

AFRICA:

NATIONAL

AND

SOCIAL

REVOLUTION



ARQUIVO HISTÓRICO DAS CLASSES

TRABALHADORAS N.º _____

3/6

**AFRICA:
NATIONAL
AND
SOCIAL
REVOLUTION**

*Collection of Papers
Read at the Cairo Seminar*

APHS

PEACE AND SOCIALISM PUBLISHERS
PRAGUE • 1967

CONTENTS

Preface	5
Message of Greetings by Gamal Abdel Nasser	8
Speech by the Representative of Algeria	10
Greetings of the Guinean Delegation	13
Greetings of the TANU Delegation, Tanzania	17
Anti-Imperialist Struggle in Africa at the Present Stage, <i>Lutfi El Khott</i> (UAR)	19
Some Problems of Social Progress, <i>Dr. Alexander Sobolev</i> (USSR)	42
Neo-Colonialism in Africa, <i>Prof. Ali Yata</i> (Morocco)	65
African Socialism Revisited, <i>Dr. Kwame Nkrumah</i> (Ghana)	86
Structure and Position of the Working Class in Senegal, <i>Majhemout Diop</i> (Senegal)	93
Democracy in Africa, <i>Omar Moustafa</i> (Sudan)	105
The Mass Party and Socialist Construction, <i>Idrissa Diarra</i> (Mali)	114
The Fight for the Liberation of Southern Africa, <i>J. B. Marks</i> (Republic of South Africa)	123
The Rhodesia Crisis: Its Source and Nature, <i>Stephen Nkomo</i> (Zimbabwe)	130
We Build as We Fight, <i>Vasco Cabral</i> ("Portuguese Guinea")	139
New Type of Relations, <i>Khaled Mohel El-Din</i> (UAR)	142
Military Coups d'état in Africa, <i>Tigani Babiker</i> (Sudan)	140
The African Revolution—Component of the World Revolutionary Process, <i>Mac Laurin</i> (Senegal)	159
The Emergence of a Revolutionary Vanguard in the Cameroons, <i>Abdoulaye Kone</i> (Cameroon)	168

Maintaining and Consolidating Progressive African States. <i>Michel Kamei</i> (UAR)	174
Rally the Patriots and Revolutionaries, <i>Richard Andriamanjato</i> (Madagascar)	202
The Intellectuals and the African Liberation Movement, <i>Thierno</i> <i>Amath Dansoko</i> (Senegal)	205
Agrarian Problems in Africa, <i>Abdel Ghoneim</i> (UAR)	217
True Nature of Imperialist "Aid", <i>Michael Harmel</i> (South Africa)	232
The Alliance of the Forces of the Working People, <i>Dr. Fuad</i> <i>Murzi</i> (UAR)	240
Planning and Source of Accumulation, <i>Shoeb M. El-Rifi</i> (Mo- rocco)	255

AHS

PREFACE

The Marxist theory of the revolutionary process has always stressed the need to unite the revolutionary forces on a world scale. As far back as the middle of the last century, the *Communist Manifesto* advanced the slogan "Workers of all lands, unite!"

Due to the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia in October 1917, the world revolutionary process rose to a new and higher stage. Millions of people oppressed by the imperialists joined in active struggle for national freedom. The international content of the unity of the revolutionary forces in the new conditions found fuller expression in the appeal "Workers of all lands and oppressed peoples, unite!"

The unity of the working-class and national-liberation movement was first achieved in struggle against social and national oppression in tsarist Russia, and was embodied in the Soviet Union, a mighty power which defeated fascism and weakened imperialism, and has been doing everything to bring about an unprecedented upsurge of the world revolutionary movement.

In recent decades the development of the world revolutionary process has been marked by the milestones of great victories: the formation of the socialist world system, the Chinese revolution, the disintegration of the colonial system in Asia, the emergence of the first seat of socialism on the American continent—in Cuba—and the winning of national independence by most African countries.

The world revolutionary process today unites three auto-

mous and interacting streams: the socialist world system, the national-liberation movement of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America, and the working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries.

The powerful pressure of these streams is forcing imperialism to abandon one position after another, to make concessions. But the nature of imperialism has not changed, and the imperialists fiercely resist the revolutionary development of the peoples, using the slightest opportunity to regain lost positions.

The increased aggressiveness of the imperialist and reactionary forces headed by the world policeman, U.S. imperialism, expresses itself, first of all, in the armed suppression of the liberation struggle of the peoples. The escalation of the dirty war in Vietnam, the criminal Israeli aggression against the Arab peoples, and new attempts to abolish the independence of the Congo are only some of the glaring instances of the mounting activity of the forces of imperialism and reaction.

The revolutionary forces of the world are realizing more and more that they must achieve maximum unity of action if they are to repel imperialist attacks and further the liberation process. At various international forums, at the congresses and meetings of Communist and Workers' parties, the demand is being voiced ever more persistently that the efforts of all the revolutionary forces and of the world Communist and working-class movement be coordinated to promote the world revolutionary process, render effective assistance to the heroic people of Vietnam and foil the intrigues of world imperialism, which is trying to take advantage of the Israeli aggression in the Middle East and hold up the Arab peoples' progress.

The revolution developing on the African continent has become a new, young contingent on the anti-imperialist front. For all the peculiarities of this revolution, historical experience and the first lessons of the development of the newly-established African states are increasingly convincing African revolutionaries that solutions to the fundamental problems of the continent can be found only by resorting to the methods indicated by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

A number of current problems facing the African peoples were discussed at the seminar "Africa: National and Social Revolution", held jointly by the journal *Problems of Peace and Socialism* (Prague) and *Al-Talla* (Cairo) from October 24 to 29, 1966.

This collection contains, in abridged form, only some of the

papers read at the seminar, which drew about seventy scholars and public figures, both Marxists and non-Marxists, from twentyfive-revolutionary parties and organizations of Africa. While the collection cannot possibly reflect the new developments that have taken place in the world and on the continent during the past year, it is of interest to the extent that it raises and analyzes topical problems of the African peoples' fight against imperialism, for social progress and peace, problems which have gained in urgency.

AHS

**MESSAGE OF GREETINGS
BY GAMAL ABDEL NASSER, PRESIDENT
OF THE ARAB SOCIALIST UNION
AND PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
ARAB REPUBLIC**

I take great pleasure in addressing this message to the Africa Seminar held in Cairo at the invitation of the two organs *At-Talia* and *Problems of Peace and Socialism* and hope to see it achieve its great and important objectives: securing for the revolutionary sons of our continent the possibility of an ideological rally, renewing the links of struggle between them, exchanging the fruits of their experience, thus enriching their abilities and affording a wider field of vision and a deeper clarity.

Contemporary African reality, the problems Africa now faces, and the strong, vigorous currents flowing in Africa demand in the first place a clear vision; a vision able both to take in the whole picture and to estimate correctly its component parts, so as to gain renewed strength and ensure an uninterrupted revolutionary struggle on African soil.

The recent years, mainly those which rolled by since 1960, require from all of us to meditate deeply anew on the events in terms of a deeper consciousness.

These six years which began with the rapid appearance of the flags of independence in many regions of the continent, up to this moment characterised by imperialist domination still holding in its grip many peoples, by neo-colonialism still following up its raids, by the monopolies' continued consolidation and extension of positions and by the continued abject and inhuman practice of racial discrimination, this period is worth considering with all the ideological strength of concentration and all the means of scientific analysis which will

allow us to discover, in all honesty, the path which has been followed, and to trace, with equal honesty, the path which should have been followed.

This message will reach you where the forces of progress of Africa rally and while I am in the Indian capital taking part, with friends common to you and to me, in work closely related to that preoccupying you and holding your attention. Still, I follow with interest the work of your Seminar, wishing you the greatest success and convey to you my best wishes of welcome on the banks of the African Nile, eternal and creative.

AHS

SPEECH BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF ALGERIA

On behalf of the Algerian delegation I salute the participants of the Seminar and express our profound solidarity with its organisers who have made this very timely meeting possible. The questions on the agenda are very important ones and the discussion that will develop during the six days of the seminar will throw new light on the problems facing the African continent.

The fact that the seminar opens a few days before the 12th anniversary of the beginning of the Algerian revolution is a happy coincidence, and will make for a spirit of effective work and objectivity at our seminar.

At this moment our thoughts turn to those who paid with their blood for every inch of the African continent liberated so far. Fidelity to the memory of our martyrs pledges us to carry through to the end the cause of liberation started by them.

That is why we welcome our brothers, the representatives and leaders of the national-liberation movement present here among us, to whom we express our most fraternal feelings. The attitude of our country is well known and it will not change. Motivated by principle, Algeria has always fully supported the strivings of the peoples for freedom, justice, and well-being, and renders them concrete aid in their struggle for the independence of their countries.

As an Arab country, and at the same time a country of the Maghreb and of Africa, Algeria belongs to the big family of

nations of the third world, whose solidarity, confirmed at Bandung in 1955, must grow and strengthen.

As regards the countries of the Maghreb, which are bound by ties of religion, language, tradition and history, the community of our interests tells us to coordinate our efforts, particularly in the spheres of the economy and culture. The same can be said of the Arab world of which our country is a part. We shall work indefatigably to promote contact between the Arab countries. Aid to the people of Palestine and the peoples of South Arabia in their struggle for national liberation, which is merging with the struggle against colonialism and neo-colonialism, will become more effective.

Algeria is an African country which is directly interested in the complete liberation of the African continent. Whether it is a matter of fighting apartheid in South Africa, colonialism in Angola, Mozambique, or in "Portuguese" Guinea, or the fascist government in Rhodesia, the Algerian people will always carry out their duty.

Algeria will take its natural place on the side of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America so as to successfully promote their solidarity in economic development.

Comrades, in their fight for liberation from all forms of colonial exploitation the peoples have won impressive victories. In 20 years they have swept away the colonial system which it took the imperialists centuries to build.

But amidst the ruins of this system some bastions have still been left standing. Moreover, colonialism is everywhere transforming itself into neo-colonialism. It would be a mistake to minimise its danger and consider it to be a lesser evil. It is colonialism's last stronghold and the imperialists are trying to defend it by all and every means.

Imperialism, which possesses vast means, is trying to oppose the national-liberation movement and to neutralise it in different parts of the world.

One of the most urgent tasks of the liberatory forces is to carry to a victorious finish the struggle against the survivals of the colonial system and against the stubborn resistance of imperialist aggression in all its forms. The events at present shaking the African continent should not be cause for despair or defeatism. Those who interpret these events as a move to the Right, simply do not understand African reality, particularly when they consciously or unconsciously fail to see that this evolution to the Right involves

only certain countries and certain leaders and not the masses who want unity, an end to colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism.

That is why we believe that the most pressing task facing our countries in their development is to help the masses become imbued with consciousness. This is fundamental to success.

In conclusion I should like to express the conviction that our work will be greatly facilitated by the common feeling uniting us all—abhorrence of imperialism and colonialism.

I conclude by paying tribute on behalf of my country to all those who gave their lives, to all those who are continuing the fight to free the African continent and the whole world from all forms of aggression and domination.

Long live the struggle of the peoples for independence!
Long live the African revolution!

AHS

GREETINGS OF THE GUINEAN DELEGATION

On behalf of the Democratic Party of Guinea and its General Secretary, President Ahmed Sékou Touré, we have the honour of conveying fraternal greetings to you and wishing the work of our great meeting every success.

The fact that the organisers of this exchange of views have chosen as its venue the United Arab Republic, the land of Africa, the land of freedom and the beacon of the revolutionary struggle of our peoples to restore and preserve their independence, dignity and human rights, is for us, Africans, a source of great satisfaction and pride.

The representatives of the camp of freedom, peace, justice and social progress have gathered here, on African soil, to discuss the problems of the present stage of the struggle against imperialism and its lackeys, the problems of the present phase of our revolutionary struggle for economic independence. This is for us a source of strength and new, justified hopes.

The struggle against imperialism in all its forms, against economic backwardness and poverty, for the progressive development of our peoples and our states—these are the objectives of one and the same struggle for freedom, dignity, democratic progress and peace.

The struggle for freedom against the enemies of freedom, against the exploitation of our peoples and plunder of our national wealth, and the struggle for democratic progress, for the social, economic and cultural advance of our countries, are one and the same.

The choice of subjects proposed for our discussion is dictated by the objective reality of Africa which is fighting for its freedom, for respect for its dignity. They also reflect the deep interest of the organisers of the meeting in promoting active solidarity between the peoples of Africa, the socialist countries and all people of goodwill on all continents. It is clear to all how essential it is to promote the unity of Africa's revolutionary forces, the solidarity of the forces of freedom and social progress, to impart a new content to our actions in the face of the new strategy of imperialism.

The present stage of the revolution on the African continent is marked by the rapid march of events, by new and more brutal forms of imperialist aggression, the moral isolation of the camp of colonial rule, the rallying of ever broader sections of the peoples against the enemy of their freedom, the complexity and magnitude of the new tasks.

Several years ago the number one problem of the African peoples was to win political independence. This problem still awaits its solution in view of, for example, Portugal's refusal to end its rule in Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea (Bissau), in view of the attitude of the racist settlers in Rhodesia and South Africa who for the sake of their own interests want to deprive our brothers in Zimbabwe, South-West Africa and South Africa of their right to freedom. The vast majority of the African states are confronted with other complex and vitally important problems such as development of the productive forces and social reforms. The struggle of the progressive forces of the African revolution to accomplish these tasks is accompanied by the unceasing attempts of the imperialists to preserve and restore colonial exploitation, and also by the aggravation of political and social contradictions inside our countries.

The revolutionary forces therefore have to apply tactics that fit the new situation in Africa.

Today, as yesterday, unity of all the healthy forces of the nation and the removal of all reactionary elements is an imperative need. Today, as never before, conscious unity of the peoples is particularly important in view of the attempts of imperialism and the internal reactionaries to halt the revolutionary upsurge of the masses, to stop and reverse the revolutionary process through plots and military coups d'état.

This people's unity, valuable as it is, is not enough. We must prepare our peoples ideologically and practically for organised

struggle which will become more and more desperate and more and more violent.

As it loses territory, sees how its influence and privileges are diminishing in time and in space, imperialism is resorting to more and more insidious and inhuman methods.

In the anti-imperialist struggle the opposing sides employ different weapons. That of the exploiters is known, it boils down to certain crude principles, namely, to:

- split,
- isolate,
- oppress,
- behave with violence and brutality,
- use lies and deceit.

This weapon of the imperialists is opposed by another weapon which is also well known. It is to: unite, organise, expose, paralyse the splitting manoeuvres of the enemy and retain the initiative in the liberation struggle. In other words, the main force of the people in the struggle for their liberation is, first and foremost, the people themselves.

I hope that in the course of our discussion, when speaking of the Guinean people, of the Democratic Party of Guinea and of our liberation struggle, I shall be able to show you the path we have traversed, the landmarks in our unceasing struggle against the enemies of freedom; to tell you that since September 28, 1958, when our people unanimously voted for freedom and rejected slavery, our country has rightly been considered by all to be the enemy for all time of colonialism and neo-colonialism.

Since then imperialism and its lackeys have continuously engineered plots and subversive activities against our people. However, all the attempts of imperialism to imperil our freedom and the gains of the revolution have foundered on the unity of our people, on their determination to defend their sovereignty by all and every means.

It is from this rostrum that I think it pertinent to express the view that today's meeting should, above all, help promote by the most concrete methods solidarity of the world's progressive forces in the fight against our common enemies.

In the face of the global and combined actions by the camp of imperialism and reaction, the camp of peace, freedom and social progress must strengthen its solidarity, increase the effectiveness of its retaliatory blows against the aggressive actions of our common enemies.

At present the imperialists are using sons of Africa, members of a youth organisation which in the past played its role in the fight for freedom, to destroy the gains of our revolution.

These individuals in whom the only thing that is revolutionary now are the revolutionary phrases mouthed by them, are supported and financed by the imperialists as a means of achieving their base objectives in Africa. At present some of these renegades have formed the so-called Front of Liberation of the Guinean Republic.

This front, financed and supported by the reactionaries, has its headquarters in Paris and outposts in certain of the neighbouring African states which render it assistance.

It would be most regrettable if these blind tools of the imperialists succeeded in lulling the vigilance of our friends in the socialist camp and winning their confidence. These corrupt elements must not be allowed to come out against us in defence of imperialism under the cover of the red mantle of the revolution.

Unless a certain vigilance is shown at this level there is a danger of misunderstanding and contradictions arising in our ranks which will lessen the effectiveness of our united struggle against the common enemy.

Throughout our liberation struggle, at its most crucial periods our people always enjoyed your unqualified support, and solidarity. Our people know that their struggle is your struggle, that their victory is your victory. And today, as before, they are confident that your full support and solidarity will always be with them.

Allow me to thank you and to express my gratitude to the organisers of this grand meeting of revolutionary forces of the world.

GREETING OF TANU DELEGATION, TANZANIA

F. MASHA

My country's delegation has the honour to express greetings to this Seminar from the peoples and all the progressive forces of East, Central and Southern Africa. We would like also to thank the government of the United Arab Republic for playing host to the Seminar. TANU is dedicated to the freedom of Africa. We are committed to cooperation with all the parties that seek liberty from imperialism. We also believe that this commitment is not confined to Tanzania, but extends to all parts of Africa. No country in Africa deserves success unless it exerts efforts for the liberation of the continent, its progress and the victory of socialism in it. Africa must act as one, and as one must enjoy happiness. We are happy that, through the Organisation of African Unity and its specialised committees, there is scope for collective cooperation. The need for united action has become more pressing. If we go Southward in the liberation of Africa we shall reach Cape Town passing through Salisbury. Going there along this road will be an experiment for our forces as well as a test for the friendship of those who assert that they are our friends. Since the peoples of Africa are committed to the liberation of their continent, we ask all the liberation movements in all the countries which are not yet free to unite and fight the enemy.

We believe that the united fronts both in the colonies and the free countries will help accelerate the achievement of victory. We, in Tanzania, have chosen the socialist path for the development of our country, because we are convinced

that it is socialism that leads to justice and truth. But our experience reveals that the forces of imperialism and capitalism will not rest content with looking on, while we score one victory after another. Economic development and political freedom clearly go hand in hand. While we expect all those non-Africans who assist us to render us faithful assistance, we must always remember that it is the Africans who are capable of developing Africa in an African manner. In the process of the African national and social revolution we should distinguish between those who are fighting for Africa and those Africans who accept to act as tools in the hands of foreign forces of aggression. We must fight the Africans who help imperialism.

The peoples of Africa are waiting to know in which way this Seminar will deal with the problems of freedom. On behalf of all our brothers from South, East and Central Africa we wish all success to our Seminar.

AHS

ANTI-IMPERIALIST STRUGGLE IN AFRICA AT THE PRESENT STAGE

LUTFI EL-KHOLI

I

The field of the battle is Africa. Today Africa is no more dark or isolated for her people, led by their vanguard, have pulled down that iron curtain set up tightly around them in the last years of the nineteenth century by imperialist powers. By means of her revolutionary movement Africa has opened her doors and windows on to the world, enjoys an increasing representation in the United Nations and non-aligned countries and has also established links with most countries of the world, including the socialist countries. Africa has her distinct voice internationally heard. Her contemporary revolution both in weight and movement has become part and parcel of the world revolution waging a radical struggle against imperialism, old and new, against its military, monopolistic and racialist bases and, at the same time, against underdevelopment, national disintegration and exploitation.

So the contemporary African revolution in its direction of development is a part of the forward march of history. It aims at putting an end to imperialism, feudal and capitalist regimes, and war. It also aims at establishing free communities with a developed national economy using the most up-to-date means of modern technology and placing them at the starting point of the path to socialism. Thus, any separation between the contemporary African revolution and the progressive humanitarian movement with its socialist trends is indeed unjust and

abnormal. It contradicts reality, is inconsistent with the movement of human history, and is antagonistic to the interests and struggle of the African peoples.

In fact this separation—which some powers try to enforce by various means—is in its essence nothing but a reactionary and imperialistic plan aiming at cultivating an unhealthy environment with a suitable climate favouring reformist instead of revolutionary trends, at replacing the exposed old imperialism with the new masked one, and resisting scientific socialism through utopian and fallacious socialism, in short—at diverting the African struggle away from its original historical trends so that Africa may remain a reserve for imperialist powers and their monopolistic institutions, though in new forms and relations of dependence that suit the existing circumstances of the second half of the twentieth century.

There is also a specific consideration which integrates the African revolutionary struggle with that of the peoples of Asia and Latin America against the same enemies and pursues the same targets. It is not a coincidence that peoples of the three continents which are the centres of the strongholds of old and new imperialism and where the challenge against economic and social underdevelopment is at its strongest—converge objectively in consecutive rallies of the common struggle and on various levels which started in Bandung in 1955, followed by the conference of Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity which held its first session in Cairo in December 1957, and the Tricontinental Conference in Cuba in 1966.

The common man in Africa does not need special intelligence to realise that the American aggression, for example in Vietnam in Asia, is the very same aggression from which he suffers, as well as all the people of the Congo (Kinshasa) in Africa, and Cuba and the Dominicans in Latin America.

Nor is he ignorant of the fact that the African glorious liberation wars in Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea are of the same nature and circumstances as the war of liberation in the Arab South in Asia. Nor is he unaware of the fact that the same colonial powers which forced—with the help of the local reactionary forces—the export of the counter-revolution to Congo (Kinshasa) in 1960-61, to Ghana in February 1966, are the same powers which he saw export the counter-revolution—with the help of reactionary local forces of the same type—to the Republic of Yemen since its revolution in 1962 and to Syria in 1966, when this country adopted

a progressive path of development, and Cambodia since she followed the non-aligned policy and refused to be a base of aggression against the Vietnamese people.

