously for they are capable of building and fighting at the same time. In fact both are but one battle; the battle of the Arab's right to be master of his own land politically, socially and economically.

Therefore, it is the duty of the Arab to liquidate all powers of imperialism and exploitation. Everyone should know everything in his country and realize that his effort and his opinion contribute to the making of the future. We wish to proceed on this basis during the coming stage. The people must be mobilized and conscripted for the execution of the plan, so that we may face imperialism, reaction and the supporters of imperialism and Zionism. We are building on two fronts which are in fact one front. This is why I have said that the plan should be discussed at the Arab Socialist Union and its units as well as at production units, factories, universities and every Governorate. Every Governorate should know its share in the plan and the plan in general. Such a discussion should proceed side by side with the reports on the follow-up of the First Plan.

We take the Gharbia Governorate for instance and examine the accomplishments realized in it, how many schools have been built, how many health units, factories, covered drainage systems were carried out. We should get a clear idea of the things that were realized and the things that were not realized.

Thus everyone will be able to form a clear idea about what is being done in his country. Newspapers criticize more than they give a picture of the accomplishments. They criticize the productive unit, and the deviations that take place. They must write about these things and also about the accomplishments realized in the country.

This discussion must be extended politically. We must begin working out our permanent constitution, because our present constitution is temporary. The National Assembly must prepare the permanent constitution. When they complete formulating the constitution their work will not be over, they will have to serve the five full years. They must not think that the completion of the constitution means that the Assembly has served its purpose and that a new Assembly will be elected.

They should begin with an open discussion in each unit of the principles and all the chapters one by one. The A.S.U. executive committees or leaderships must take part, together with their bases, in the discussion. Each executive bureau and group of leaders must state its view, whether they approve or do not approve and make

known their observations. After that, when a referendum is held on the constitution, the ayes and nays should not be merely perfunctory, but the result of full comprehension and discussion by all in the production units, the A.S.U. units, the districts and the universities.

The masses fully understand the plan because it carries their hopes and belongs to them and they supervise its execution. The masses also understand the constitution, because it is the foundation of public action, a guarantee of freedom and of continued action by the masses in shaping their own future and enjoying it economically and politically. In this the masses carry out the will of God which is the will of justice. May God guide your footsteps and peace be upon you.