The common man in Africa is well aware that the imperialist, monopolist and racialist forces which laid down the plans for the establishment of armed racialist forces in the form of States at the expense of the African people in South Africa in 1910 and Rhodesia in December 1964 are the very same forces that established Israel in Asia in 1948. This ultimately aims at constituting an extension—under a false international legitimacy—of the imperialist Western powers to the centre of Africa and Asia and at using them as means and weapons at the service of neo-colonialism.

For we at the same time face both neo and old imperialism. We are also confronted with puppet, conservative, racialist regimes, military bases and occupation at one and the same time. We face the horrors of the policy of racial discrimination, the recruiting of white mercenaries against national and progressive governments, economic pressures and exportation of counter-revolution and the fetters of pacts, military bases, conditioned aid and forced treaties. We also face missionaries hiding behind religious banners and destroying the people's moral integrity and national heritage; we face them side by side with concerted aggression by imperialist states—in spite of secondary differences between them—sometimes under the guise of the U.N. The tragedy of the Congo (Kinshasa) is a clear example. We face, moreover, genocide of tribes and the kindling of hatred to prevent national unity. We also face imperialist intrigues to instigate regional wars. This at the same time explains the great diversity of means, methods and paths of struggle of the people of the general revolutionary front in Africa.

The methods and paths of struggle are determined by the people's own realities and according to their degree of development as well as by the specific nature of the main enemy.

Under the broad African front armed liberation movements, anti-racialist resistance, violent and peaceful, co-operate to establish national entities, to liquidate monopolies, to direct social struggle, by peaceful and violent means, towards socialism, and to coordinate unity for joint revolutionary action between a number of progressive free states.

We can trace the consecutive stages of development of the

African anti-imperialist revolution with both its negative and positive aspects, as well as the changes it has been introducing into the map of Africa.

In 1950 the independent area—apart from South Africa with its special racist attitude—was composed of only three states: Egypt, Ethiopia and Liberia. Liberia was in fact an American colony, Egypt a British colony occupied by 80,000 British soldiers. Ethiopia had strong ties with the first manifestations of neo-imperialism.

But in 1960, which is worthy of the term "Year of Africa", 17 new states representing 42% of the area of Africa became independent. In 1968 direct imperialist influence could only be maintained in 21 political regions totalling 3.5 million square miles and 59 million inhabitants (24% of the total population of Africa).

With the independence of Lesotho and Botswana this year (1966) only 11 political entities are directly dominated by imperialism. Most of these, however, are extremely small, such as Sabteb, Ifni, Rio Muni, Banda, French Somalia—the total area amounts to about one million square miles (14% of the continent's area) and 15 million inhabitants representing 6% of the continent's population.

It is worthy of notice that the strongest imperialist powers were the first to change their methods of old imperialism for those of the new.

France, for example, which used to control the biggest area of African colonies, has been left with one direct colony of 9,900 square miles and inhabited by 70,000 people. This is French Somalia.

Britain that used to colonise the largest number of the inhabitants of the continent has not any direct colonies in the continent (after Rhodesia's escape from direct imperialist influence, due to the racialist minorities' concoctions compromise with the conventional imperialist forces), whereas Portuguese imperialism still keeps 3 colonies, covering 793,000 sq. miles where about 10 million Africans live. Spanish imperialism, moreover, dominates five colonies (130,000 sq. miles) where 238,000 inhabitants live.

II

The achievement of independence by 39 African countries has not liberated Africa from imperialist exploitation. Heavily

restricted aid and monopolistic investments have replaced the armies of occupation.

Neo-colonialism has employed its monopolistic methods to rob the continent of its wealth and to drain its labour powers to the extent that the invested capital in Africa had reached in 1983 the amount of 22,000 million dollars which yielded profits of 2,000 million dollars in the same year.

By means of its control and domination of world markets imperialism—through its monopolies—has regulated prices to guarantee fabulous profits, preventing our peoples from accumulating the capital allowing them to develop their resources, proceeding simultaneously to the reduction of prices of raw materials and agricultural products and raising those of industrial commodities and machinery. In addition western monopolies still dominate about 80 per cent of the volume of African trade.

The USA plays an increasingly important role in this field. In Africa its investments went up from 287 million dollars in 1950 to 925 million dollars in 1960 and leaped up to 1,700 million dollars in 1964. Its exports to Africa went up from 494 million dollars to 916 million dollars, its imports from 362 million dollars to 1,211 million dollars during the period 1950 to 1964.

The increase of Western investments was accompanied by the spread of aggressive military bases. America has now the largest number of naval and air bases in Africa, such as bases in Morocco, Lybia, Tunisia, Liberia and Ethiopia.

American imperialism started brazen intervention against national-liberation movements. This intervention reached its climax against the Congo (Kinshasa) in addition to planning reactionary coups d'état and exporting counter-revolutions to undermine the freedom loving regimes.

The essence of neo-colonialism is to ensure formal political independence while securing actual subordination to imperialism, especially economically. The neo-colonialists realise that subordination can be ensured by means of a large number of methods, by various economic, political, military and ideological means.

These methods and means are based on economic links represented in special economic relations, loans, assistance and investments.

Special economic relations are represented by the engagements of an African country toward a specific zone of in-

fluence, a customs union or "a common market" dominated by imperialism. All these factors are often combined. The monetary systems of most west and Central African states are linked with France and subordinated to the "Bank of Western Africa" and to the "Bank of Central Africa". The Monetary Council that issues the East African Shilling is dominated by the British. A huge number of African independent states are still either in the Sterling or Franc zones. The system of "Commonwealth Preference" directs the foreign trade of some of these states. Most of them belong to the European Common Market where they suffer its fetters without taking part in its administration and orientation—the excuse of course is that they benefit by selling their products in it and obtain from it aid and investments.

The essence of "special economic relations" is best reflected in the foreign trade of a large number of African states. British, U.S. and West German share in African Commonwealth countries' imports often exceeds 50%; France's share of the Afro-Malagassy countries varied in 1963 from 33% (Togo) to 74% (Madagascar). This situation shows clearly how closely the economy of African countries is linked to the imperialist economies and how greatly it is dependent on them. The most cunning trick the neocolonialists play in this respect is their claim that they buy African countries' products—especially agricultural products and raw material—at higher prices than those of the world market. The catch is, of course, that the world market prices are fixed by the same imperialist countries. The high prices they pay to African countries are all used to finance imports from imperialist countries. Those high prices, however, do not suffice. And so we find that most African countries suffer a deficit in their balances of payments which they cannot cover without turning for aid and loans from imperialist countries. Thus "special economic relations" compel African countries to seek aid.

Nor is the deficit in the balance of payments the only factor that drives them to seek aid. There is also a deficit in the state budget that is covered by one or more imperialist states. Imperialist assistance is sometimes in the form of military aid to equip and train the local armies. In certain cases it can be used to finance "technical aid".

What strikes us first as far as imperialist aid is concerned is that the need of African countries for it is caused by imperialism. For imperialist domination hampered the development

of African national economies which kept on producing nothing but raw material. Imperialist powers always succeed in developing "relations of trade" to their own interest. It is noticeable that the prices of raw materials produced by great imperialist powers are relatively kept steady; this cannot be said about the prices of those produced by the newly independent countries. Take the case of Egyptian and American cotton. The former, though better in quality and less in quantity, fell in price by 30% during the period 1955-65, whereas American cotton fell in the same period by only 12%. It is also to be noted that developing countries cannot sell their new industrial products without export aid, i.e., unless they are cheaper than similar products in Western countries. The core of the matter lies in the relations of exploitation enforced by neo-colonialism upon newly independent countries by means of unequal trade. As a result of this exploitation, African countries lose many times what they get of aid.

The main purpose of military aid is to bring up nascent military forces in the bosom of imperialist armies and to feed them to satiety with reactionary thought so that they can be easily used against revolutionary movements and play the old role of imperialist armies as their territorial troops; the role of crushing national-liberation movements.

On the social level, colonialism relied solely on the tribal chiefs. Neo-colonialism, however, exerts all efforts to win over the nascent educated bourgeois elements by placing them in posts, in the state machinery (which depends on imperialist aid) and in monopolistic enterprises, thus trying to isolate them from the working masses and create a privileged class indebted to imperialism.

On the political level, neo-colonialism depends on pro-colonialist governments, which cannot rid themselves of this dependence, since their economic, political and ideological interests are tied to the wheel of imperialism. Neo-colonialism has actually succeeded in winning over a number of statesmen who once belonged to the national movements, thus taking advantage of their former popularity to consolidate its authority. In order to ensure the complete loyalty of those statesmen and rulers, neo-colonialism tries to stir up tribal and border disputes to push countries into adopting a hostile attitude towards each other, as in Latin America, where, instead of uniting to rid themselves from the influence of U.S. companies, Latin American countries fought each other in the

interest of these companies. At the beginning, neo-colonialism tried to establish a façade of formal bourgeois democracy so as to be able to attack the revolutionary regimes as anti-democratic. However, this façade was very weak and in most cases the political parties were no more than new names for tribal or racial assemblies. Faked elections, political corruption, bribery and conflicting imperialist interests were exposed and proved incapable of resisting mass action. Neo-colonialism has therefore resorted to misrepresenting the concept of the system of the single revolutionary party which has emerged in some progressive countries as a means to engage the national forces in the struggle against imperialism and reaction, for national and social liberation. It has imposed reactionary one-party regimes to mislead the masses and disguise the dictatorial reactionary rule. However it seems that this new attempt will not survive for long; faced with the growth of the national and class conflict, imperialism in many countries has attempted (sometimes in collusion with the ruling governments) to hand over authority to a number of army leaders who once served in the imperialist armies and rose in rank not as a result of participation in a rebellion or a revolution but merely because, at the time of independence, they were the only people of military experience available.

III

At present, the struggle in Africa against imperialism is mainly characterised by the growing inclination towards unity. Indeed, African unity has become one of the main slogans of the anti-imperialist and neo-colonialist revolution in Africa. This slogan inspires the African peoples to intensify their struggle for national liberation, for the safeguarding of independence and national sovereignty and for social progress.

After independence, the slogan of unity has not been confined to national liberation; it has come to mean cooperation to safeguard independence and to solve the economic and political problems which cannot be solved by one country's efforts alone.

African unity has acquired a militant and profound revolutionary content which has extended the scope of the struggle against colonialism, to include neo-colonialism. It has acquired a social content which is reflected in the realisation of the necessity for cooperation to safeguard independence by the

elimination of economic, social and cultural backwardness. With this new concept, unity has become the aim and objective of the popular masses in Africa for which the workers, peasants, intelligentsia and the revolutionaries are struggling.

With these new dimensions the question of African unity has to be discussed and crystallised in the context of growing national-liberation struggle and the peoples' determination to work out an independent way of development, and in an organisational form, which constitutes in itself an instrument and a safeguard in the struggle for unity. By the beginning of the sixties, the absolute majority of the African countries had achieved their independence. The year 1963 marked the founding of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU).

The establishment of this organisation is regarded as one of the main achievements of the African peoples and its Charter is correctly considered to be a progressive anti-imperialist and anti-neo-colonialist document.

The establishment of the OAU has proved the attachment of the African peoples to unity; it has enabled the African peoples and countries to extend the scope of their cooperation in the political, economic and cultural domains. It has also made it possible for an increasing number of its members to adopt certain common attitudes in defence of the cause of world peace and African national liberation, inside international organisations.

The Organisation of African Unity faces certain objective difficulties, mainly:

- a) Subversive activities of neo-colonialist forces;
- b) The stand of some countries which are inclined, in their internal and foreign policy, to depend on neo-colonialism;
- c) Differences in the African countries' political and economic structure as well as in their standard of social development;
- d) Theoretical and ideological difficulties or problems pertaining to the cause of African unity.

All these difficulties interact on the soil of complex African reality, a soil which nurtures tribal, sectarian and racial differences, language barriers, multi-nationalism, ignorance, chaos and underdevelopment, which seeds were skilfully sown there by colonialism.

Despite all these hindrances, the desire for African unity has been stronger than anything else, for the very simple

reason that this unity is the objective of all the active revolutionary forces in the continent.

The task of the new African states is to safeguard the OAU and maintain its anti-imperialist and anti-neo-colonialist stand. The OAU is called upon to adopt a policy based on reality and principles, in order to settle the issues of African unity in a way that prevents the emergence of factions and new divisions in the African front. At the same time, the OAU should concentrate on questions which would ensure broader mobilisation of the peoples of the continent, and strive for the implementation of its resolutions on cooperation and economic unity. Whenever it becomes impossible for the African countries and governments to undertake action which would consolidate the unity of Africa, then it will be the united struggle of workers, peasants and revolutionary intellectuals which will pave the way for such unity.

Thus, the progressive national, political organisations and parties in every African country are called upon to establish a strong alliance of all anti-imperialist and anti-neo-colonialist forces whose interests meet with the requirements of an independent development. These parties and organisations should establish on the continental scale an order of priority of urgent issues—such as the national-liberation movement of Africa—and thus define common actions and positions towards which efforts should be united.

The historic experience of the struggle of the peoples of the continent has proved that trade unions have a glorious part to play in the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism, for the establishment of a powerful unity of the trade union movement on a continental scale against the dissensionist activities undertaken within the trade union movement itself by the agents of old and new colonialism. A solid basis of African unity will be laid through meetings between trade union organisations, and promotion of the peasant movement, as a prelude to meetings between the peasant vanguard and revolutionary intellectuals.

Lastly, it has been established that the African countries which have chosen the socialist path constitute the advanced posts for the defence of African unity. The experience of the masses has shown that it is the political forces which struggle for social progress that are most devoted to the ideals of African unity and most militant in the struggle for its achievement. Thus, it falls on the revolutionary parties and po-

litical organisations in the African countries that have chosen the socialist path to safeguard internal unity in their respective countries, since the achievement of unity among workers, peasants and revolutionary intellectuals is a pre-condition for the accomplishment of the tasks of socialist transformation. At this stage, characterised by rabid attacks of the neo-colonialist forces on the continent, the revolutionary parties and organisations in the countries that have chosen the socialist path are faced with the task of struggling in the ideological field with the aim of purging their respective societies of ideas that are antagonistic to scientific socialism. At the same time they should exchange experiences that would help solve the complicated theoretical problems which naturally result from the convergence of the national and social revolutions.

The national-liberation struggle has been assuming greater dimensions in the African continent; the actual methods of struggle and the forms of organisation have likewise grown in variety. The continent has witnessed—and still does—liberation and guerilla warfare, strikes, demonstrations and different forms of passive boycott. The African masses have mobilised their forces through their national and progressive parties and organisations, as well as through workers' trade unions and peasants', intellectuals' and women's organisations.

For centuries the cauldron of revolution had been boiling in African societies. The continent suffered under the heavy pressures of colonialism where occupation was associated with slave trade, ruthless exploitation and the crimes of racial settlements. Today, modern means of communication and scientific progress have made the world smaller. Revolutionary thought and radical changes that have tilted the balance of power are echoing loudly in Africa, especially since socialism has become a strongly materialised world phenomena. Consequently, the explosion was violent, comprehensive and sudden, especially since the African toiling masses had nothing to lose but their chains.

This explosion took place in favourable world conditions. The African revolution was able to find in more than one domain great support in the general world revolutionary development and in the socialist countries. The USSR, in particular, offered unconditional moral and material aid, instant diplomatic recognition, immediately after independence, the issuing of ultimatums to adventurers, as happened

during the Suez war in 1956, low-interest loans (2.5 per cent), technical aid for economic development—especially in the industrial field—and which in 1963 reached 400 million dollars for developing countries, 70 per cent of which was allocated to industry. This aid was a positive contribution which enabled a number of African countries to win the battle for economic independence.

IV

Yet this great history of our continent's struggle went through moments of ebb and flow. Along with victories there were also some losses.

It is our duty today boldly to highlight these shortcomings in order to find a scientific remedy and realistic revolutionary solutions.

We would be deceiving ourselves first and foremost if we believed the bright picture manifested in the map of our continent today, flying the flags of 39 independent countries (with only 11 regions still directly subjected to colonialism, the area of which does not exceed 1 million square miles, i.e., 14 per cent of the continent's surface) and with a total population of not more than 15 million people, i.e., 6 per cent of the continent's inhabitants.

Objective realities are such, however, that apart from less than 10 countries which have been able in varying degrees to attain true independence through the emancipation of their economies and development, the remaining countries, the overwhelming majority, have attained no more than formal independence, and still suffer under the strain of military bases. Their economies are still fettered and subordinated to foreign monopolies and consequently fall mainly in the sphere of influence of neo-colonialism.

It follows therefore that the essence of African struggle today lies in economic emancipation and the building of an independent, developing national economy. However, the process of economic emancipation and the subsequent development operations come up against complicated negative conditions. In addition to utter backwardness, the poor, sometimes even non-existent financial accumulation necessary for development, and the severe dearth of technical cadres, we find that imperialist disintegration has divided the continent into small units. Only 3 of the countries have a popu-

lation that exceeds 20 million; 25 countries have a population below 5 million and 13 countries have a population less than 1 million. This means reduced viability of most African countries to develop by themselves and the limitation of the national market to a dangerous degree, preventing any serious and effective progress.

It follows that the struggle for economic emancipation is closely associated with the issue of African unity in many possible forms, ranging from economic coordination and planning among a number of states to the establishment of greater units through the cooperation of a number of states in accordance with their conditions, and leading to the laying of the material foundations for an African common market through the establishment of strong ties and relations among all African states.

The struggle for economic emancipation, ultimately associated with the question of unity, can never accomplish its radical objectives except by pursuing the road to socialism. This is the only way which can, through planning, mobilise all human, technical and material resources in projects of development, which will serve the interests of the masses and raise their standard of living as a whole. This must be the goal, not merely the interests of a minority which leads a parasitic existence, off the toil of the masses, to crystallise eventually into a bourgeois class linked, by its interests and nature, with the foreign monopolies and neo-colonialism.

This is the basic general trend as confirmed by revolutionary experiences in Africa. Experience has shown that even in countries where the local capitalist class developed relatively under the colonial rule—as in Egypt for instance—that this class is too weak to undertake big development to the required extent within the framework of classical capitalism. Further, one has to regard the climate of the epoch—especially since World War II—when socialism has become a strong centre of attraction for the numerous popular classes and sections other than the working class.

This capitalist class has become antagonistic fundamentally to the national-liberation movement. This antagonism is due to the predominance of socialist tendencies among the masses of the national revolution aspiring to a better material and cultural life with the consequent convergence of the essence of the national-liberation revolution with that of the social revolution with its socialist horizons. Faced with this inevitable

convergence which has come to form a general phenomenon, such a local bourgeois class, especially the big bourgeoisie, has lost all the classical revolutionary attributes which characterised it during the national-liberation movement in the period between the two world wars, when it was fighting against imperialism and its monopolies to gain the national market and to share with it its power and independence.

That is one thing. Besides this, neo-colonialism—unlike imperialism—ceased to be hostile to the interests of this bourgeois class and its political, economic and social ambitions. Neo-colonialism is now ready not only to play partner to this class, but even to consolidate it as a prospective force opposed to the new progressive national revolution with its trend towards socialism—on the condition that all economic development operations are confined to a narrow frame linked to and controlled by the interests of the neo-colonialists. Neo-colonialism, unlike the old colonialism, is willing to accept political independence and limited development on two conditions:

First, that development should not in any way go beyond extracting and processing industries. It should not extend to heavy industry which is the basis of radical development of any national economy and the essence of its independence.

Secondly, that the national revolution be deprived of its social content with its socialist horizons.

That is why neo-colonialism has now a very definite plan for Africa, crystallising in its endeavour to build a nucleus for a national bourgeoisie in the countries where such a social class does not exist. This it does either through bureaucratic means by replacing its own elements by those of the new class in the state apparatus after independence, or by granting its aid and loans to set up, in conjunction with them, private firms whose interests are linked with those of foreign monopolies, especially in trade and in processing industries. This is what French neo-colonialism endeavoured to do during the Algerian revolution through the Constantine project in 1958 with the purpose of building what it named "the third force", or through bringing up and forming cadres under its influence to dominate the state apparatus and to take over the greatest share of the national income as is practised in Dahomey, where 60 per cent of the national income goes into the pockets of bureaucratic elements in the state apparatus.

Hence, objective reality confronts the African revolution with the task to build—strategically speaking—the unity of its forces through the struggle which follows the attainment of independence under the leadership of the popular classes interested in securing complete national independence and developing society in the direction of socialism.

It would also be a form of self-deception if every African people who has achieved independence limited its existence within its borders with the excuse of concentrating on the process of building and developing its society, destroyed by colonialism and plundered by monopolies. It is certainly important and necessary for the people to embark on the building and development process with all its potentials, but it is equally important and necessary not to be isolated for a moment from the liberation movement anywhere in the continent, but to react to it deeply and extend to it all possible moral and material assistance. The independence of every African country is seriously menaced by the existence or influence of imperialist forces anywhere in the continent, for its present zones of influence are in fact but springboards against independent states.

Assisting national-liberation movements in the continent is not an obligation imposed on independent African countries by considerations of militant fraternity and revolutionary principles alone. It is similarly an obligation imposed by considerations of safeguarding the independence achieved and the current processes of evolution and development. It is, in short, a kind of simultaneous defence and attack against enemy imperialist bases used, basically, to attack independent, and particularly revolutionary, countries. That is what happened against the national Congolese government headed by the late Patrice Lumumba, and the progressive government of Ghana headed by President Kwame Nkrumah. Similarly, the imperialist racist base in Rhodesia constitutes a serious and direct menace to Zambia.

We must admit here that this duty to self and brother alike was not observed with the required effectiveness by a considerable number of independent countries. There is now an urgent need to implement the resolution of the OAU on assistance to national-liberation movements, as well as to intensify the revolutionary exercise of this duty particularly by progressive revolutionary regimes by virtue of their historic responsibilities toward the destiny and future of the continent as a whole.

It is certain that the great inequality of the social development of the African countries and peoples, the differences in the ideological and social bases of political parties, and the dissensions of which the working class and trade union organisations suffer are all objective factors producing causes that lead to the disintegration of the unity of the revolutionary forces in Africa.

There is in addition a subordinate factor objectively opposed to the unity of the revolutionary forces. This is the conflict within the world Communist movement, with its negative effects on trade union, progressive and national movements in Africa, and consequently on the African revolution as a whole. It has rendered the African revolution incapable of concentrating all its efforts against the main enemy; imperialism and reactionary rightists have, since this conflict, found their way into it.

It is the duty of the African revolutionary forces to resist such disintegration resolutely and swiftly and to deal with it in a patient and scientific way. This may be a difficult task but it is not impossible, particularly since the aim of the present phase of the contemporary revolution is clear and agreed upon: complete national liberation and development towards socialism. Consequently, it has the objective criterion that enables it to distinguish—by words and deeds—revolutionary from reactionary forces regardless of the assumed masks. While we should limit to the greatest extent the effect of the conflict within the Communist movement on our African reality, in respect and appreciation of hard experiences, the revolutionary national African forces should reject, in theory and practice, the policy of anti-communism. Communist forces should at the same time reject doctrinal rigidity when considering the new phenomena that appear in Africa. We are all called upon to build our revolutionary unity through the scientific vision of reality, and to partake in drawing up a unified plan of African revolutionary action, taking into consideration the special circumstances and the particular possibilities of every one of our societies.

Last but not least, we would be deceiving ourselves if we considered the reactionary imperialist coup in Ghana in February 1966 against the progressive government of President Nkrumah to be a transient event in the history of the African revolution; or if we thought that the main causes behind it were created by the imperialist forces alone, over-

looking the negative factors that contributed to the success of the reactionary imperialist blow.

There are eight main observations on the Ghana coup d'état:

1. It is the second counter-revolution plotted against an African society with a revolutionary national leadership; after the first counter-revolution in the Congo (Kinshasa), in 1960-1961.

2. Contrary to the former tradition of denial and disguise, the imperialist forces and Ghanaian reaction openly and defiantly declared that they were the organisers of this coup.

This means that at this stage imperialism and African reaction are aiming to make a show of strength, in order to create an atmosphere of actual intimidation of all revolutionary liberation forces and new states, destroy their morale from within in order to facilitate the exertion of pressure with the purpose of undermining their unity of struggle and forcing them to singly seek compromise with old and neo-colonialism and return once more to the zones of imperialist influence. This flagrant aggressive imperialist attitude is not restricted to Africa. It constitutes a general phenomenon in Asia (Vietnam, Aden, Yemen, and Palestine) and Latin America (Cuba and the Dominican Republic).

3. The Ghana coup d'état occurred on the eve of a series of internal military coups in a number of neighbouring African countries (the Congo, Upper Volta, Central African Republic, Dahomey, Nigeria). These coups did not change the nature of the regimes in these countries which are hostile or at least reserved towards the African revolution. They were intended to tighten the grip on these countries through military regimes, rendering them into relatively powerful bases for attacks against progressive regimes. The Ghana coup was their first operation.

4. The coup occurred about three months after the usurpation of Rhodesia by the white fascists backed by imperialism, on November 11, 1965, despite the collective threats of independent African states to resist this usurpation by force. But these threats were not put into effect. At the Organisation of African Unity, some of these states even broke their promise to sever relations with Britain if it did not interfere—by force of arms—to overthrow the racist regime, while the progressive regime of Ghana, which rebelled against membership of the Commonwealth, and severed relations with it on account of Rhodesia, was overthrown. The imperialist forces and African

reaction seemed to be desirous of discouraging the African revolutionary peoples who could do nothing for the people of Rhodesia, whereas the revolutionary regime of Ghana was overthrown.

5. It is evident that the coup came as a surprise to the Ghana revolutionary forces and leadership itself, as President Nkrumah left Accra on a trip to North Vietnam, and before four days had passed the coup took place. Organisers of the coup revealed that they had thought of staging their coup earlier, but they gave up the idea and put off the execution of their plan until Nkrumah's departure. This means that preparations for the coup were conducted in full secrecy and without the knowledge of the revolutionary forces, the party and the leadership. The party could not even put up an immediate organised resistance. Why?

This is probably due to the fact that the party overestimated its formal strength derived from its occupation of positions of power, not from its organisation, cadres, and position among the popular masses, the real source of strength. It remained to be a boat floating on the surface of society, comprising a group of revolutionary intellectuals and city-dwellers. It could not penetrate to the depths of the rural masses; to enlighten and mobilise the broad masses who have a real interest in the revolution and who are its safeguard. Its most important activity was cultural action laden with revolutionary slogans and doctrinal theoretical discussions within four walls, not militant political action that merges with the masses through interpretation and crystallisation of their interests, views, problems, and vital issues in realistic applicable political plans; and the mobilisation of popular forces capable of actual movement.

The fact we should face is that some of our revolutionary parties are still more like members of revolutionary intellectual clubs who enjoy listening to their own voices and compete in displaying their theoretical information on formal structures, organisational procedures and other obvious aspects of revolutionary organisation, such as democratic centralism, collective leadership, subordination of the lower organs to higher ones, etc. But they do not exert sufficient efforts to achieve organisational fusion with the masses and to grasp the particular circumstances of their own society. All they want is a party modelled after the revolutionary parties of the socialist countries. Consequently, it turns out to be a mag-

nificent revolutionary building on the outside, but lacking in content and effectiveness, disconnected from reality and isolated from the popular masses, so that it collapses before a practical test.

The issue of establishing a revolutionary party is first and foremost a realistic national issue. It is not sufficient to lay out the revolutionary organisational procedures and rules, all this should be formulated in a national spirit so as to fuse with reality and the masses without any barriers or resort to administrative methods. Democratic centralism and other revolutionary party rules are actually necessary, but what is more essential for a revolutionary party organisation in an African society is to take into consideration the tribal conditions destructive for the unity of the people itself, and to devise methods of building an organisation capable of realistically and perseveringly handling tribal divisions and probing into them with the purpose of achieving national unification and isolating reactionary and imperialist influence. If revolutionary parties in relatively advanced countries are established by organs, tactics, and strategies of transferring society from the capitalist to the socialist system, revolutionary parties in most newly independent African countries should be established by different organs, tactics, and strategies drawn from their reality. Here the aim of the party is to move in a rapid and serious leap unprecedented in human history—from tribalism through the phases of feudalism and capitalism directly to socialism, in confrontation of both old and neo-colonialism.

6. The immediate allegiance to the coup of the state machinery with all its officials, especially those in responsible positions, from Foreign Minister Saky to ambassadors and directors of the principal organs, on the grounds that they were after all, only officials obeying orders of the government, whatever that government may be.

This shows that despite the revolutionary nature of political power in Ghana, the state machinery remained in the hands of the reactionary forces and the puppet cadres formed by colonialism to replace it after independence.

Consequently, colonialist reactionary influence continued to spread like cancer in the state machinery, which always constitutes the centre of gravity within a newly developing community. This influence bridles and paralyses the effect

of the new revolutionary forces and party control over this machinery exists in appearance only.

7. The principal instrument of the coup was the army. The army in Ghana, as in a great number of newly independent African states, is a combination of, on the one hand, traditional military elements, which once served and defended the colonialist regime and which were inherited by the revolution after independence, and, on the other hand, new nationalist elements which joined the army after the revolution.

However, since the former elements had behind them the service and technical experience which the latter did not, it was the normal thing for the independent government, without consideration of future hazards and under pressure of urgent demands, to depend on the old elements with their traditional ties to the colonialists, and consequently put them in charge of the army and its organisation.

In Ghana itself the army with its new elements continued to be directly commanded by foreign officers who obviously had antagonistic tendencies or subordinate to foreign military experts. Besides, the new officers receive their training in the imperialist Western countries and consequently they are indoctrinated against the progressive development of their countries.

In Ghana particularly, British officers continued to train the army even after 1961, while 20 per cent of the officers had received their training at Sandhurst in Britain.

This in effect means that the Ghanaian army remained under an imperialist command which opposed the revolution and its leadership.

The revolutionary and party organisations failed to contain the army politically and link its action and the destiny of its officers and soldiers with that of the revolution.

Hence the social and political split between the army and the revolution. The army came to be a reserve for reaction and imperialism instead of becoming a people's army constituting an effective force of the revolution itself.

There is no need to underline the fact that imperialism and neo-colonialism are today concentrating their efforts to infiltrate into army organs. A large proportion of U.S. and Western aid and experts sent to the newly independent African countries is for military purposes.

8. The coup d'état was met by different policies of African and socialist states. Some of them recognized the coup d'état or

had to recognize it as a fait accompli, while others denounced it. This led to confusion in the ranks of the African and world revolutionary forces.

Today the African revolution faces one of three alternatives:

— Introversion and isolation within its own regional boundaries. This would mean not only giving up its liberation and revolutionary principles in the light of which it has gained moral and material importance and weight at all levels, but also giving up its front line of defense against colonialism and reaction.

— Entry into bargaining with neo-colonialism and reaction, which actually means forfeiting its independence and historical material and moral gains—losing out against monopoly, feudalism, capitalism and underdevelopment and regressing gradually to the fold of colonialism.

— Continuation of the revolution, pooling all efforts and reorganisation of forces in the light of the experience gained in the battle against colonialism and reaction.

This is the path of History, Hope and Life—a hard path in fact but with no other substitute.

The very fact that the African revolution survives is proof that it has taken this last path. Our meeting here today testifies to this choice.

However, to ensure advance along this path at the present stage it is essential to take into consideration a highly significant and grave matter.

As the colonialist forces direct their recent offensives to certain strategic spots in Africa, pooling all forces and shortening lines as much as possible, and thus arriving at rapid results, the progressive and revolutionary forces have extended their scope of action under the slogan of "besieging" the colonialist forces on a broad front and on a large scale. This is by far more than their actual possibilities allow, and it is detrimental, for they draw into their ranks hesitant forces merely because they are, formally speaking, liberated from colonialist subjugation.

This has lengthened their lines more than they are in a position to support, introduced a sort of "fifth column" for the enemy and restricted freedom of revolutionary action.

This was done to safeguard the formal and quantitative "unity" with allies.

We hasten to say that theoretically and practically, we cannot underestimate the importance of a common action

and its relative gains on the broad front. We should regard this action as "auxiliary" and not the main and principal action of the revolutionary forces.

By essential action we mean the utmost possible organised staunch military and economic resistance to colonialist military and economic action. Consequently, the formation of a broad African front should not hamper the formation of definite revolutionary units from the total of revolutionary forces and institutions capable of effective and rapid action.

Let the OAU continue to carry on its common action within its relative boundaries but with a solid core of Africa's most advanced revolutionary energies and systems.

In order to assume its responsibilities on an effective level Africa's revolutionary core has:

First: to ward off the danger of the conflicts among the socialist states affecting the African revolution. In fact the situation demands that actual effective pressure be exerted on parties to the conflict so as to have them bound by the adoption of objective and united stands versus the principal common enemy.

Second: not to be led into ventures that unnecessarily lengthen the lines of the struggle as cannot be borne by the actual possibilities of the African revolutionary forces and their allies.

Third: to set up systems for united action by offensive and defensive forces along coordinated and united policies.

Fourth: to adhere to peaceful coexistence, which is the objective law of the age, in a realistic and dialectic manner. This would prevent the outbreak of an all-out war and at the same time repel colonialist violence and export of counter-revolution with increasing violence.

Fifth: to provide political, economic, social, intellectual and military conditions for the revolutionary forces and systems so that there would be a radical purge of all reactionary and puppet pockets and remnants which act as a reserve for the imperialist forces.

Sixth: the group of socialist states should concentrate the economic assistance they unconditionally give to the genuinely revolutionary African states.

This in fact would be an answer to the neo-colonialist policy of concentrating economic aid in a number of African and non-African states and regimes having ties with it.

It was noted that the U.S. had early in 1968 discontinued

its aid to 26 African and non-African states, those who insisted on adopting a revolutionary independent or non-aligned policy on the international scene.

If today it is granting aid to 76 states, 8 of them get 74 per cent of the total.

Next year, it is expected, according to official declarations, that 86 per cent of aid will be apportioned among 9 states. There is only one African state—Nigeria—among these.

It is also one of the means of ensuring the control of the colonialist forces over the world capitalist market, and consequently over the prices of raw materials that constitute most of the exports of African states, which they seek to lower with the aim of undermining Africa's possibilities of economic and social development. This was the case with Ghana. They kept bringing down the price of cocoa, which represents 50 per cent of its exports, from 58 cents per lb. in 1954 to 16.3 cents in 1964 prior to the coup.

Hence, the African revolution, with its tremendous potentialities, still faces great odds. Hence the ruthlessness of its battle and the decisive effect of its victories on the history of human revolution in quest for a better life.

Our revolution is unfolding in an area that offers unprecedented possibilities for man. It is contemporary to mankind's efforts to reach the moon. It is our responsibility to see that this struggle on our sacred soil ends with colonialism and all its works in the grave.

SOME PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL PROGRESS

ALEXANDER SOBOLEV

1. Introduction

The African continent is embarking on the highroad of progress.

Everywhere one can see the shoots of a new life, the birth, development and strengthening of progressive forms of social, economic and political organisation of society. A slow but steady growth of the productive forces is taking place; both education and culture are advancing.

At present when the majority of the African peoples have reached another turning point in their development they feel an ever-increasing need for serious conclusions to be drawn from the path traversed, elaboration of a concept of further socio-economic, political and cultural development reflecting the strategic aims of the entire movement and the tactical tasks at the given stage of the struggle. The African peoples are seeking to elaborate the constructive and fundamental ideas of social progress on the continent, to determine the concrete paths, forms and methods of building a new life applicable to each country.

Today, the difficulties hampering the solution of this task have become still more obvious. They stem from several causes, some operating over long periods of time, others transient. Above all, there is the extremely uneven viewpoint of productive forces and political organisation of society, culture, etc. The direction of socio-economic development also differs. It is but natural that the new problems confront different countries in different ways.

A serious aggravation of contradictions relating to the most profound aspects of the African revolution has taken place. The most important of them is the contradiction between imperialism and neo-colonialism on the one hand, and the African peoples on the other. This contradiction is sharpening in the present conditions due to the fact that imperialism, widely using both old traditional and new i.e., neo-colonialist methods, tries to step up its expansion in Africa. In some cases it even succeeds in launching a counter-offensive. It is against the background of this heightened imperialist activity that all the other contradictions should be examined: the contradictions between the African exploiters and African working people; between the poverty of the masses and the wealth of the élite; between the archaic forms of social relations and the requirements of the productive forces; between the rapid growth of the population and the slow rate of production; ethnic relations are still an acute problem; tribal strife continues to exist while racial contradictions are increasingly interwoven with the class struggle.

After the gaining of independence the social problems and economic difficulties inherited by Africa from colonialism became increasingly evident. The results of the past few years show that the gap between the level of production and national income of the advanced capitalist states and the African continent as a whole and each country in particular, is not narrowing. Miscalculations in planning and industrialisation have come to light. The first attempts at organising producers' co-operatives in agriculture have not always been successful. Moods of economic pessimism ("we shall never be able to catch up with the imperialist bloc in any case") have appeared.

The fundamental and urgent question is: what social forms will ensure the solution of these contradictions, overcome the difficulties and lead Africa on to the highway of progress?

In discussing these problems in the present article I shall confine myself mainly to the countries of Tropical Africa, and for this reason only some of the points raised can be applied to the Arab belt of the continent.

2. The Specific Features of Africa and the General Laws of Historical Development

A study of the prospects of social progress requires a scientific solution of a number of new theoretical and political

problems which arise from the peculiarities of the historical development of Africa, the specific features of African society, and the present socio-economic situation on the continent.

First of all, it should be borne in mind that the peoples of Africa were, during a long period of time, already in the epoch of capitalism, objects of slave-trade. Colonial domination in Africa was accompanied by ruthless and crude forms of plunder. In the structure of the economy there existed two parallel sectors—the colonial commodity sector and the traditional patriarchal sector, between which there was no organic link. Colonialism, utilising diverse forms of plunder, delayed the development of the African countries for a long time. From the socio-economic viewpoint the feature of Africa is that the economy was based on natural, small-scale production at the embryonic stage and on tribal, communal relations. Most of the peoples did not experience land hunger and exploitation was mainly practised by non-economic methods of compulsion.

Significant features of class relations in the African countries are extreme immobility of the social processes, slow rate of social differentiation, absence of clearly defined class boundaries, numerous transitional social groups, uneven development of these groups and their interpenetration. This is how the Charter of the National Revolutionary Movement of the Republic of Congo (Brazzaville) characterises the class structure of the African society. It enumerates the following classes and strata existing in the country: feudal landowners, colonial landowners or agricultural colonists, landowners from among the clergy, rich peasants, middle peasants, poor peasants, agricultural workers—the rural proletariat—comprador and bureaucratic bourgeoisie, the national bourgeoisie, petty bourgeoisie, intellectuals and junior officials, proletariat, lumpen-proletariat.

The class relationships are affected also by the tribal relations existing in varying degree in all Tropical African countries.

The bulk of the population and the core of the communes consist of working peasants (80-90 per cent). As a rule, these are impoverished peasants and agricultural labourers, but there are among them some well-to-do peasants. Extreme poverty is, however, the lot of the overwhelming majority of peasants. And this poverty, which is growing, is perhaps the

greatest evil of our times, hampering the development of the productive forces.

Within the commune, because of the mode of distribution, there are no stimuli to increase output per man, to accumulate the means needed for further production, or to modernise production. Moreover, the peasants and agricultural labourers are at the mercy of money-lenders, middlemen and rural merchants. The villagers are forced to pay exorbitant interest on loans. Besides, the villages bear a heavy tax burden. And the villager, unable to sustain himself and his family on the land, is obliged to look for work in the towns, where he falls victim to colonial and neo-colonial exploitation. But he preserves his links with the community, which is actually one big family where he shares even personal income with the others.

The foregoing suggests the following conclusions:

The bulk of the peasants of Tropical Africa (those who do not independently produce for the market), as regards property status, their role in production, the nature and scale of their remuneration, and perhaps even their outlook, are not petty-bourgeois in the ordinary sense of the word. They are poor peasants or agricultural labourers. The traditional stratum of petty-bourgeoisie is not numerous in the villages of Tropical Africa and in some areas it is non-existent. In other words, the spread of a petty-bourgeois outlook in the countries of Tropical Africa is limited by the social set-up.

Because of its undeveloped character, conservative organisation of production and obsolete system of distribution, the tribal community lacks effective driving force and appreciable internal resources for developing the productive forces, for extended reproduction. This community cannot in its present form lead on to socialism; far from facilitating any advance to socialism it, on the contrary, is a retarding force. It would, however, be incorrect to suggest that the community should simply be abolished by allowing it to break up into antagonistic classes as a result of spontaneous development of commodity-money relations. The way out, perhaps, lies in preserving the democratic and collectivist attributes of the community and turning it into a production unit where all members would be equal and obliged to work, and where payment according to work done would be gradually introduced and an ever-widening range of individual and joint incentives provided. Such a regenerated and transformed community

could ensure extended reproduction, serve as a form opening up broad vistas for the development of the productive forces in agriculture and the handicrafts.

In the course of this democratic reconstruction the rural population would pass through a process of renewal, and the peasants would become an important productive and political force of society.

The moulding and the growth of the African working class likewise have their specific features. The emergence of the working class is associated with the penetration of foreign capital and it is opposed more to the foreign exploiters than to the local bourgeoisie.

The systematic efforts of the colonialists have imparted to the growing African working class some negative features: first, it is *not stable in composition*, for many return to their villages after working a year or two in the towns and are replaced by a new lot of villagers; second, many who stay on in the towns drift from one enterprise to another or migrate from country to country; third, the colonialists are doing their utmost to prevent the local proletariat from improving its skills, artificially to limit its political role, to stop it from organising, to check the growth of its class consciousness, and thereby prevent it from fulfilling its historical mission as the builder of a new society.

But the march of history cannot be stopped. A modern proletariat, though still numerically small, has already emerged and is developing in Africa. This part of the proletariat is the most progressive section of African society and, in the final analysis, the class base and the builder of socialism. A new social force has thus appeared on the political arena of Africa, a force to which the future belongs. The working class is growing most rapidly in countries which have broken with neo-colonialism and are following along the path of progress.

The main social adversaries of the working people in the various countries are the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie which, in view of its connections with foreign capital, can be described as a comprador bourgeoisie; the "bureaucratic" bourgeoisie which has latterly strengthened its positions and in a number of countries is the chief internal danger; the tribal upper stratum which uses semi-feudal, semi-capitalist methods of exploitation; in some cases a defi-

nite danger is presented by the national bourgeoisie even if it exists only in embryonic form.

Many African leaders, exaggerating the specific features of the social and spiritual life of the peoples of the continent, advance the concept of African exceptionalism, the idea that the historical destiny of the African people fundamentally differs from that of the rest of mankind, that there is a specifically African path of development. Absolutisation of these peculiarities has been the source and ideological basis of all sorts of theories of extreme African nationalism, including Negritude.

Negritude, as is stated in a number of researches, is a whole set of values engendered by African civilization—cultural, economic, social and political—which characterise the black peoples, or more precisely, the Negro-African world.

The adherents of such concepts take a negative attitude towards the capitalist path of development. At the same time they argue that the path of scientific socialism is unsuitable for Africa. Many African leaders advance the idea of a third path—a specifically African path, the idea of special African socialism.

Tom Mboya, for instance, states: "When I think of African socialism, I mean those traditional ideals and mode of thought which guided our people in their striving for social welfare, I think it necessary to stress the fact that these ideals and opinions are of a local nature and that they stem from the experience of our people here in Africa and even here, in Kenya."

This is tantamount to claiming that Africa lies somewhere outside the mainstream of history, that the experience of mankind as a whole and its immense theoretical and scientific achievements are not valid for Africa. If this were so the African peoples would hardly fall within the general orbit of civilisation. Thus it would seem that an entirely new theory of social progress must be evolved for Africa.

But the facts of history refute this idea. Marxists, and, as we know, African Marxists in particular, recognising and taking cognisance of the specific nature of African reality, see in it only a particular manifestation of the general laws of historical development discovered by Marxism-Leninism.

The peoples of Africa, like all peoples, are confronted with the problem of discovering the dialectical interconnection between the general and the particular, between the historical

and the national. Political activity, the elaboration of concepts, paths and forms of social organisation can, as experience shows, be fruitful only when the general laws of historical development are individualised, refracted through the prism of national peculiarities, when the laws of social development are not ignored, but are fully and deeply revealed through an endless variety of national peculiarities. But a general concept of development of human society has existed for a long time—that is Marxism-Leninism. It is true that some African leaders claim that Marxism either has not justified itself or it is obsolete. However, not a single substantiated, convincing argument has been advanced in defence of this thesis. Hundreds of attempts have been made to prove the untenability of Marxism, but all of them have sunk into oblivion, while history develops according to Marx.

Marxism, or rather scientific communism, has provided mankind with the most profound substantiation of the main features of the revolutionary process. Guided by this theory, the peoples of Russia carried out the Great October Revolution. The ideas of Marxism-Leninism have been the guiding star of the revolution and the building of socialism in a number of countries in Europe and Asia and also in Cuba.

It is under the banner of Marxism-Leninism that the world revolutionary process, the class struggle in Europe, Asia, the Americas and Africa is developing today.

The theory of scientific communism has equipped mankind with knowledge of the laws governing the transition to socialism. By utilising this theory in their struggle, developing it and applying it to the national conditions, the Soviet people and the peoples of other countries which have broken with capitalism, have built socialism, created the model of a new society which is not only of national, but also of international significance.

True, the Western press would like to limit this model to national boundaries, turn it into an isolated phenomenon and on its basis prove that the experience of the USSR cannot be fully applied in other countries.

But the experience of some one country can never be fully utilised by another country, even if they were socio-economic twins; this would not be revolutionary remaking of history, but senseless, mechanical copying resolutely rejected by creative Marxism which always proceeds from the facts of reality and takes cognisance of the concrete situation.

Historical experience teaches, but does not dictate; it enriches and deepens our knowledge of social processes, but is not a stereotype pattern for revolutionary forms. It does not imply the creation of mirror-like socio-economic constructions; historical experience embodies the interconnection of social processes, their movement, and that is why it serves as the theoretical and practical basis for creative revolutionary work.

A reasonable, creative attitude towards historical experience means that it is viewed as a process and not as a final result, as a whole and not in its partial manifestations.

It is often said that the experience gained in building socialism in European and Asian countries is not applicable to Africa. Such theses of Marxism-Leninism as the dictatorship of the proletariat, the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party and of the theory of scientific communism are being debated and even challenged, and controversies are going on concerning the methods of building socialism, the correlation of heavy and light industry, industry and agriculture, etc.

It seems to me that many, if not all, of these issues have become controversial because of misunderstanding or dogmatic interpretation of some laws or principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Clearly the prerequisite for man's transition to socialism is leadership by the working class. But, as we know, the laws of social development operate not in pure form, but as historical tendencies. Hence the forms in which the working class exercises its leading role, the concrete manifestations of this role at different stages of the revolutionary process and in different countries, are multifarious. For example, there was no working class in the Mongolian People's Republic when it stepped out along the highroad of progress. The historical mission of the working class, and in some respects also of the socialist state (for instance, defence of Mongolia's independence against imperialism), was undertaken in the case of Mongolia by the fraternal Soviet Union.

For present-day Africa this problem is seen in a still more specific form. It is common knowledge that in most countries of Tropical Africa the working class is either non-existent or in embryonic form. In countries, in which the working class has already emerged, it, because of its poor organisation and insufficient consciousness, has not yet become the

leading force of the liberation movement. But this question should not be limited by national boundaries. It should be borne in mind that the fight of the African peoples for national liberation and social progress is a component of the world revolutionary process, which consists of three currents: the revolutionary constructive work of the peoples building socialism and communism and thereby deepening and carrying forward the world revolution; the national and social revolution of the peoples of the developing and colonial countries, and the working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries. In this revolutionary process the historical mission of the proletariat is carried out by the socialist system and the world working class. This is manifest in at least three respects: available to the African countries is the wealth of experience gained in building socialism; the socialist world system and the international working class are reliable and powerful allies of the African peoples in their fight against imperialism, for national freedom and social progress; and the socialist countries and the working class generally help to bring the ideas of scientific socialism to the African movement.

In these circumstances new solutions can be found—and the African peoples are indeed finding them—to the problem of the forms in which the leading role of the working class can be realised. The existence of the socialist world system, performing the leading role in the world revolutionary process, makes it possible to carry out far-reaching social changes in countries, in which the working class is either non-existent or does not yet play the leading role, under the leadership of revolutionary democratic parties, etc.

However, the revolutionary democratic forces perform their role up to a certain period of time. Parallel with progressive development the productive forces will grow, the numerical strength of the working class will increase as well as its consciousness and organisation. At the stage of building socialism, too, when modern production is making rapid headway and the working class has become mature, better organised, ideologically united and more numerous, the political, organisational and ideological leading role of the working class is bound to grow in the African countries.

The theory of scientific communism and the practical experience gained by the peoples in the revolutionary reconstruction of society also provide an invaluable groundwork

for solving the problem of what methods to use in building the new life.

For instance, the experience of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union provides a wide range of methods of building socialism. In the early years of the revolution the attempt was made to smash capitalism by frontal attack, i.e., by taking the "shortest, quickest, most direct way of going over to the socialist principles of production and distribution", as Lenin put it. During the years of the New Economic Policy the link between the workers and the peasants was strengthened also by all-round development of trade between town and country, private trade included. At that time a limited development of capitalism was allowed, and concessions were granted to foreign firms.

During the years of industrialisation and the building of collective farms, owing to the conditions in which the Soviet Union found itself, to considerations of an international order, expansion of the productive forces was *accelerated*, as was the reconstruction of agriculture on a socialist footing.

On the basis of the experience gained to date in the transition to socialism it can be said that there are two basic methods of building the new life.

One is the method of radical abolition of obsolete socio-economic relations, resolute elimination of out-of-date structures by various means, non-economic means included, and accelerated growth of production and the creation of new forms of social life to meet political exigencies.

But there is also another method—the method of competition of differing structures, in the course of which the forward-looking rising structures enjoying the support of a revolutionary government triumph, and the conservative, declining structures suffer defeat; the method of maximum application of economic laws for the purpose of fully revealing the progressive character of the emerging structures and finally ousting the moribund ones. This method presupposes gradual reorganisation, reform of social relationships in order to reduce to a minimum the painful aspects of reconstruction.

Discussing the differences between these methods, Lenin wrote:

"Compared with the previous, revolutionary approach, this is a reformist approach (revolution is a transformation which shatters the foundations and roots of the old and does not

remodel it cautiously, slowly, gradually, trying to break as little as possible).

"...The greatest danger, perhaps the only danger, that confronts a genuine revolutionary is exaggeration of revolutionariness, forgetting the limits and conditions in which revolutionary methods are appropriate and can be successfully employed. Genuine revolutionaries have most often broken their necks when they began to write 'revolution' with a capital R, to elevate 'revolution' to something almost divine, to lose their heads, to lose the ability to reflect in the coolest and most sober manner, weigh things and ascertain at what moment, under what circumstances and in which sphere of action it is necessary to act in a revolutionary way and when it is necessary to adopt reformist action. Genuine revolutionaries will perish (not that they will be defeated from outside, but that their internal affairs will collapse) only if—and they certainly will, if they do—they lose their sobriety of outlook and take it into their heads that 'the great, victorious, world' revolution can and must solve all problems in a revolutionary manner under all circumstances and in all spheres of action."

How will the African peoples build a new life? By what methods? It is for them, of course, to decide. An examination of past experience, however, makes it possible to see clearly the positive and negative aspects of the forms and methods of building socialism already tested in practice, and this will most likely make it possible for them to advance with a minimum of error and cost and in a brief space of time to find their own effective ways of solving socialist problems.

But even the first observations of the socio-economic processes on the continent show that the African countries in their fight for social progress and economic prosperity, notwithstanding the specific nature of their concrete tasks, are confronted with many problems similar to those that have been solved by the peoples who have built socialism.

3. The Great African Revolution: Its Character, Features, Driving Forces and Stages

A feature of the battle of ideas in recent times is that concepts of scientific socialism (in its entirety or its main components) are gaining ground in Africa, and that the efforts aimed at creatively applying them in solving the specific, and in many

respects new and urgent problems of African reality, are becoming more varied and persistent. A lively debate is going on around choice of the way of development for the next few decades. Looking at things in the abstract, one might say that there are only two alternatives: the capitalist way and the socialist way. But real life does not afford even this freedom of choice.

The imperialist states no longer count on the natural and spontaneous development of capitalist relations as a result of the disintegration of the communal system, growth of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, and the development of the so far numerically weak elements of the national bourgeoisie. In point of fact, they do not want this to happen, inasmuch as any advance, even on a capitalist basis, threatens their interests. The neo-colonialists are of course exerting every effort to implant capitalism in Africa, but what they want is a lop-sided, dependent capitalism completely tied to the foreign monopolies.

The imperialists want to keep Africa within the sphere of the world capitalist division of labour, prevent it from choosing the socialist road, preserve it as a raw-materials appendage to the developed capitalist states. If they have their way, all the difficult and painful problems tormenting the continent will be aggravated.

There is another way—the way leading to socialism. It cannot be called an easy way, but, in the long run, it will ensure the solution of all the social problems confronting the African continent, satisfaction of the basic interests and aspirations of the people, economic independence and genuine progress. The peoples, all progressive forces are waging a struggle for this way. But to advance along it requires determined effort, the creative, purposeful activity of the masses guided by the revolutionary vanguard.

Three powerful enemies stand in the pathway leading the African continent to socialism:

(a) imperialism, the entire system of neo-colonialism;

(b) the local reactionary forces; they are not very strong numerically, but taking into consideration their position in the state machinery and the economy, their ties with imperialism, their position in political and other public organisations and in the army, it must be admitted that they are a formidable opponent of social progress;

(c) the backwardness of the socio-economic structure of the

African countries, the low levels of output in industry and agriculture, the poverty of the masses, and the cultural backwardness of millions of people.

The elimination of these obstacles; the defeat of imperialism and neo-colonialism on the continent and achievement of genuine economic independence; the political and economic defeat of the internal reactionaries and the establishment of genuine political and economic sovereignty of all the peoples in their own countries; the creation of the broadest possible democracy and genuine participation of the people in the solution of economic and political problems; the liquidation of all forms of backwardness and ensuring social progress; the creation of a society with a comprehensively developed economy; ensuring the flourishing of all aspects of the economy; the abolition of exploitation; a high standard of living, a just social system; genuine equality of all nations, tribes, men and women in social life, and the rapid development of culture—all this forms the content of the great social revolution the African countries are entering one after another.

In its present phase this is a national-democratic revolution, because firstly, it is aimed at winning complete *national independence*, and, secondly, to ensure social and economic progress. Moreover, the national and social problems are inseparably intertwined.

In certain respects the African revolution is accompanied by features unknown to any other revolution so far.

One of these is the priority of the constructive over the destructive tasks following the overthrow of colonial domination and the winning of power by the patriotic, popular democratic forces.

As has been said, feudalism never existed as a developed social system in most countries of Tropical Africa. Hence there is no need to uproot it. Capitalism, too, was absent as a system. And so there is no capitalism to destroy. These tasks, as we know, were solved in one way or another in all previous revolutions.

The specific nature of the democratic phase of the social revolution in Africa consists further in that in the overwhelming majority of cases there is a real possibility of avoiding civil war between antagonistic classes, of isolating the hostile class elements and compelling them to bow to the will of the democratic majority by peaceful political and economic means employed with the solid support of the people gen-

erally. But, needless to say, this does not imply complete rejection of coercion by armed force, of which the Marxists are accused by Left extremists. The political domination of the colonialists and racists can be ended only by armed action, and in some cases such action is the basic way to fight neo-colonialist regimes. Experience shows that armed clashes can and do take place in Africa. However, as a rule, these clashes have been associated with an upper-crust struggle for power between rival political groupings and clans.

It should be stressed that the above thesis refers only to countries which have shaken off the colonial yoke. As regards such countries as Angola, Southern Rhodesia, "Portuguese" Guinea, South Africa and some others, the imperialists and white racists have not left them any other means of winning independence except the determined, uncompromising armed struggle against the colonial oppressors and racists.

The social revolution in Africa is unique also because of its unintermittent character, the progressive dynamism of its advance and development, the gradual transition from the solution of one task to the solution of others as strength is accumulated and social relations develop. True, with imperialism, neo-colonialism and its agents within the various countries trying to strangle the revolution, there have been ups and downs, and even some retreats, but the overall tendency towards accelerated advance is asserting itself and its further strengthening will to a large extent depend on the activity and consciousness of the masses, on the work of the patriotic revolutionary forces.

Reforms can become a method for solving contradictions, a driving force in the transition from one qualitative state of society to another.

In the present-day conditions, when there exists the socialist world system assisting the social advance of the peoples of Africa, and also bearing in mind the weakness of the national bourgeoisie, the conditions are becoming favourable in Africa for a broader utilisation of reforms in revolutionary development.

Even such measures as the formation of a new socio-economic structure, industrialisation and co-operation can be effected not by methods of drastic reconstruction over brief periods of time and with great exertion of effort, but gradually. The Marxist concept of reforms as a method for resolving contradictions is based on the analysis of real

processes and completely repudiates the claims of some theorists who insist that historical materialism should be brushed aside because it, allegedly, recognises only steep, explosive and leap-like changes in the development of society, changes that assume painful forms and require enormous strain of social energy. In reality, historical materialism has substantiated the utilisation of evolutionary processes for the solution of revolutionary tasks.

It may be noted that the gradual character of the revolution, the broad application of the method of reforms in Africa lends it a highly specific character. The USSR was compelled in a very short period of time to nationalise industry and, after gathering strength, to undertake rapid industrialisation and make a leap in the sphere of collective forms of organising agricultural production. As stated above, this was not done for the sake of adhering to certain concepts but in view of the need to prepare the country to repulse imperialist aggression. And had the Soviet people and the CPSU not done this, we, I fear, would hardly have been able to meet here. But it is thanks to the successes of the socialist states that the African people can build a new life without violating objective economic laws.

Owing to the fact that the influence of neo-colonialism in Africa is still very strong, the democratic revolutions there will retain their anti-colonial nature for a long time to come. In this respect they can hardly differ from the anti-colonial, anti-imperialist revolutions of other countries.



The African peoples are confronted with the vital necessity of destroying the remnants of archaic, obsolete social forms (tribal, semi-slavery, semi-feudal, feudal), laying the foundations of modern production, ensuring the masses a minimum of democracy and culture, and solving urgent social problems. These tasks are of a general democratic character. Historically capitalism is called upon to solve them, but it has not even taken shape as a formation. This was prevented by colonialism, foreign capitalism.

As has been shown by the experience of many African countries, the general democratic tasks facing the continent cannot be solved within the framework of capitalism. These problems can be solved during the transitional stage which

has come to be known as the non-capitalist way, the non-capitalist phase of development, that is, the phase when transitional tasks of a general democratic nature but projected towards the socialist perspective are solved. The term "non-capitalist way" has, of course, its inadequacies, but it is useful in the sense that it clearly points to the need for a more or less prolonged transitional stage on the way to socialism owing to the absence of the material prerequisites for embarking directly on the building of socialism.

Building socialism implies, firstly, the creation of powerful productive forces in industry and agriculture; secondly, socialised means of production and creation of socialist relations of production; thirdly, political organisation of society on a socialist footing.

However, the objective preconditions for the solution of these problems are only being created in most African countries. There is a tendency to regard the initial steps towards socialisation of the means of production, even of primitive tools, as building socialism. Socialisation of the means of production is, of course, a step forward. But this alone, without a powerful material and technological base and without major achievements in the sphere of culture, does not amount to socialism. All the conditions—social, economic and cultural—and also some of the political prerequisites necessary for building socialism are created in the course of the transitional period we call the non-capitalist stage. Although at this stage a number of measures of a socialist nature are carried out they still do not add up to the establishment of a socialist society.

The non-capitalist stage is a complex historical phenomenon.

Firstly, it is a revolution limited in time. Its aim is to traverse in decades a path which took many other countries centuries. The peoples of Africa, having broken free from the fetters of conservatism, are beginning to scale the summits of progress.

Secondly, the socio-historical tasks which were solved by many societies under feudalism and capitalism and by the methods typical for these formations will in the pre-socialist phase be solved as general democratic tasks during the non-capitalist development. They will be solved by revolutionary-democratic and socialist methods. That is why the economic and political programme of the non-capitalist phase includes measures which carry the revolutionary process beyond the

boundaries of ordinary revolutionary-democratic transformations and which contain more or less pronounced elements of socialism although in the initial stages they do not bring the country directly to socialism.

Thirdly, the non-capitalist way makes possible a grand historical leap from primitive, semi-slave-owning, semi-feudal, semi-capitalist relations, by-passing advanced capitalism, to a democratically organised society and, eventually, to socialism.

Fourthly, as regards its socio-economic essence the non-capitalist way is a phase of transition, and the society which takes shape along this way is a society with transitional relationships of production.

This transition has several aspects. First, the socio-economic aspect of this phase is characterised by the existence of a variety of forms of economic structure. Some of these combine in a somewhat contradictory unity features of the past and features of the future and hence themselves are transitional.

The concrete picture of the transitional relationships of production would be something like this:

1. The state sector. This is the future socialism in embryo.
2. The state-capitalist sector: enterprises jointly owned by the state and private proprietors. This is a transitional form.
3. The foreign-capitalist sector. This is a colonial, purely capitalist structure which embodies all the negative aspects of modern imperialism.
4. The private-capitalist sector. This is also a purely capitalist structure although it has specific features in Africa. In most countries this form is not yet widely developed.
5. The co-operative sector. In a number of countries this is a dynamically developing sector. Where there is no mature state sector the initial forms of co-operation may not be of a socialist character and, moreover, may serve as a disguise for the exploitation of the working peasantry by the tribal chiefs. But later, as this sector acquires more mature features, elements of socialism will, under certain conditions, develop within it.
6. The small-scale commodity sector and natural economy. The small-scale commodity sector in the African countries considerably differs from its counterpart in the capitalist countries. In interaction with the state sector and provided it receives aid from the state it tends to develop into various forms of co-operation, thus engendering a socialist tendency.

Such is the complicated and varied picture of the transitional social relations taking shape in the process of the non-capitalist development of African society. It should be stressed in this connection that the role of the sectors, their importance in economic life, is far from identical in all countries.

The non-capitalist way develops as a result of the mutual influence and conflict of all these sectors. In the course of this struggle the structures left over from previous formations suffer defeat and are compelled to leave the scene. The socialist structures triumph and become predominant.

The superstructure of the state of national democracy corresponds to the non-capitalist way. The state can be just as diverse in form, shading and nuance as is the objective historical development of the African countries.

The superstructure conforms to the process of non-capitalist development if the entire policy of the state genuinely reflects the interests of the people and if conditions are created which preclude the possibility of a privileged group—the military, technocrats, or party bureaucrats—being able to seize the dominant position or even to establish their rule by removing the masses from participation in political life.

In the light of all this one cannot agree with the contention that power alone should be the source of socialism. Socialism, a higher type of democracy, derives from the people. It is built by all the working people. And it is the people who are the defenders of socialism against the monopoly capitalists, internal reaction and the threat of military coups.

4. The Democratic Revolution and the Prospects of Its Development into a Socialist Revolution

The ultimate aim of the non-capitalist stage, which is a continuation of the national-democratic revolution, is to ensure the development of this revolution into a socialist revolution, to prepare the conditions for the direct building of socialism.

Development along the non-capitalist way passes through phases which differ in character and duration from country to country. There is no strict order of succession for these stages. But there are historical junctures which characterise the sequence of the maturing of social relations in the process of non-capitalist development.

For many African countries the first stage, and in all likelihood a rather long one, will be the preparatory demo-

cratic period when the material, social, political and cultural preconditions are created for the advance along the non-capitalist way.

There are countries in Africa where modern industry is non-existent or hardly exists, where there is no infrastructure and where agriculture is primitive and lopsided.

As a rule, two sectors predominate in these countries: the natural, small-scale commodity sector with insignificant capitalist elements, and the foreign-capitalist, neo-colonialist sector.

The experience of these countries shows that the most important socio-economic task of the initial phase of non-capitalist development is to create a state sector as the embryo of further progress and a co-operative sector to prepare the millions of peasants for progressive forms of social life. The rudiments of industry (processing agricultural raw materials, production of consumer goods, repair of machinery, etc.) are created at this stage. Modernisation of agriculture, increasing its productivity, and the use of modern implements, fertilisers, etc., assume special importance in the process of developing the co-operatives. Society pays serious attention to creating an infrastructure where it does not exist. On the whole, the object is to go over from simple to extended reproduction.

Two problems come to the fore at this stage: the attitude to the emerging private capitalist structure and the colonial sector. These are debatable matters. It is often maintained that the emergence and especially the development of a private capitalist sector should be opposed. Only time, the experience of each country, can provide the final answer. Everything depends on the circumstances, but as I see it one cannot always categorically deny the need to draw on private initiative.

Given power in the hands of the people, given a politically alert working people, and given contacts with the socialist world, a measure of private enterprise can perhaps be permitted, provided it is constantly controlled by a revolutionary society, and the economic and political levers in the hands of the people's state are used to restrict the growth of this sector.

Still more complex is the question of the attitude towards the foreign sector. From the objective historical and international viewpoints the practicability and effectiveness of the

non-capitalist path is ensured by direct and indirect aid of the socialist system and the resolute, uncompromising struggle waged by the peoples against imperialism and for the complete abolition of all types of colonial and neo-colonialist oppression. But it is hard to imagine the African countries being able to isolate themselves from the capitalist world. Experience so far shows that the traditional economic and cultural ties are likely to be maintained, in a modified form, for a more or less long time. In the present international situation, with the influence exerted by the socialist world, the developing countries may enter, and some already are entering, into various kinds of economic, trade, credit, scientific and technical relations of a new type. In the opinion of progressive African leaders, it is expedient to have these relationships refracted through the prism of state or mixed ownership. This would ensure a certain influx of capital and specialists and a growth of markets and at the same time safeguard the national sovereignty and economic independence.

The realisation of the tasks of the first stage of non-capitalist development does not yet create the conditions for building socialism. It merely ushers in a new phase of non-capitalist development, that of pre-socialist reconstruction. The main aim at this stage is to build a modern light industry, to lay the foundations for industry making means of production, and a highly productive agriculture. In the sphere of social relations, socialisation is carried further and, as the objective conditions ripen, partial and sometimes complete nationalisation of the basic means of production is effected. The two sectors—the state and co-operative sectors, which form the base of the new society—become predominant. Natural economy is abolished. Small-scale commodity production is preserved to some extent in agriculture, handicrafts, and in services.

As to the private capitalist sector (where it exists), it is maintained at the initial stage. But a steady process of ousting it by economic means is already under way, and it plays an ever smaller role in the economy. The matter of foreign-owned enterprises is decided in keeping with the concrete conditions.

As a result of these processes a relatively mature transitional society with several forms of economic structure takes shape, a society in which socialist and non-socialist elements interact, exert a reciprocal influence and compete with each

other. On balance, however, the socialist elements, supported by the revolutionary government, should constantly gain ground and restrict the non-socialist, and economic planning should make steady progress.

The national-democratic revolution grows into a socialist revolution, the non-capitalist way leads to the phase of building socialism. Changes take place also in the superstructure. The state of the transitional period develops into a socialist state. But it is practically impossible to foresee all its concrete forms. They will be determined by life itself.

5. The Relationship Between Politics and the Economy in the Different Phases of the African Revolution

In any revolutionary movement politics, i.e., the subjective factor, imparts a vital impulse to the struggle. In the African revolution the role of politics is extremely great and it is constantly growing in breadth and even more so in depth. Politics influence to an ever growing extent the most essential aspects of the social relationships.

This is due to a number of historical circumstances: the grandeur of the revolution's aim—to build an economically developed, prosperous society, socialism, in the shortest possible time; the scale of the tasks—to build from scratch a powerful industry and a modern agriculture and rapidly to raise living standards; the novelty of the path—no one so far has taken the non-capitalist path in conditions such as those obtaining in Africa, which means that it will have to blaze the trail independently.

African society faces a dialectically contradictory problem: it is necessary to accelerate the building of the new life, to exert the maximum effort, but at the same time political and especially economic overstrain must be avoided. Only political leadership can find the solution to this contradiction. Politics, as Lenin noted, becomes the concentrated expression of economics.

The political approach implies a striving fully and deeply to reflect in political concepts and actions the requirements of economic development, and to find reserves and resources to meet the demands of economic and social progress.

It is up to the state to find solutions to such problems as planning, ensuring a harmonious balance between production and consumption, between industries producing consumer

goods and means of production, between industry and agriculture; to pursue a tax and finance policy corresponding to the interests of the revolution; to wage an uncompromising struggle against corruption and all forms of plunder of state property; to promote the development of the more advanced and promising sectors of the economy; to solve the problem of accumulation, organise the training of skilled workers and technicians, ensure sound economic relations with the socialist countries and to mobilise all resources to combat neo-colonialist oppression.

Moreover, it is up to the state to exercise control over the various private sectors: capitalist, small-scale commodity and colonial sectors.

From this the following conclusions can be drawn:

—the state must have scientifically substantiated economic and political plans which clearly define the strategic aims and the tactical methods for achieving them at each stage;

—for the national-democratic revolution to develop successfully, the people and their representatives—the revolutionary patriotic organisations—must firmly stand at the helm of state.



Many of the peculiarities and specific laws of development of the African revolution are the result not only of the intrinsic features of African society, but also of the influence exerted by contemporary international factors and, first of all, by the existence of the socialist world system. It is indeed due to the influence of world socialism that the socialist tendency can assert itself in many aspects of African life, and an even greater variety of methods of building the new life be devised.

The socialist world system, the bulwark of human progress, exerts a direct and an equally important indirect influence on all social, political and ideological relationships in Africa.

The socialist system is the most sincere and consistent ally of the African people in their struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism. It extends and will continue to extend direct and indirect political, diplomatic and, if necessary, military aid to the African peoples battling for genuine independence and social progress.

The socialist countries extend many-sided economic, scientific and technical aid to the African peoples, promoting the development of industry and agriculture. They thereby, and

also by the very fact of their existence, exert an influence also on the policy of the capitalist countries, compelling the latter to make concessions to the developing countries as a manoeuvre designed to safeguard their positions.

The socialist countries stand by the African working people. They are ready to march with them along the road to the triumph of socialism.

Africa has already given much to world history and will surely enrich it in the future with an even greater new, original and valuable contribution.

AHS

NEO-COLONIALISM IN AFRICA

ALI YATA

I

Africa, throwing off its fetters and flexing its muscles, is searching for the way forward. But it is faced with enormous difficulties. For too long the embattled continent was captive to idealistic oversimplification and starry-eyed optimism which caused people to think that henceforth it would be smooth sailing, that all the barriers were down and Africa could forge ahead along the high road of justice, prosperity and happiness free from obstacles and pitfalls.

The view was held that the national-liberation movement was to develop rapidly and irresistibly, without halts or retreats, that a revolutionary situation prevailed everywhere. And from this, incorrect strategic conclusions were drawn and tactical lines adopted which could not lead to success.

There was a tendency not to distinguish clearly between stages of historical development, with the result that it was not seen what could be achieved and what could not in the given circumstances. For instance, socialism was proclaimed when the means for building it were lacking and thus exposed to the danger of being discredited in the eyes of the people.

There was a tendency to put forward slogans irreproachable in themselves but inadequate to evoke a response among the people and to rally them, and still less capable of finding concrete expression, for they did not correspond to the aspirations and vital needs of the African peoples. In particular this applies to the slogan of a single African government.

It is therefore necessary to make a closer examination of the African realities in all their multiformity and complexity, to face the truth however harsh, to eschew exaggerations and to pose only those tasks which can be carried out, while continuing of course to work to open to the peoples happier prospects, eventual realisation of which is guaranteed by the laws of social development and struggle.

In this connection it should be said that the hallmark of any genuinely revolutionary African organisation is its spirit of realism.

We by no means wish to create by these preliminary remarks the impression that we are taking a pessimistic view of the situation now or in the foreseeable future; we merely want to focus attention on what we believe has been a weakness of the African revolutionary and progressive movement in recent years.

It should be underscored that the main feature of post-war Africa is the rapid disintegration of the principal colonial empires which once held practically the entire continent in their grip.

This disintegration did not come as a surprise for the African peoples. It was the result of decades of struggle waged with varying degrees of intensity depending on the country and the circumstances, a struggle in which the participants learned by their own experience, often without adequate ideological grounding since they knew little or nothing about revolutionary movements in other parts of the world, and especially about the international working-class movement and the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia.

We must of course pay tribute to the heroes of Africa, both the known and the unknown, who founded the splendid traditions of anti-imperialist struggle on the continent, traditions which have already borne fruit in the winning of political independence by many countries and which should be preserved and developed in order to bring freedom to those still under foreign rule.

But for all that, the victories gained to date became possible thanks to the growth of the progressive forces in the world which defeated fascism, the extreme manifestation of ultra-colonialist and racist ideology, thanks to the rise of the socialist world system. For the bourgeoisie of the European countries emerged from the Second World War greatly

weakened and unable to perpetuate its traditional overlordship in Africa.

A new competitor now came to the fore—the U.S. bourgeoisie, which together with international monopolies took over the economic and political leadership in the capitalist world.

Thus the struggle waged by the African peoples openly or clandestinely, by armed means or by peaceful methods, triumphed over one type of imperialist domination—naked colonial rule by imperialist Europe. But it did not achieve genuine and complete national liberation.

Even today the feature of the African continent is that it remains an arena where the national striving of peoples towards complete independence clashes with the imperialist striving for domination.

This, a constant factor, should be stressed, for it testifies to the continuity of the struggle of the African peoples; it is the living, concrete political factor linking the various forms of struggle throughout the continent. The Moroccan people, for example, are fighting against different forms of imperialism, depending on whether they live in the liberated part of the country, in the province of Mauritania recently torn away from the motherland, or in the remaining strongholds of Spanish occupation: Rio de Oro, Saguia el Hamra, Ifni, Ceuta and Melilla.

One can hardly obtain a full idea of African reality if phenomena stemming from the classical type of colonial rule are not taken into account. On the other hand, it should be borne in mind that neo-colonialism makes a deep imprint also on the classical colonial structure, imparting to it some of its specific features and thereby modernising it.

The neo-colonial powers are known: the United States, France, Great Britain, Federal Germany, Japan, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, Switzerland and Sweden.

The United States also exercises its influence through Israel on non-Arab Africa, through Portugal on Angola and Mozambique, through Spain on its possessions and Arab Maghreb countries, and through the South African Republic on neighbouring countries.

The replacing of the traditional imperialism by neo-colonialism—a process epitomised by the Eisenhower doctrine of "filling vacuums"—has acquired considerable dimensions. In a number of cases it has led to sharp conflicts both between the imperialists of different countries and between competing

Imperialist groups in the same country. The consequences of this rivalry have been experienced by countries such as Morocco and the Congo.

Sometimes the neo-colonialists try to camouflage their actions and their domination. The French Community is a case in point. U.S. influence is likewise spread in a round-about way and through agents, both in the matter of investment and in cases of armed intervention.

Because of this covert activity neo-colonialism has been underestimated not only by some African parties, organisations and governments, but also by progressives elsewhere who, impressed by the sensational disintegration of the classical imperialism, have not always fully appreciated the possibility of a new imperialism emerging with all the tactical and political implications this involves.

One can often hear the oversimplified view expressed that neo-colonialism is the outcome of the weakening of imperialism, a sign of its inability to continue to base its relations with the former colonial countries on crude force.

As we see it this thesis reflects a certain underestimation of imperialism. By the same token some people, prompted by revolutionary optimism, see in the armed aggression in Vietnam a sign of weakness. The tendency is to see these signs everywhere and to regard imperialism as being constantly on the defensive, whereas actually it has in many cases gone over to the offensive, as can be seen from the events of the past two years on our continent. The imperialist counter-offensive which has caused the African revolutionary and progressive movement to retreat to some extent does not of course alter the world balance of strength, which remains favourable to progress and socialism.

In our opinion, one of the reasons for the underestimation of neo-colonialism is that, notwithstanding Lenin's clear-cut and still timely counsel concerning the imperialist tendency of capitalism, no sufficiently profound analysis of the question has been made from a Marxist standpoint. Way back in 1920 Lenin underscored the "need constantly to explain and expose among the broadest working masses of all countries, and particularly of the backward countries, the deception systematically practised by the imperialist powers, which, in the guise of politically independent states, set up states that are wholly dependent upon them economically, financially and militarily".

To some extent this is the case today too. The African peoples are still not sufficiently alerted to the U.S. striving for hegemony, nor have the machinations of international monopolies been sufficiently exposed.

II

In their day-to-day struggle the peoples of Africa come up against diverse forms of imperialism, and the fight they are waging against neo-colonialism is attended by specific difficulties.

It should be stressed above all that *the basic feature of neo-colonialism is by no means the use of means less violent than the naked terror of direct colonial rule, it is rather the financial infiltration of the economy and indirect influence exerted through either the classical colonial structure or through the local bureaucratic state machine.* Neo-colonialist domination may be established and preserved by either forcible or non-forcible means, depending on the circumstances.

Whereas formerly colonial dictatorship was exercised by a single invader after the imperialists had come to agreement on the distribution of colonies, today imperialist capital dominates wholly or partly many African countries either through the agency of monopolies with ramified systems of subsidiaries or through international organisations controlled by the USA, such as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Finance Corporation, International Monetary Fund and International Development Agency.

If the classical colonial aggression was of a peripheral nature and designed to subjugate the country militarily and politically in order to establish control over its economy, neo-colonialism has sufficient strength and means to attempt to establish financial control at top level from the outset.

Keith Morsefield, publications director of the International Monetary Fund, wrote in the October, 1965, issue of *Finance and Development*, organ of the IMF and IBRD: "The League of Nations Conference recommended the establishment of central banks with the purpose of preventing governments from adopting independent policies; but nowadays central banks are created mainly to help governments to adopt the policy of their choice."

African experience shows that the first principle still prevails. The author hastens to specify: "A really independent

central bank—such as that of monetary institutions abroad—may be of a greater help to a government than a national central bank, the stabilising power of which could also be limited.”

This means that people charged with carrying neo-colonialism into practice visualise financial domination primarily as control over state finance, exercised through administering it.

The seizure of this vital economic lever enables the imperialists to dictate the financial policy of the African states to suit their own interests, decide whether there will be devaluation or inflation, determine credits policy, etc.

In Morocco, for instance, IBRD and IMF specialists compelled the country to give up the five-year plan—the first attempt of the short-lived progressive government to ameliorate the economic situation—and to replace it by a three-year plan which spelled stagnation. They determined priorities for the Moroccan economy in disregard of its real needs and the plight of the peasantry, which makes up 80 per cent of our population.

Like all capitalist banks, the various imperialist banks contribute to the growth of the indebtedness of states. This money-lender's method strengthens their grip on the latter.

It will be recalled that these monopolistic organisations are mostly U.S.-controlled, for the United States' share in the IBRD amounts to 75 per cent, and interest on international loans is paid chiefly to U.S. banks.

Highly characteristic is the activity of the Agency for International Development (AID), the homonymy of which is constantly taken advantage of by U.S. propaganda. Between 1959 and 1961 two-thirds of its credits were interest-free, whereas in 1965 70 per cent of them were granted as loans.

Since 1962 the bulk of these loans has had to be repaid in U.S. dollars, and not in local currency as before.

In 1962 loans for a term of 40 years were granted at an interest not higher than 2.5 per cent, and 25-year loans at a higher interest. Mention should also be made of a new invention of the U.S. imperialists—the “Cooley loans” whose funds are made up from receipts from the sale of foodstuffs for African currencies. The declared purpose of this AID-controlled organisation is to “promote business activity and growth of trade” in Tunisia, Morocco, Guinea, Sudan and Ethiopia. It receives:

\$2,700,000 in Tunisian dinars
\$2,000,000 in Moroccan dirhams
\$1,640,000 in Guinean francs
\$1,018,000 in Sudanese pounds
\$148,000 in Ethiopian dollars

Thus the money obtained from the sale of foodstuffs helps the imperialists strengthen their domination.

U.S. investments in Africa amount to \$2,500 million as against \$20,000 million invested by the European countries. But they grow much faster. They totalled \$287 million in 1950, 573 million in 1955, 1,423 million in 1963 and 1,629 million in 1964. These official data do not include investments made under foreign cover. The figure of \$2,500 million is more correct.

A feature of the U.S. investments is that they are channelled, as a rule, not to the manufacturing industries. This can be seen from an examination of the U.S. investments made in 1964, which totalled \$1,629 million. Of this sum

\$830 million was invested in oil and gas extraction, mainly in Libya;

\$350 million in mining;

\$225 million in manufacturing industry, but of this \$192 million went into South Africa and only \$33 million in the rest of the continent;

\$122 million in other branches, particularly crude rubber production in Liberia.

U.S. penetration into this area is effected primarily by means of "aid", which makes it possible to exert political pressure while being less burdensome and risky for the colonialists themselves.

According to official statistics, the U.S. "aid" to Africa between 1946 and 1965 amounted to \$3,062 million, with two-thirds of it granted between 1961 and June 1965. Within the framework of this "aid", five African countries received more than \$200 million each:

Morocco — 488.4 million (of which 448 million since independence)

Tunisia — 451.1 million

Congo (Kinshasa) — 301.3 million

Liberia — 230.9 million

Lybia — 206.4 million

This is added proof of the United States' special plans with

regard to the Arab Maghreb, Liberia and the Congo and the special pressure on them.

European "aid" to the African continent is slightly more than double the U.S. figure, but *it should be noted that the total of Western "aid" to Africa amounts to only one-fifth of the national income of France.* This affords an idea of how miserly this aid is, compared with the development needs of the oppressed and exploited continent and with what is needed to ensure the future of so many nations.

Moreover, the neo-colonialist infiltration takes place even when direct colonial rule still exists, and is effected by the monopoly tentacles of the old colonialism as well as by new means.

Morocco affords many examples of this. We recall that at the time of the French Protectorate the Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas controlled the greater part of the national economy. And to this day it has retained much of its influence; it still controls some branches of the mining industry, having relinquished, on exceedingly favourable conditions for itself, its grip on the electric power industry and the railways. The new element in its activities is the tourist trade. With the help of U.S. capital it has set up travel firms and is also active in investment companies.

During the protectorate France established in our Mauritanian province two companies—Miferma and Micuma—in which capital from other Western countries participates. Micuma is under U.S. control today. These two are the real masters of the Mauritanian pseudo-state, which receives from them some crumbs in reward for its complaisance.

Strong positions are held in Morocco by Unilever, while Proctor & Gamble has entrenched itself in the production of detergents. They monopolise trade in soap, formerly a domain of small manufacturers.

But the penetration and entrenchment of neo-colonialism is not necessarily accompanied by industrial construction. As we have seen, in 1964 only 2 per cent of U.S. investments in Africa (with the exception of South Africa) went into manufacturing.

The U.N. Conference on Trade and Development revealed that between 1950 and 1961 the profits and interest repatriated from the undeveloped countries totalled \$20,900 million, whereas private long-term investments there in 1951-60 amounted to only \$10,300 million.

The neo-colonialists are not interested in Africa's development. Factories are built only as appendages to the imperialists' industry, and the term "industrialisation" is often used to imply production having no major industrial significance.

Going back to Morocco, we put on record that neo-colonialism has not prevented outflow of capital and a drop in investments. Some enterprises have been abandoned and replaced by others, accentuating the one-sided character of the economy in which some branches produce more than the country needs.

For instance, in October 1965 the United States sold us \$3,350,000 worth of edible vegetable oil. This was done despite the fact that the cultivation of oil-bearing plants is rapidly growing in our country (in 1962-63 the area under these plants increased from 3,000 to 13,000 hectares), and oil-mills are closed because of overproduction.

We already have Simca and Fiat assembly lines, which do not operate to capacity because the domestic market is limited and export difficult. Nevertheless, a Renault line has been added to them.

This is not an isolated example. Factories assembling lorries, tractors and TV sets have to be closed to free the market for foreign-made commodities or introduce a new neo-colonialist group.

Foreign trade, which plays quite an important role in the economic life of the liberated countries, remains under the control of the neo-colonialists, who fix the world prices, own the merchant fleet and, generally speaking, dominate the markets. This is not just a matter of mere competitive capacity.

An exceptionally important role in this connection is played by the banks. Apart from the general financial control exercised and pressure exerted by the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development and its affiliates, we are witnessing an increasing infiltration by commercial banks and the subverting of the state organisations engaged in the economic sphere. As a result, the state-controlled banks have found themselves in neo-colonialist dependence and the Industrial Investment Research Bureau has been closed.

In this connection mention should be made of the recently-founded International Bank of West Africa with the participation of French and American capital.

To this should be added the corruption of high-ranking civil servants and economic executives which has resulted in the

crystallisation of a class of "bureaucratic" bourgeoisie acting as an accomplice of neo-colonialism, a class which is rapidly enriching itself.

This kind of thing is widespread in Africa, where the neo-colonialists have taken patronage over those who served their interests when they were the direct colonial rulers. These people are again playing their old anti-national role as the core of the compradore class.

The role of the latter, not confined to the commercial sphere, is widely felt also in political life. The soldier clans, for instance, used in the past by the classical colonialism for its own ends, are still on the scene, ever ready to do the bidding of neo-colonialism. They have already played their part in more than one reactionary coup.

Neo-colonialist penetration is effected also through foreign technological and cultural "aid", the U.S. Peace Corps, the French and Dutch "champions of progress", through the Moral Rearmament agency and others.

Religious beliefs, too, are used as a neo-colonialist weapon to counteract patriotism and progressive nationalism. Countless intrigues and machinations are camouflaged by religion.

Thus, the Jewish religion is used, through the agency of Zionism, for the double purpose of weakening certain African states by the departure of Jewish minorities, which have a large percentage of intellectuals, and increasing the population of the Zionist state.

Attempts are also made to encourage growth of religious sects which flourish in the United States, such as the Bahai movement.

Islam is employed with the help of some "Moslem brotherhoods". The same aims are to be served by the projected Islamic pact.

Christianity, however, is the most dangerous Trojan Horse. At the second Ecumenical Council, which had a total attendance of 2,200, Africa was represented by 300 bishops of whom 79 had been born on the African continent. Bishop Merclier from Sahara declared there: "It is a scandal and a misfortune to realise that for the desolate world communism frequently seems to hold the monopoly of true justice and the salvation of the poor."

Incidentally, the majority of the Council declared in favour of an alliance of the various Christian religions against anismism, long professed by some African peoples, and against

Islam, which is winning ever stronger positions. For this purpose the African representatives at the Council requested freedom of action transcending the canonic in order "to set up the framework of an African piety and prepare the introduction of new rites inspired by the autochthonous folk lore and culture".

Lastly, *in examining the question of neo-colonialist penetration in Africa, particular attention should be paid to the military aspect of the problem.*

Above all it should be noted that so far the imperialists have not involved any of the African countries in military alliances such as NATO in Europe, SEATO in Asia and CENTO in the Middle East.

Nevertheless the continent is encircled by aggressive military systems represented, on the one hand, by U.S. naval forces and bases on the Canary Islands, the Azores, Ascension Island and elsewhere, by Israel, and, on the other hand, by the strategic strongpoints left over from the time of colonial occupation. Some of the latter are still maintained in combat readiness and are being modernised by the USA and NATO. And now that the United States is encountering difficulties in the Atlantic military set-up, it is planning to establish strategic reserve positions in Africa, especially in the last Spanish possessions on the continent, Rio de Oro in particular. Nor have the U.S. imperialists abandoned the hope of regaining possession of their former nuclear bases in our country to complement the Wheelus Field base in Libya.

France and Britain still have bases in some of their former colonies, on which they have imposed military conditions giving them the right to meddle in the internal affairs of the particular countries. And they are anxious not to miss any opportunity to make use of this right. Moreover, the training of African officers in the military schools of the neo-colonialist powers offers the latter an opening for corruption of which they are making full use.

The military threat hanging over Africa is often concealed by the negligible number of foreign troops stationed there, since the use of modern weapons obviates the need for large bases. As the French *Overseas Juridical Review* noted, "armed intervention is no longer dependent on the stationing of military units in advance. It may therefore be said that fulfilment of our commitments under defence agreements

presupposes to a far greater extent the availability of the forces needed for invasion than the presence of large contingents of troops on the spot".

This highlights the danger presented to the African countries by the "defence" agreements concluded with the imperialists, both with the old colonial rulers and with the United States, which prefers secret compacts. The USA, Federal Germany and Israel also render military-technological "aid" to African countries.

The Congo tragedy is an instance of the most shameless imperialist intervention with the participation of mercenaries hired from the misfits of society in the colonialist countries, the Belgian revanchists, U.S. agents and the United Nations forces which were used to preserve and strengthen the positions of the neo-colonialists. That the latter have considerable resources in the sphere of military action can be seen from the frequency of the military coups.

III

The series of coups witnessed in recent times merits careful study.

Some believe that they were due exclusively to internal factors, while others attribute them solely to the influence of neo-colonialist forces. We believe that no generalisation can be made without the risk of arriving at only a partial, inadequate and hence in the long run erroneous answer. For, although all these events occurred within a brief span of time marked by the growing aggressiveness of imperialism, it is no less true that they took place in conditions specific to each of the countries concerned.

Still, some elementary facts should not be overlooked, facts generally recognised with respect to Ghana, Dahomey, Upper Volta, the Central African Republic, the Congo and Nigeria alike:

1. *In each case, the hand of neo-colonialism was visible in one way or another.*
2. *In each case power was seized by the military.*
3. *As a result of military takeovers both progressive regimes which had launched out on the road of non-capitalist development and regimes linked with neo-colonialism were overthrown.*

4. *The coups met with little, if any, resistance from the people.*

The involvement of neo-colonialism in these events, whatever its form and extent, was due to the growing aggressiveness of imperialism on the international plane—the escalation of aggression evident in Africa as in Vietnam. Aggressiveness is, of course, typical of imperialism, but it is heightened by the striving to take advantage of the temporary difficulties in the world revolutionary movement with a view to changing the balance of forces and retarding the development of the socialist world system and the national liberation movement. But it hardly needs saying that imperialism, no matter how many "points" it may score, cannot halt the march of history.

In some of the coups, as, for instance, in Ghana, the neo-colonialists above all sought to put a stop to non-capitalist development and to regain their economic positions. In takeovers in countries directly controlled by the neo-colonialists, the aim was to remove servile but no longer useful leaders for fear that their inability to rule would stimulate the popular struggle and jeopardise the privileges enjoyed by the imperialists.

One of the more disquieting features of the coups was that the people did not take vigorous action against them and that the reactionaries were able to achieve their sinister ends without opposition from anyone but the genuine revolutionaries.

In our view this was due to two groups of reasons:

1. Reasons of a more deep-seated nature associated with the colonial background.

2. Immediate reasons emanating from the mistakes and shortcomings of the progressive revolutionary movement.

There is no need to discuss in detail the first of these reasons, such as the weakness of the African economy caused by colonial plunder, the extremely low cultural level, illiteracy and the scarcity of educated and trained local people. Needless to say, countries which seriously pursue a policy of industrialisation and forge ahead irrespective of the difficulties, and gained freedom some years ago, such as the United Arab Republic, are less vulnerable than younger states like Ghana.

It is equally clear that it is impossible to overcome the consequences of the century-old colonial exploitation in the space of three, five or even ten years. It must be frankly

admitted that this basic truth was often eclipsed by overconfidence or demagogy. The masses, who were more or less definitely promised that soon their standard of living would compare favourably with that of their former masters, believed what they were told, all the more so since they were still riding on a wave of enthusiasm. Some people, to whom imperialism had given a modicum of education, became careerists and made up the bureaucratic stratum whose support played the decisive role in the subsequent putsches. The masses, who had sacrificed much in the liberation struggle and to build a better life, were either disillusioned or felt they had been betrayed. The progressive and revolutionary leadership, being isolated and lacking effective mass support, left the doors wide open to all kinds of adventurers. The putschists attacked the shortcomings of the revolution; this was their trump, all the more so that in some of the countries concerned inter-tribal antagonisms became aggravated.

We appreciate, of course, that the unbridled demagogy to which the new regimes have resorted will not get them very far. The unsolved problems will make themselves felt with renewed force, since the neo-colonialist exploitation and the growing appetites of the new bourgeoisie can but accelerate the decline.

All this spells new ordeals and even greater poverty for the people, but it will not necessarily enhance their revolutionary potential. On the contrary, this state of affairs is fraught with the danger of despair and passivity, especially in the event of the progressive and revolutionary parties and organisations being unable to provide the masses with a clear understanding of the new situation. *It is of the utmost importance for the African working people to be able to recognise their enemies both at home and abroad.*

In the initial stage of the fight for political independence national unity tended to cover up the social contradictions, which in itself was quite natural. It was believed that the unity would be maintained after the common goal of national independence had been achieved. The view that there were no class divisions in African society gained currency among progressive leaders; the latter thought in terms of an "African socialism" which ruled out class struggle. The facts have dispelled these illusions.

Views of this kind caused harm, for they often made it possible to camouflage the anti-democratic nature of neo-

colonialist regimes which in words proclaimed themselves supporters of socialism.

The vagueness of the ideological concepts of some progressive leaders led to wrong assessment of the role of the working masses, the decisive factor in upholding the gains of the revolution. The role of the working class, regarded as a privileged class compared with the mass of the poor peasantry, was minimised, and the trade unions were regarded with distrust.

This attitude, this refusal to examine the problems of class struggle, caused the greatest harm to the African progressive and revolutionary movement. It prevented or retarded the building of true democratic vanguard parties capable of giving revolutionary leadership to the mass organisations and ensuring the ideological training of cadres.

The putschists and their neo-colonialist bosses would never have succeeded had they been confronted by vanguard organisations consisting of fighters grounded in the theory of scientific socialism, people who by personal example had proved their loyalty to the revolution and were in close contact with the masses of workers and peasants.

There were of course other mistakes, in particular the personality cult, the overconfidence of some leaders in their popularity, the use of authoritarian methods and secret manipulations of diverse kinds.

Lastly, it should be noted that all the coups resulted in military men coming to power.

Although the army did not play the same role in all countries, the process of its degeneration was often identical.

The armed forces lacked sufficiently close bonds with the people and were poorly controlled by the state, and their ranks included many who had served in the old colonial armies. Many of the officers had been trained in the military schools of the imperialist countries and were strongly influenced by Western technical advisers. These men were easy prey for the secret agents of imperialism who played on personal ambitions and arranged meetings in clubs of a shady nature with corrupt old-regime leaders or with reactionaries from neighbouring countries.

It can be said that *the military coups gave the neo-colonialists broader opportunities for carrying on their machinations in Africa. Each takeover was a defeat for the progressive and revolutionary movement, a retreat for this movement.*

While this must be granted, it should not be forgotten that the important thing is, on the one hand, that generally speaking the peoples are forging ahead towards complete liberation and socialism, and, on the other hand, that the decline of imperialism is continuing, however great its aggressiveness, and that this makes it incumbent on us to intensify the fight against imperialism in its new forms. It is essential to undermine the material and strategic positions of the imperialist powers, to annul the military stipulations imposed by these powers on some African countries, to impart a national image to their armies and to strengthen the positive neutrality of our continent.

Imperialism, fully aware of the significance of patriotism in the fight for national liberation, resorted to the creation of sham states along the lines of administrative subdivisions forcibly imposed on the countries. In this way big nations were fragmented, national frontiers were arbitrarily drawn, and tribal divisions were consolidated and deepened.

Very complicated problems arose, causing frictions and instability on our continent. We do not feel sufficiently informed or confident of our rightness to pass judgement on the territorial and frontier problems existing between fraternal African peoples.

Instead, we consider it useful and our duty to call attention to the methods the neo-colonialists use to subvert the territorial integrity of our country.

You know that Morocco was formed as a state ten centuries ago as an Arab-Islamic civilisation strongly gravitating towards the African continent of which it is a part.

At the beginning of this century, acting in agreement with the British, German and Italian imperialists, France divided our occupied country, giving its northern and southern parts to Spain and joining another part to French West Africa. Finally, in reference to the Algerian borders, it will be recalled that at the time of the conquest of Algeria a part of Morocco had been occupied by France and that during the period of armed resistance, in 1952, France shifted our eastern frontier and never delineated our border with Mauritania beginning from Figuig, waiting for an opportunity to fix it to its best advantage.

This enabled the neo-colonialists to loosen the ties of unity and fraternity between our peoples, to delay a rapproche-

ment which frightens them, and to prevent effective co-operation between them, which they fear.

But we are confident that together with our Algerian brothers we shall overcome this painful legacy which weakens both our countries. Inspired by the idea of a united Maghreb and knowing well the genuine interests of our peoples, we shall succeed in reaching mutually satisfactory agreement.

By creating in 1960 the puppet Islamic Republic of Mauritania the neo-colonialists tore away from Morocco one of its oldest regions, the cradle of the first Moroccan state, the state of the Almoravids. Their chief intention was to seize the rich iron and copper ore deposits and bar access to them for Morocco, Maghreb and Africa. It must be said that this split gravely impaired our relations with our southern neighbours, cooperation with whom could be highly fruitful.

Our provinces Rio de Oro and Saguia el Hamra remain under direct oppression by Spain, which prepares their final separation from Morocco as an "independent" state, although they have always been Moroccan territories subordinate to the central Moroccan government and inhabited by Moroccans in origin, language, religion, culture and spirit. And they want to remain Moroccans. To get its crime put up with, Franco Spain plans a travesty of referendum. In preparation for it, it expels politically conscious patriots, stimulates Spanish immigration, brings in troops and distributes handouts in cash and kind among the 60,000 nomads inhabiting these large regions.

While exposing this monstrous crime and insisting on an immediate and unconditional return of our provinces to the motherland we want to make clear that as consistent democrats we do not oppose the sacred principle of self-determination. But we demand that before the referendum is held the exiles be allowed to return home, the Spanish civic and military authorities quit the country, and only its indigenous residents be given the right to answer the following question: "Do you wish to return to the Moroccan motherland or separate?" And, of course, the referendum can be carried out only under the aegis of the U.N., only by this organisation and not by the occupying power.

We reaffirm our determination to do everything to foil the plot of the Spanish neo-colonialists. Weak and short of means, they ally themselves with U.S. neo-colonialism, which is prospecting for oil in this region, where some mineral depos-

its have already been found. Moreover, Washington is looking for sites for well-protected strategic bases and Madrid appears ready to oblige.

We also want freedom for our cities of Ceuta and Melilla where permanent Spanish garrisons are maintained, because their occupation prevents the development of our Riff region.

We speak about the territorial problem because it is characteristic of the neo-colonialists' manoeuvres to hold back the liberation of Africa and prevent its unity.

The African countries, like the other countries of the third world, are subjected to constant neo-colonialist pressure from without; on the other hand, they are victims to its penetration and its subversion from within. This double aggression, designed to strengthen neo-colonialist domination, must be countered with intensified struggle by the national-liberation movement.

IV

We have sought to show the danger of neo-colonialism and its profoundly anti-African and anti-national character. Africa indeed is in danger, for Imperialism has not given up its aggressive intentions, and it must be noted that its hands are still far from tied in many areas. It would be most unrealistic not to see this.

But the danger can be averted.

Above all it is imperative to draw on the peoples' traditions of anti-imperialist struggle and to expose neo-colonialism and the "innocent" front it seeks to put up. This explanatory work will be facilitated by the proletarianisation of the African masses who come into direct contact with the class enemy as well as with the national enemy. The progressive movements, workers' parties and trade unions of the continent are guided by this in their activities.

Neo-colonialism was not always effectively exposed in the past inasmuch as African experience in this respect was still inadequate. And, as we know, it is through experience that the consciousness of the masses matures.

By now, however, we have accumulated enough experience to be able to see the true meaning of neo-colonialism. It is indeed gratifying to note the maturing of the consciousness of some of our peoples who have either learnt through their

own experience or assimilated the experience of neighbouring peoples.

Another important factor is the independence of our working class and its liberation from the grip which the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions sought to lay on it. Independent working-class action is a guarantee of the workers' ideological and revolutionary advance.

It should be noted, however, that we are still far from having achieved trade union unity. The All-African Trade Union Federation came into being when the liberation movement and the more progressive forces in a number of countries were on the upgrade, which also gave rise to the Casablanca pact. But the workers' movement in these countries, being insufficiently independent, was unable to pursue a flexible policy after some of the governments in the Casablanca group changed their orientation, and since that time the work of the Federation on all-African problems has been practically at a standstill.

In the meantime the Christian trade unions, besides disseminating religion in Africa, are propounding anti-revolutionary ideas. In close contact with their reformist and reactionary counterparts in Europe and with ostensibly religious but actually neo-colonialist missions from Europe and the United States (there are some 7,000 U.S. missionaries in Africa), they are working to divide and neutralise the forces of the working class.

Consequently, much remains to be done in the sphere of trade union work. Success can be achieved only if the dual task of enhancing militancy within the various countries and building unity on an all-African scale is carried out.

The present forms of trade union organisation are no longer adequate. They do not take in the peasantry to a sufficient extent nor are they adapted to a situation when the working class is bound to grow as a result of industrialisation and the migration of the rural population to the towns.

Experience shows that, like the classical colonialism, neo-colonialism relies above all on the most retrograde sections to whom the colonial rulers gave a semblance of power—the tribal chiefs, the feudal overlords, and in some cases reactionary leaders of various kinds.

Therefore the struggle against neo-colonialism should be complemented and reinforced by political and class struggle

against the privileged strata, the agents of neo-colonialism and all those to whom it extends privileges.

This struggle can succeed only if unity is achieved on the scale of each country and of Africa as a whole.

The efforts made so far to achieve unity among countries have not produced the desired results for reasons we shall not go into here but which patently are connected with neo-colonialist intrigues. We are referring, in particular, to the failure of the Casablanca group, the present difficulties encountered by the Organisation of African Unity, and the problems of the Arab League which affect many African countries.

We hold that the lack of unity in combating neo-colonialism is due to the fact that the progressives exert insufficient influence on the governments, and to the absence of internal democracy, which makes it possible for some governments to ignore the will and the demands of the people.

Indeed, one can hardly expect a government to pursue an effective anti-imperialist foreign policy if it does not wage a firm and resolute struggle against imperialism at home. Consequently, the revolutionary and progressive forces of all countries should compel their respective governments to wage a consistent anti-imperialist struggle, which alone can pave the way to the anti-imperialist unity Africa needs so urgently.

The problem of the unity of the revolutionary and progressive forces of Africa has thus been raised, and also solved in theory. What is needed now is practical work to promote that unity, to strengthen it and raise it to a higher level, to cement African solidarity, deepen our understanding of the problems involved and the means of struggle needed for success. It is imperative also to eschew hasty, unconsidered actions which might be regarded as interfering in the internal affairs of one or another country and which could be detrimental to the anti-imperialist struggle and African unity.

Right now African solidarity can and should take the form of substantial support to our brothers who are fighting to end the direct occupation of their countries or who have become victims of neo-colonialist machinations.

Unconditional political and material support should be given to the peoples of the Portuguese colonies as well as South Africa, "Spanish" Guinea and the Somali coast.

Effective sanctions, such as a ban on the use of port facilities, should be employed against Portugal.

Constant assistance in all forms dictated by the situation should be given the African population of South Africa, which is ruthlessly oppressed by the racist minority. Every effort should be made further to isolate the government of the South African Republic and to help the countries still bound to it for economic and social reasons to free themselves from such contacts.

And above all it is imperative to open the eyes of more and more people to the role played by the USA in the economy of South Africa and its support for the colonial policies of Portugal and Spain.

The exposure of U.S. imperialism as a backer of colonialism and rabid racism, its interference in the affairs of Latin America, its neo-colonialist manoeuvres in Africa, its involvement in the arming of Israel for provocations against the Palestine and other Arab peoples, and its efforts to promote counter-revolutionary pacts should be regarded as a long-term task calling for unflagging struggle and vigilance.

A I C ★

Epoch-making changes have taken place in Africa since the Second World War, but there are still bigger changes ahead. These changes can be hastened if the revolutionary and progressive forces of the continent, co-operating with the international working-class movement and supported by the socialist world, build a united front on both national and continental scales.

Let us close ranks in the face of the neo-colonialist enemy, let us unite our forces around Africa's bastions of revolution resisting the neo-colonialist aggression. To rally to the support of these bastions is the duty of all the revolutionary and progressive forces in Africa.

Standing united in the struggle we shall win!

AFRICAN SOCIALISM REVISITED

DR. KWAME NKRUMAH

The term "socialism" has become a necessity in the platform diction and political writings of African leaders. It is a term which unites us in the recognition that the restoration of Africa's humanist and egalitarian principles of society calls for socialism. All of us, therefore, even though pursuing widely contrasting policies in the task of reconstructing our various nation-states, still use "socialism" to describe our respective efforts. The question must therefore be faced: What real meaning does the term retain in the context of contemporary African politics? I warned about this in my book *Conscientism* (London and New York, 1964, p. 105).

And yet, socialism in Africa today tends to lose its objective content in favour of a distracting terminology and in favour of a general confusion. Discussion centres more on the various conceivable types of socialism than upon the need for socialist development.

Some African political leaders and thinkers certainly use the term "socialism" as it should in my opinion be used: to describe a complex of social purposes and the consequential social and economic policies, organisational patterns, state structure, and ideologies which can lead to the attainment of those purposes. For such leaders, the aim is to remold African society in the socialist direction; to reconsider African society in such a manner that the humanism of traditional African life re-asserts itself in a modern technical community.

Consequently, socialism in Africa introduces a new social synthesis in which modern technology is reconciled with

human values, in which the advanced technical society is realised without the staggering social malefactions and deep schisms of capitalist industrial society. For true economic and social development cannot be promoted without the real socialisation of productive and distributive processes. Those African leaders who believe these principles are the socialists in Africa.

There are, however, other African political leaders and thinkers who use the term "socialism" because they believe that socialism would, in the words of Chandler Morse, "smooth the road to economic development". It becomes necessary for them to employ the term in a "charismatic effort to rally support" for policies that do not really promote economic and social development. Those African leaders who believe these principles are supposed to be the "African socialists".

It is interesting to recall that before the split in the Second International, Marxism was almost indistinguishable from social democracy. Indeed, the German Social Democratic Party was more or less the guardian of the doctrine of Marxism, and both Marx and Engels supported that Party. Lenin, too, became a member of the Social Democratic Party. After the breakup of the Second International, however, the meaning of the term "social democracy" altered, and it became possible to draw a real distinction between socialism and social democracy. A similar situation has arisen in Africa. Some years ago, African political leaders and writers used the term "African socialism" in order to label the concrete forms that socialism might assume in Africa. But the realities of the diverse and irreconcilable social, political, and economic policies being pursued by African states today have made the term "African socialism" meaningless and irrelevant. It appears to be much more closely associated with anthropology than with political economy. "African socialism" has now come to acquire some of its greatest publicists in Europe and North America precisely because of its predominant anthropological charm. Its foreign publicists include not only the surviving social democrats of Europe and North America, but other intellectuals and liberals who themselves are steeped in the ideology of social democracy.

It was no accident, let me add, that the 1962 Dakar Colloquium made such capital of "African socialism"; but the uncertainties concerning the meaning and specific policies of "African socialism" have led some of us to abandon the term

because it fails to express its original meaning and because it tends to obscure our fundamental socialist commitment.

Today, the phrase "African socialism" seems to espouse the view that the traditional African society was a classless society imbued with the spirit of humanism and to express a nostalgia for that spirit. Such a conception of socialism makes a fetish of the communal African society. But an idyllic, African classless society (in which there were no rich and no poor) enjoying a drugged serenity is certainly a facile simplification; there is no historical or even anthropological evidence for any such society. I am afraid the realities of African society were somewhat more sordid.

All available evidence from the history of Africa up to the eve of the European colonisation, shows that African society was neither classless nor devoid of a social hierarchy. Feudalism existed in some parts of Africa before colonisation; and feudalism involves a deep and exploitative social stratification, founded on the ownership of land. It must also be noted that slavery existed in Africa before European colonisation, although the earlier European contact gave slavery in Africa some of its most vicious characteristics. The truth remains, however, that before colonisation, which became widespread in Africa only in the nineteenth century, Africans were prepared to sell, often for no more than thirty pieces of silver, fellow tribesmen and even members of the same "extended family" and clan. Colonialism deserves to be blamed for many evils in Africa, but surely it was not preceded by an African Golden Age or paradise. A return to the pre-colonial African society is evidently not worthy of the ingenuity and efforts of our people.

All this notwithstanding, one could still argue that the basic organisation of many African societies in different periods of history manifested a certain communalism and that the philosophy and humanist purposes behind that organisation are worthy of recapture. A community in which each saw his well-being in the welfare of the group certainly was praiseworthy, even if the manner in which the well-being of the group was pursued makes no contribution to our purposes. Thus, what socialist thought in Africa must recapture is not the structure of the "traditional African society" but its spirit, for the spirit of communalism is crystallised in its humanism and in its reconciliation of individual advancement with group welfare. Even if there is incomplete

anthropological evidence to reconstruct the "traditional African society" with accuracy, we can still recapture the rich human values of that society. In short, an anthropological approach to the "traditional African society" is too much unproven; but a philosophical approach stands on much firmer ground and makes generalisation feasible.

One predicament in the anthropological approach is that there is some disparity of views concerning the manifestations of the "classlessness" of the "traditional African society". While some hold that the society was based on the equality of its members, others hold that it contained a hierarchy and division of labour in which the hierarchy—and therefore power—was founded on spiritual and democratic values. Of course, no society can be founded on the equality of its members although societies are founded on egalitarianism, which is something quite different. Similarly, a classless society that at the same time rejoices in a hierarchy of power (as distinct from authority) must be accounted a marvel of socio-political finesse.

We know that the "traditional African society" was founded on principles of egalitarianism. In its actual workings, however, it had various shortcomings. Its humanist impulse, nevertheless, is something that continues to urge us towards our all-African socialist reconstruction. We postulate each man to be an end in himself, not merely a means; and we accept the necessity of guaranteeing each man equal opportunities for his development. The implications of this for socio-political practice have to be worked out scientifically, and the necessary social and economic policies pursued with resolution. Any meaningful humanism must begin from egalitarianism and must lead to objectively chosen policies for safeguarding and sustaining egalitarianism. Hence, socialism. Hence, also, scientific socialism.

A further difficulty that arises from the anthropological approach to socialism, or "African socialism", is the glaring division between existing African societies and the communalistic society that was. I warned in my book *Conscientism* that "our society is not the old society, but a new society enlarged by Islamic and Euro-Christian influences". This is a fact that any socio-economic policies must recognise and take into account. Yet the literature of "African socialism" comes close to suggesting that today's African societies are communalistic. The two societies are not coterminous; and

such an equation cannot be supported by any attentive observation. It is true that this disparity is acknowledged in some of the literature of "African socialism"; thus, my friend and colleague Julius Nyerere, in acknowledging the disequilibrium between what was and what is in terms of African societies, attributes the differences to the importations of European colonialism.

We know, of course, that the defeat of colonialism and even neo-colonialism will not result in the automatic disappearance of the imported patterns of thought and social organisation. For those patterns have taken root, and are in varying degree sociological features of our contemporary society. Nor will a simple return to the communalistic society of ancient Africa offer a solution either. To advocate a return, as it were, to the rock from which we were hewn is a charming thought, but we are faced with contemporary problems, which have arisen from political subjugation, economic exploitation, educational and social backwardness, increases in population, familiarity with the methods and products of industrialisation, modern agricultural techniques. These—as well as a host of other complexities—can be resolved by no mere communalistic society, however sophisticated, and anyone who so advocates must be caught in insoluble dilemmas of the most excruciating kind. All available evidence from socio-political history discloses that such a return to a status quo ante is quite unexampled in the evolution of societies. There is, indeed, no theoretical or historical reason to indicate that it is at all possible.

When one society meets another, the observed historical trend is that acculturation results in a balance of forward movement, a movement in which each society assimilates certain useful attributes of the other. Social evolution is a dialectical process; it has ups and downs, but, on balance, it always represents an upward trend.

Islamic civilisation and European colonialism are both historical experiences of the traditional African society, profound experiences that have permanently changed the complexion of the traditional African society. They have introduced new values and a social, cultural, and economic organisation into African life. Modern African societies are not traditional, even if backward, and they are clearly in a state of socio-economic disequilibrium. They are in this state because they are not anchored to a steadying ideology.

The way out is certainly not to regurgitate all Islamic or Euro-colonial influences in a futile attempt to recreate a past that cannot be resurrected. The way out is only forward, forward to a higher and reconciled form of society, in which the quintessence of the human purposes of traditional African society reasserts itself in a modern context—forward, in short, to socialism, through policies that are scientifically devised and correctly applied. The inevitability of a forward way out is felt by all; thus, Leopold Sedor Senghor, although favouring some kind of return to African communalism, insists that the refashioned African society must accommodate the "positive contribution" of colonial rule, "such as the economic and technical infrastructure and the French educational system". The economic and technical infrastructure of even French colonialism and the French educational system must be assumed, though this can be shown to be imbued with a particular socio-political philosophy. This philosophy, as should be known, is not compatible with the philosophy underlying communalism, and the desired accommodation would prove only a socio-political mirage.

Senghor has, indeed, given an account of the nature of the return to Africa. His account is highlighted by statements using some of his own words: that the African is "a field of pure sensation"; that he does not measure or observe, but "lives" a situation; and that this way of acquiring "knowledge" by confrontation and intuition is "negro-African"; the acquisition of knowledge by reason, "Hellenic". In *African Socialism* (London and New York, 1964, pp. 72-3), he proposes that we consider the Negro-African as he faces the Other: God, man, animal, tree or pebble, natural or social phenomenon. In contrast to the classic European, the Negro-African does not draw a line between himself and the object, he does not hold it at a distance, nor does he merely look at it and analyse it. After holding it at a distance, after scanning it without analysing it, he takes it vibrant in his hands, careful not to kill or fix it. He touches it, feels it, smells it. The Negro-African is like one of those Third Day Worms, a pure field of sensations... Thus the Negro-African sympathises, abandons his personality to become identified with the Other, dies to be reborn in the Other. He does not assimilate; he is assimilated. He lives a common life with the Other; he lives in a symbiosis.

It is clear that socialism cannot be founded on this kind of metaphysics of knowledge.

To be sure, there is a connection between communalism and socialism. Socialism stands to communalism as capitalism stands to slavery. In socialism, the principles underlying communalism are given expression in modern circumstances. Thus, whereas communalism in a non-technical society can be *laissez-faire*, in a technical society where sophisticated means of production are at hand, the situation is different; for if the underlying principles of communalism are not given correlated expression, class cleavages will arise, which are connected with economic disparities and thereby with political inequalities. Socialism, therefore, can be, and is, the defence of the principles of communalism in a modern setting; it is a form of social organisation that, guided by the principles underlying communalism, adopts procedures and measures made necessary by demographic and technological developments. Only under socialism can we reliably accumulate the capital we need for our development and also ensure that the gains of investment are applied for the general welfare.

Socialism is not spontaneous. It does not arise of itself. It has abiding principles according to which the major means of production and distribution ought to be socialised if exploitation of the many by the few is to be prevented; if, that is to say, egalitarianism in the economy is to be protected. Socialist countries in Africa may differ in this or that detail of their policies, but such differences themselves ought not to be arbitrary or subject to vagaries of taste. They must be scientifically explained, as necessities arising from differences in the particular circumstances of the countries themselves.

There is only one way of achieving socialism; by the devising of policies aimed at the general socialist goals, each of which takes its particular form from the specific circumstances of a particular state at a definite historical period. Socialism depends on dialectical and historical materialism, upon the view that there is only one nature, subject in all its manifestations to natural laws and that human society is, in this sense, part of nature and subject to its own laws of development.

It is the elimination of fancifulness from socialist action that makes socialism scientific. To suppose that there are tribal, national, or racial socialisms is to abandon objectivity in favour of chauvinism.

STRUCTURE AND POSITION OF THE WORKING CLASS IN SENEGAL

MAJHEMOUT DIOP

Problems of a socio-economic nature loom large at the present stage of the revolution on the African continent. The solution of these problems today and especially in the future rests largely with the emerging working class, the most progressive and revolutionary force in society. Hence the importance of studying questions associated with the structure and the position of the working class in Africa, its place in the African revolution, and its potentialities. There is, however, a regrettable dearth of the factual and sociological data essential for any thorough analysis of these questions. Moreover, the amount of statistical and other data available varies sharply from country to country and this makes it difficult to obtain a complete picture of the situation.

Nevertheless we feel that an analysis of the structure and position of the working class in Senegal will help to determine the role and significance of this class in the social life of our country. Some of the points and conclusions could perhaps be extended also to other African countries, although it goes without saying that a special study is needed in each particular case. It should also be said that the numerical strength of the working class, its national composition, structure according to level of skills, and distribution among the various branches of industry clearly reflect the general features typical of the level of development and the socio-economic system of Senegal.

With a population of over 3 million, the total number of wage and salary earners runs to 110,000; of these 73,000 are

manual workers. The share of Europeans, chiefly French, in the labour force is approximately 9 per cent; moreover, the lower the level of skills the greater the number of African workers. Thus, manual workers are almost exclusively Africans, as can be seen from the following table:

	<i>Africans</i>	<i>Europeans</i>
Executives	2,000	4,000
Office employees and officials	25,000	5,000
Skilled and semi-skilled workers	36,000	1,000
Unskilled workers	37,000	—
	100,000	10,000

The largest contingent of the Senegalese labour force is the railway workers. Next come the agricultural labourers. Third place is occupied by the oil-mill workers, followed by the textile, knitgoods, garment and footwear industries. This shows that the Senegalese working class is engaged chiefly in light industry. The absence of large-scale industry and low skill and educational standards retards the development of class consciousness among the proletariat.

On the other hand, if we examine the distribution of wage-earners in industry and in the services depending on ownership—state-owned or private—we find that for every worker employed in the state sector there is an average of six in the private sector. And inasmuch as the private sector is basically foreign and neo-colonialist, the share of the nationalised enterprises in the "national development" of industry in Senegal is negligible.

The low level of development is evidenced by the distribution of workers according to skills, especially as compared with any industrialised country—France for example. Skilled workers and those engaged in specialised fields comprise 42.1 per cent of the working class as compared with 72.8 per cent in France, whereas the share of unskilled is 50 per cent in Senegal and only 14.3 per cent in France.

The low percentage of foremen and apprentices of local origin, the high percentage of women among the unskilled (61 per cent) and the total absence of women foremen, and the high percentage of Europeans (91.5) among the executives, administrative staff, engineers, etc., are the hallmarks of an economically underdeveloped country until recently under colonial rule.

Other features are the low standard of living, poor housing,

and inadequate safety provisions and industrial hygiene. There is a yawning gap between the wages of Africans and Europeans.

If we take the total of wages paid in 1962 in industry we find that some 11,500 Africans received 2,700 million francs, while less than 1,000 Europeans received a total of 1,820 million. In other words, the average wage of one European is equivalent to that of approximately eight Senegalese.

A comparison with wages in France gives the following picture:

Monthly Wages in 1966

(in African francs)

	<i>Senegal</i>	<i>France</i>
Unskilled workers	5,000	31,000
Skilled workers	13,500	45,700
Foremen	30,000	72,250

This comparison shows that the lower the skills the wider the gulf between the two groups of workers. Whereas the French foreman gets more than double the wage of his Senegalese counterpart, the French labourer gets six times more. This shows that the lower the standard of living, the greater the tendency for it to decline.

Housing conditions are particularly squalid. Many, including nearly all unskilled labourers, live on the outskirts of the towns in wretched plywood or tin hovels, 5 to 10 people to a room. In Dakar as many as 20 share a single room. Water consumption is strictly limited, the more so since the water supply in these areas is generally poor. There is no electricity, no sanitary facilities and no sewage system of any kind.

The factors underlying industrial development in Senegal are revealed in a study made by J. Mas. "Industry in Senegal developed in an atmosphere of extreme liberalism," he writes. "Capital, mainly French, flowed into Senegal in search of profit, but only when the profits were not less than those derived from investment at home. In other words the industrialists were out to extract the greatest possible gain." The burden of this drive for maximum profit falls on the shoulders of the Senegalese workers. Dakar industrialists economise at the expense of funds that should be used for labour protection and safety devices, which accounts for the high rate of industrial accidents.

Women and children, the latter often from the age of nine, work in conditions of dubious hygiene. Particularly deplorable is the plight of women employed in the fish canneries. They live in incredibly crowded conditions without elementary conveniences. A recent survey, published in the *Dakar-Matin* on August 10, 1966, showed that women employed in the Dakar refrigerator plants "often have to work ankle-deep in water".

On the other hand, the rules in the enterprises are stringent, with frequent dismissals, fines and temporary layoffs from 4 to 8 days.

The educational level of the Senegalese workers, too, is low, for schools are few. The percentage of illiterates among the adult population is as high as 95 for men and 99 for women. The second four-year development plan envisages school facilities for only 40 per cent of the population. Most of the unskilled workers are illiterate.

Unemployment, both full and partial, is the scourge of the Senegalese worker. Lack of statistical data makes it difficult to determine the exact number of totally unemployed, but at any rate it ranges between 10,000 and 20,000. For example, more than 15,000 unemployed were registered in the Dakar Labour Exchange at the end of 1963, but this undoubtedly falls short of the actual figure. Short-time working and temporary shut-downs are widely practised, and the seasonal nature of many jobs adds to the number of partially employed.



The working people have waged a bitter struggle for better conditions. Between 1947 and 1957 the former French West Africa witnessed 104 labour conflicts involving 95,000 workers and resulting in a loss of 615,000 man-days. In 1958 there were strikes at the SOCOIM works (20 days), in the food-processing industry (16 days), and in the postal and telegraph service (5 days), not to mention strikes by municipal workers and firemen.

In 1959 a 12-day strike of 14,000 government employees was broken by the wholesale dismissal of 3,000 workers. In 1960 food-processing workers staged a 24-hour strike, and in 1961 1,500 dockers struck. The workers of the ICOTAF enterprise downed tools for 5 days in 1962, and for two weeks in 1963. In August 1965 taxi drivers were on strike for 10 days. Thus the working class has been carrying on the struggle from

year to year in defiance of the government's counter-measures and the new code of labour laws.

The strike movement has yielded considerable gains. In the private sector wage increases ranging from 11 to 40 per cent have been won. The conditions of office workers have improved, in particular following the postal and telegraph workers' strike. Another result of this struggle is the Africanisation of personnel. Moreover, the employers have had to agree to seven national and eight local collective agreements. In the sphere of social legislation the workers have won three weeks' annual holidays with pay and the right to leaves of up to 10 days for personal reasons. Besides, it was thanks to the workers' struggle that safety regulations and rules for combating occupational diseases were introduced in the private sector, and family allowances and pensions increased.

The strike movement and the struggle of the working class generally could have yielded even better results had not the trade union movement been divided. The most advanced and class conscious leaders of the working masses have worked hard to unite the trade unions. The most recent attempt in this direction was undertaken last August when an appeal to all unions to get together was issued by six union organisations stressing the "urgent need to unite the working class by establishing a single trade union centre independent of political parties and international organisations". There is no doubt that unity is the only way to new successes for the Senegalese working class.

In 1957, with the founding of the Independence Party, the working people acquired a political organisation resolved to uphold the rights of the working class. Basing itself on Marxism-Leninism this Party plunged into the thick of the struggle and won important gains. When independence still was not on the order of the day, it organised and successfully conducted the national-liberation struggle. It worked for the Africanisation of cadres and for diplomatic relations with the socialist countries. Throughout these difficult struggles, which often called for self-sacrifice, the Party upheld the honour and dignity of the Senegalese working class. Many of its officials and members sacrificed their lives or spent long years in prison.

However, in the course of the nine years of its existence, owing to inexperience and the complexity of the local conditions, it made mistakes, some of which had grave conse-

quences. The time has now come to exert every effort to rectify these mistakes in order to ensure further success for the working class and to promote the progress of our people.



A look at the position and structure of the Senegalese working class will reveal a number of specific features, of which some help to advance its struggle and others tend to retard it.

A positive feature is that in Senegal the working class took shape earlier than in other West-African countries. Its most united, experienced and tested section is the railway workers. Moreover, although it plays a comparatively small role in the overall system of social relationships, the working class is relatively bigger than that of the other African countries, with the possible exception of those with a developed mining industry, such as the Congo (Kinshasa), South Africa and Zambia.

Another positive feature is the degree of concentration of the working class. The fact that 80 per cent of all workers are to be found in the Cape Verde area facilitates their organisation. Indeed, this is one of the most important factors promoting the growth of class consciousness. Moreover, this concentration in the "Wolof triangle" compels the workers to speak the Wolof language regardless of where they came from.

It should be mentioned that the working class and sections close to it make the third biggest contribution to the national income (32 per cent), after trade (33 per cent) and agriculture (34 per cent). This gives an idea of the role it plays in production, a role which undoubtedly will continue to grow.

Lastly, a feature of the Senegalese working class is its militancy. With the general railway strike of 1937 in Thies and the general strikes of 1949 and 1952, our working class entered, so to say, the modern age. Needless to say, independence was accompanied by many new problems which to some extent disorientated the workers and, above all, prompted them to re-examine their traditional methods of struggle. But the difficulties notwithstanding the struggle is continuing, and this is an encouraging sign.

At the same time the working class has features reflecting its relative weakness. Even though it is older than the working

class in the neighbouring countries, it is still very young, and hence its organisations too are weak.

By and large our working class suffers from a lack of vocational training. Few workers can go to professional schools, and the fact that those who do usually become office employees after graduation does not help to improve the skills of the working class. Another adverse factor is that the employers are satisfied with using low-skilled labour.

Moreover, the unemployment constantly spells insecurity. Chronic unemployment means that there is an excess of supply over demand on the labour market, and this keeps wages down, tends to prevent strikes, fosters parasitic tendencies and helps to swell the lumpen-proletariat. Other negative features are the slow rate of growth of the working class, the absence of heavy industry which prevents the working class from playing the decisive part in the national economy, and the limited employment of women in industry.

Half of the working class is of urban origin. This is an indication that the working class began to take shape in our country earlier than in countries where most of the workers come from rural areas. However, in a country like ours where the class consciousness of the workers is generally at a low level this makes for the spread of petty-bourgeois ideas. At the same time the negligible percentage of agricultural labourers hampers contact between the working class and the countryside.

In appraising our working class some other circumstances of a contradictory nature should be taken into account. The bad conditions engender militancy, but at the same time they to some extent channel the class struggle on to purely economic lines. While the dominant position occupied by Europeans in a way gives a political tinge to the economic struggle, linking it with the fight against imperialism, it tends to impart a racial connotation to the concept "bourgeoisie". And while the fact that many Senegalese workers (1 out of 5) go to France in search of employment helps to awaken class consciousness and to enlist people in class organisations, it also fosters a petty-bourgeois way of thinking, not to speak of other negative phenomena.



Not long ago sociologists studying African problems could be divided into two main groups—those who claimed that there

were no classes in African society, or that they were to be found only in embryonic form and hence to all intents and purposes played no social role, and those who maintained that classes existed irrespective of the degree of their differentiation. Since independence class stratification has been so accentuated that many authors now recognise the existence of classes and of class struggle.

Classification of the social strata after the pattern of the more developed European societies may in some cases be useful since it helps to elucidate the correlation of social forces and, consequently, to chart the correct line of action.

It is necessary, however, to avoid drawing purely external parallels, for African society is far from being a replica of the European. Even if a cursory examination reveals obvious social barriers, a closer analysis will show a diversity of reciprocal interconnections between the classes. The objective existence of classes is one thing and their awareness of their own identity, i.e., their socio-political position, is another. To get to the bottom of the question it is essential to take into account the sum total of phenomena and circumstances involved. There are phenomena which tend to gloss over things and mitigate the class struggle, although this by no means signifies that this struggle has not become more intense in recent years.

Above all there are specific factors which can be traced back to precolonial times. One of these is allegiance to the extended family of the patriarchal type which gives rise to real or imaginary loyalties tending to reduce, even if they do not completely abolish, antagonisms between, say, the employer and the worker. Brothers and cousins are prepared to back each other at difficult moments even when their economic interests are obviously contradictory.

Secondly, members of the same tribe or ethnic group come to the defence of their tribal leader if he is able to prove that his position is endangered for ethnical reasons.

Moreover, the attitude of age groups to one another and ties of interclan kinship often blur the frontiers between classes. To this day people are often guided by the social concepts inherited from the past. For example, survivals of the obsolete hierarchic gradations are tenacious. Because of this a labourer may consider a cabinet minister his social equal or even inferior. This is what C. A. Diop had in mind when he said if you scratch a Senegalese you will find a feudalist.

But it's not only precolonial survivals that tend to obscure demarcation lines between classes. During the colonial period the French imperialists nurtured such a numerous petty bourgeoisie that they could often export it to the other countries of "French" Africa. As a result the descendants of former feudal chiefs and other influential people as well as part of the working people became accustomed to live and think like the petty bourgeoisie. Suret-Canale was right when he said that the Senegalese national bourgeoisie as well as the bureaucratic bourgeoisie bear the imprint of petty-bourgeois mentality.

Moreover, alongside the struggle to win and consolidate independence, Negro micro-nationalism and macro-racism developed. Although these are of no great significance at present, they should not be ignored, especially when we bear in mind how Senegalese micro-national chauvinism was used in splitting the Mali Federation.

No small part in defining a person's place in society is played by adherence to a particular religion, and sometimes to a particular sect. Idealised relationships may be formed between followers of one or another religion, regardless of what class they actually belong to.

To sum up our examination of the structure, specific features and status of the Senegal working class as well as of the factors retarding its awakening, it is necessary also to define its place in the overall class structure of Senegalese society, its relationship to the sections standing closest to it, and briefly to characterise its allies and their role in the social development of the country.

The ruling classes account for only two-fifths of one per cent of the population. They are the landowners, the middle and bureaucratic bourgeoisie, and the top officialdom. These sections are closely interconnected. As for the two types of bourgeoisie, they can hardly be considered independent classes in view of their weakness from the standpoint of both numbers and organisation; they are rather two strata of a single class. Moreover, the facts show that the national bourgeoisie is not anxious to separate itself from the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, but acts as a reserve for the latter.

At the opposite social pole we find the working class proper, the core of which consists of wage workers engaged in

industry, agriculture, transport, etc. Close to it there are sections whose material position is similar to that of the workers, the most important of these being the semi-proletariat, handicraftsmen, clerks and minor officials. Together with these sections the working class accounts for nearly 17 per cent of the population.

The biggest sections are the rural strata (peasants, herdsmen and fishermen), which make up 77.6 per cent of the working population. It should be noted that the peasants are mostly illiterate, unorganised and dispersed among 12,000 villages and rural townships. Primitive forms of production and organisation and the superstructure corresponding to these forms lag far behind the requirements of the modern world, owing to which the winning of the peasantry in active struggle as the natural ally of the working class will obviously be a difficult task for some time to come. Moreover, the absence of "land hunger" in Senegal should caution us against automatic acceptance of diverse theories of peasant revolution.

The revolutionary forces include also the petty-bourgeois sections, such as the students, middle-bracket office workers and officials, members of the free professions, shopkeepers and middlemen, who make up about 5 per cent of the population. This group, even though it is only one-third the size of the working class and associated sections, remains an important factor from the standpoint of its influence and revolutionary potential.

The building of a revolutionary party in Senegal is bound up with the matter of political alliances, primarily the alliance of the working class and other revolutionary forces. Where the Independence Party erred was in proclaiming itself to be a Marxist-Leninist party solely of the working class, whereas it actually was right from the beginning, owing to the smallness of the working class, a party of both this class and of the other sections of society associated with it. This explains the misunderstandings of an ideological, strategic and tactical order which cropped up. The point is that only the proletariat can subscribe wholly to Marxist-Leninist ideology, while the broader social sections, i.e., non-proletarian sections standing close to the proletariat, by virtue of their position, are able to draw on it only partly in the spheres of economics, sociology, politics and especially philosophy.

From the organisational standpoint there is no particular

reason to consider it impossible for the working class to unite politically with other social strata, including sections of the bourgeoisie. This is a matter of conditions and political timeliness. The establishment of a single party does not preclude the inclusion in it of different social strata, nor overt or covert class struggle within its ranks. Nor does it exclude the possibility of one or another class detaching itself in order to form its own class organisation when the conditions are favourable for this or should the need for it arise. In a word, in practice such a party functions as a united front.

Hence in a society such as that of Senegal to see the issue of whether there should be only one party or several parties as some kind of a dilemma would be a wrong way of seeing things.

The problem of an alliance of classes and the need for it in the colonial and neo-colonial period involves the question of leadership of the alliance. Classes can and should combine in one or another way depending on the circumstances. The strongest and best organised class, i.e. the class which enjoys the greatest support among the people, will, naturally, head the alliance. Leadership in the alliance is a matter of the balance of forces, and any approach which would regard such hegemony as the *a priori prerogative* of any one class would be the wrong way. This in no way contradicts the main strategic idea that with the development of society the working class is in the long run destined to play the main role in all spheres. But in the case of a working class like the Senegalese, the question of priority in alliances is primarily a question of the type of the given revolution. It is asserted—and correctly so from the general historical standpoint—that the era of bourgeois-democratic revolutions is over and that henceforth all revolutions will inevitably lead to socialism. But to believe, on this basis, that our revolution will be a socialist revolution and that it will be headed by the proletariat would be premature, to say the least. In reality what we see taking place in our country are transitional democratic revolutions which are often led by the petty bourgeoisie and hence bear a dual character. It is true that some Right-wing elements of the petty bourgeoisie are towing the revolution to the Right in order to turn it into a bourgeois-democratic capitalist revolution, but the bulk of the radical-minded petty bourgeoisie are fighting for a genuinely national democratic

revolution aimed, in the long run, at building a socialist society.

In my view revolutions such as those taking place presently in countries like ours are often seen in a false light. The transitional democratic revolution cannot be regarded as a socialist revolution. Only under certain conditions it can and should develop into a genuinely national democratic revolution which in turn could at some later stage evolve into a socialist revolution. Failure to appreciate these differences could lead to attempts to skip stages which would obscure the perspective and result in setbacks that would be swiftly taken advantage of by our enemies to the detriment of socialism.

With which class should the proletariat join at the stage of transitional democratic revolution? Those who are carried away by current "peasant" theories insist on an alliance of the working class with the peasantry as in the case of the proletarian revolution. It would be well to return to the concepts Lenin set forth in his *Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*. At this stage the proletariat and the intermediate strata gravitating to it should join mainly with the petty bourgeoisie and together with the latter win over the peasantry. Thus, proceeding from an opposite point of departure, we arrive at the same conclusion as the comrades from the northern countries who consider such an alliance to be of prime importance. In their case this is because the peasantry is the minority of the population. In our case, because although they constitute the majority the peasants are very backward, and because the revolution in question is not a proletarian revolution.

The transitional democratic revolution establishes a national democracy. The working class and the social strata close to it or the petty bourgeoisie engage in struggle with the bourgeois strata which are still far from destroyed and which in our underdeveloped countries are often entrenched in the machinery of state and in the key sectors of the economy. The nature, intensity and forms of that struggle will depend on the resistance offered by the opposing classes. Hence to consider beforehand and in all cases that a national democracy would imply the peaceful coexistence of classes would be a mistake. On the contrary, it would give impetus to a sharp conflict between the progressive classes and classes seeking to retard the advance of society.

DEMOCRACY IN AFRICA

OMAR MOUSTAFA

The subject of democracy in the political life of Africa includes the rich experience of countries at varying stages of social and political development. A detailed exposition of this experience would entail much time, so in this article we shall confine ourselves to the experience of the Sudan and make some general observations which may be relevant to some other countries in a similar position.

At present the issue of democracy is posed in Africa as it has never been posed before. At the present stage of the liberatory movement in Africa truly revolutionary changes can be effected only in conditions of genuine democracy, with the people enjoying full rights in conducting their political, social, economic and cultural affairs and being the real masters of their destiny.

Among the systems which are usually regarded as democratic two basic types should be singled out, types that are widely current in the political life of the African countries. The democracy corresponding to the interests of broad sections of the masses is based on an alliance between the various categories of the working people, on the transfer of legislative and executive power as well as state management of production into the hands of these social sections. Democracy of this kind is inevitably linked with progressive social changes. Then there is Western democracy which a number of African countries have inherited from colonialism. With all its seemingly impressive ornaments of Governmental Party and Opposition, parliaments, press, regular general elections, etc.,

this democracy is essentially no more than a market for empty and fruitless talk, a cover for shameless political profiteering.

If we examine this type of democracy we find it absolutely devoid of content and severed from the masses of working people. It is a hollow body incapable of providing bread and clothes for the worker and peasant on whom the parties vying for power ultimately depend.

The experience of the Sudan can serve as an example of the inconsistency of Western democracy, showing how it has led the country into a blind alley. The Sudan won independence after a long hard struggle against British imperialism. And it should be said that the advanced social forces—the workers, peasants, intellectuals and students—bore the main burden of this struggle. These forces had, from the beginning, combined against imperialism. They clearly realised that the winning of democratic rights signified greater opportunities to extend the independence struggle based on the mass movement.

Thanks to this, even under the colonial regime there existed in the Sudan trade unions and other organisations with a genuine democratic and revolutionary line among workers, peasants, students, intellectuals, women and youth, which in fact gave the mass revolutionary movement in the Sudan a special character since all these organisations had, from the start, been formed in the course of the struggle waged by the left forces and under their influence. The Sudanese Communist Party played the principal part in this process, a fact which has enabled the trade unions and the other mass organisations to preserve till this day their revolutionary character and keep aloof from the influence of the reactionary forces. This factor made its imprint on the progressive democratic development of the modern social forces in the Sudan.

The revolutionary movement based on the working class, the peasants, intellectuals, students and the national bourgeoisie (the latter with its limited possibilities) proved able to besiege British imperialism in the early 'fifties and frustrated all its constitutional schemes, exposing them as a fraud directed against the striving of the masses towards genuine democracy and full independence.

It was during this siege that there erupted the great revolution of July 23 in Egypt which greatly influenced the

revolutionary struggle in the Sudan. The progressive character of this struggle was enhanced by the principles of the Egyptian revolution embodied in such revolutionary measures as the abolition of the traditional regime, the forced abdication of the King, the expulsion of his clique of Princes and Pashas from positions of power, decisions on land reform and the beginning of the liquidation of feudalism. Thus, British colonialism found itself besieged both from within and from the North.

Under pressure of the new, revolutionary regime in Egypt, the Anglo-Egyptian agreement was signed in Cairo in February 1953, which put the Sudan on the road to political independence. This was a big success both for the revolutionary democratic forces in the Sudan and for the Egyptian revolution.

On the basis of the Cairo agreement the independence of the Sudan was proclaimed in 1956, whereby a Sudanese government was constituted from among the representatives of the national bourgeoisie, a Parliament was formed, a new national flag was hoisted over the Palace of the Republic in Khartoum, the British occupation troops were withdrawn, and all British positions in the state were handed over to the Sudanese. And so the Sudan stepped on to the threshold of a new stage of social development, and the new rulers were faced with the problem which usually arises upon the proclamation of independence, namely, the need to impart a truly social content to the independence.

The social forces which had borne the main burden of the struggle against colonialism were looking forward to deep-going transformations in the interests of the masses, to overcoming the backwardness in all spheres of life which was inherited from half a century of injustice and colonial persecution. These forces maintained that political independence should be the point of departure for social progress and emancipation from economic slavery.

But the ruling bourgeois parties proved unable to live up to these historic tasks and resolve the problems logically following from independence. They even went as far as to advance the slogan "This is a period of liberation, not construction", thereby demonstrating their complete loss of perspective and inability to realise that liberation should in no way be separated from social change.

However, despite the fact that the traditional ruling parties at that time exerted strong influence on big sections of the

people who were thrilled by achieving independence and could not yet see that genuine independence was unthinkable unless it was linked with social revolution, the progressive forces remained firm in the face of the difficulties created by the ruling parties and upheld socialism as the sole revolutionary way towards progress. This was realised notwithstanding an atmosphere pregnant with illusions and empty slogans.

The march of events, the determination and perseverance of the progressive forces began to open the eyes of the masses to the true state of affairs. Day by day it became clearer that bourgeois democracy was proving a failure; its inconsistency was demonstrated in the face of growing imperialist pressure on the national economy, the lawlessness of the big landlords with regard to the peasants, the decline in living standards, and the preservation of the old imperialist culture. At that time the leaders of the bourgeois parties were engrossed in the spoils business, ignoring the urgent needs of the people. The masses saw their Parliament being transformed into a market place where deputies were bought and sold, while the change of ruling parties depended only on their ability to pay. The so-called democratic system became increasingly isolated from the masses, and ultimately the masses lost faith in it.

By the end of 1958 the crisis of bourgeois-democratic rule had reached its peak. At the same time the movement of the new social forces was on the upgrade, showing the masses an example of revolutionary action and attracting the attention of the people who reposed their hopes in it.

It was obvious in November 1958, when Parliament was called into session, that a basic change in government was imminent, a change that would bring about the isolation of the Right as represented by the big landowners and the agents of foreign concerns, which, in turn, should lead to major social changes. It was this moment that the imperialists and their accomplices from among the local reactionaries chose to deliver a blow at the hesitant and isolated democratic regime. The coup d'état took place on November 17, 1958, the day Parliament was to meet.

Thus the crisis of democracy entered into a new phase, the officers who headed the puppet regime abolished all democratic freedoms, dissolved Parliament, dissolved the parties and trade unions, liquidated all the revolutionary institutions

and closed progressive newspapers; they promulgated reactionary laws, arrested hundreds of Communists and other progressives, and staged a series of trumped-up trials of trade union leaders.

It would be appropriate here to examine in some detail the nature of the military coup in the Sudan, which can serve as an example of bourgeois interpretation and application of democracy. The coup was but the next act of the farce called bourgeois democracy. The hollowness of this democracy was evident from the fact that the imperialists and their puppets permitted its existence only within the limits enabling them to retain their domination.

Another feature of bourgeois democracy is the facility with which it is abolished through coups and conspiracies. This is due to the very nature of bourgeois democracy, since it is not linked with the masses and represents the interests only of the ruling classes consisting of bourgeois elements and landowners. Such is the real state of affairs in those African countries where military coups have taken place.

Right from the very beginning some sections of the people adopted a negative attitude vis-à-vis the military coups, whereas others welcomed them. This attitude shows that the masses had little faith in the democracy of the bourgeoisie.

The revolutionary and progressive forces neither changed their attitude nor lost their identity. The military coup made them even more aware of the bankruptcy of the traditional ruling circles and their inability to establish genuine democracy for the people. These circles have never defended democracy—neither during the crisis nor during the six years of military rule. They betrayed the people who brought them to power. Therefore their parties retreated, were dissolved or paralysed. Some of their leaders even received pensions from the military regime.

The working class, the peasants, intellectuals and students launched an unrelenting struggle to overthrow the reactionary regime and re-establish democracy. Despite the persecution, the revolutionary forces played a vanguard role in the struggle against the military dictatorship. Prisons and concentration camps were filled with revolutionary leaders, Communists, progressives and patriotic officers. Many of them were sentenced to long terms of imprisonment; five officers were executed. For six years numerous militants continued to work illegally; workers, peasants and students went on

strike, and a progressive officers' movement developed in the armed forces.

The military regime, the greatest trial, was successfully withstood by the revolutionary forces. Their heroic struggle led to a major change in the balance of social forces. Appreciable changes took place in the sentiment and views of the masses who saw the revolutionary forces standing by their side, heading their struggle with firmness and courage. While the fighters for the people's cause made many sacrifices, the leaders of the traditional parties indulged in luxury and idleness and almost completely abandoned political activity.

The revolution of October 21, 1964, brought into bold relief the political positions attained by the new, socialist forces during the military regime. It was these forces that sparked off the revolutionary explosion and organised the general political strike with the participation of all workers, peasants, students and government employees. These actions paralysed the military regime. Even the leaders of the traditional parties, conscious of the imminent collapse of the military dictatorship, formally joined the opposition movement. After ten days of heroic struggle the military regime completely disintegrated and the democratic experiment entered into its third stage, a stage highlighted by the following features:

- the emergence of new, socialist forces playing an important part in political life;
- substantial weakening of the traditional social forces and of their political positions.

Thus, the revolution began to acquire a deep social content, essentially socialist. For the first time in the history of the Sudan the new, socialist forces were able to take part in state organs, and a government of a new type was formed; it contained representatives of the workers, peasants and intellectuals, including representatives of the Communist Party and the People's Democratic Party. As a result a progressive majority took shape in the government.

New horizons of progress now opened up before the revolutionary movement. For the first time in the history of the Sudan the cause of democracy acquired its proper significance. The revolutionary movement advanced the slogans: "Democracy for the people! No democracy for enemies of the people!"

As an indispensable condition for the establishment of

genuine democracy, the revolutionary movement set forth the following objectives:

- abolition of all manifestations and survivals of the military regime;
- ridding the armed forces, police and machinery of state of reactionary and opportunist elements;
- the landed estates to be brought under control and placed in the hands of the peasant co-operative societies;
- abolition of the old civil and tribal administration to make way for democracy in the rural areas;
- nationalisation of all companies, banks and enterprises of national importance;
- allocation of definite electoral areas exclusively for workers, peasants and intellectuals;
- safeguards for the democratic freedoms of the working people and repeal of all reactionary laws promulgated by the former military regime;
- bringing to trial members of the reactionary military clique and their accomplices responsible for the coup of November 17, 1958;
- aiding the national-liberation movements and pursuing an anti-imperialist foreign policy.

When the new government opted for the revolutionary way, opening up prospects for far-reaching social reconstruction, the reactionaries again began to muster their forces in a so-called national front, thus initiating a conflict, unprecedented in ferocity, between the reactionary and revolutionary forces.

Firstly, the reactionaries trotted out the bogey of communism as the principal instrument for dividing the revolutionary forces. A campaign of hysteria, based mainly on religion, was mounted against the Communist Party and the revolutionary government.

Secondly, lies and slanders were invoked against every measure of the revolutionary government with a view to isolating it and, should the circumstances be favourable, to deliver it a mortal blow. They resorted to violence, gathering in Khartoum tens of thousands of their armed supporters for purposes of intimidation.

In short, the reactionaries rallied all their forces, internal and external, the latter in the shape of the imperialists, to prevent the establishment in the Sudan of a new democracy

based on the working people and paving the way to socialist development.

During this conflict the transitional government was replaced by a new government which excluded the representatives of the workers, peasants and intellectuals. This was followed by gerrymandered elections in which only 15 per cent of the electorate took part; in this way the reactionaries regained power.

Recovery of power by the reactionaries in itself signified a coup against the revolution and its achievements, and a major setback for democracy. Tension reached a peak in November 1965, when the constitution was amended and the Communist Party banned. The aim of the latter action was to exclude the Communists from the Legislative Assembly. And so, for the second time in eight years the reactionaries rejected the democracy they had created.

After ten years of this system the Sudan has made little progress; things are much the same as they were at the time the imperialists were ousted. As hitherto, the country is a source of raw materials for the capitalist countries and is dominated by foreign banks and companies, while the people live in poverty and ignorance. As in the past the basic contradiction in the development of the Sudanese revolution is that between the ruling circles anxious to preserve the status quo, and the progressive forces interested in socialism. This situation, we believe, cannot last long since it is contrary to common sense, and to social progress.

The deep-going social changes that have taken place in the United Arab Republic, Guinea, Mali and in some other African countries show that democracy is expressed not in the existence of numerous parties with slogans that serve merely as camouflage for the exploiting and parasitic classes, but in the existence of a revolutionary leadership capable of rallying and inspiring the masses and expressing their will for complete liberation from the fetters of class oppression; these changes show that there can be no freedom and democracy in conditions of exploitation, that the exploitation of man by man is the enemy of progress and democracy.

So, it can be inferred from the foregoing that at the present stage of the struggle in Africa the problem of democracy is organically bound up with social change. Without this, democracy would be a mere phrase, devoid of substance and imprisoned in the formalities of bourgeois democracy.

Under capitalism democracy can only be democracy for capital, the guarantee of its right to exploit the workers. In a feudal society it can but guarantee the right of the feudal rulers to exploit the peasants. This is what history, our entire experience and the experience of other African peoples have taught us.

However, we do not reject bourgeois democracy absolutely and in all cases. At certain stages of the revolutionary process special significance attaches to the development of the mass movement paving the way to progress. In the Sudan the trade union and revolutionary movements have been able to establish themselves and gain important basic rights under bourgeois democracy; hence experience of bourgeois democracy is important for winning genuine revolutionary democracy in the future.

Imperialism with its drive for cultural penetration into the newly independent countries has always found in Africa some people among the intelligentsia who regarded the bourgeois system as a model of democracy and, as a result, were unable to overcome its formal aspects for the sake of a more revolutionary content. By virtue of their education and cultural traditions they tend to bourgeois-liberation ideas rather than to revolutionary socialism.

They say, for example, that the one-party system and the banning of other parties and newspapers is a dictatorship. True, it is a dictatorship, but whose dictatorship? This question they never ask. Their prejudices conditioned by upbringing and social environment make it difficult for them to appreciate the process of the revolutionary transition from the dictatorship of the exploiting classes to the dictatorship of the working people. At the same time, should the popular forces representing the interests of the working people adopt a liberal and idealist attitude and allow their enemies to form their parties and organise themselves, the latter by virtue of their class interests would saddle the revolution, deprive the working people of their gains, and return them to the conditions of feudal or capitalist society.

Thus, there can be no such thing as absolute democracy in any society. The decisive factor is who benefits from the establishment of democracy—which social classes or popular forces. The advent to power of the forces representing the working people is the sole guarantee of genuine democracy.

THE MASS PARTY AND SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION

IDRISSA DIARRA

Among the many theoretical problems posed by the spread of socialism is the problem whether a mass party, that is, a party with a national rather than a class following, can ensure the building of the new society.

The problem should be seen against the background of the emancipation of colonial peoples and the spread of socialism when some mass parties are actually taking part in building the new socialist society. We are now in a position to discuss this purely theoretical problem on the strength of facts, in the light of the experience of a number of countries.

This problem, only now coming to the fore in Africa, is bound to gain in importance. And for those mass parties currently engaged in building socialism its significance is great indeed. Depending on its solution, the problem may or may not occasion difficulties in these parties by giving rise to what we might regard as unnecessary differences. That is why we feel that it merits thorough study, although it has not yet come to a head. Clarifying the issue through frank discussions we can avoid misunderstanding and contribute to the solution of the problems of socialist construction today.

We do not propose to go deeply into the meaning of the term "building socialism" but will merely state the opinion of our Party on this issue.

We think that a socialist trend of development can be defined by criteria which we would list as follows:

—public or co-operative ownership of the basic means of production;

- no large-scale private property in agriculture;
- state monopoly of foreign trade;
- distribution effected chiefly by the state sector and the self-managing sector;
- an independent national monetary unit.

These criteria, we believe, make it possible clearly to define the policy of building socialism, especially if the policy is pursued by a mass party based on democratic centralism.

To be sure, the specific content of these conditions and the extent to which they are achieved may vary. But this is a question of the stages of socialist construction; it is not, in our view, a matter of questioning the orientation. At any rate we hold that a country striving for the objectives listed above is building socialism.

We also think it is necessary to specify whether there is a fundamental difference between the socialist and the non-capitalist roads. This term came into being some years ago with the liberation of the colonial peoples. Some of these countries have, under the leadership of their mass parties, carried out a series of structural reforms the general nature of which undoubtedly fits into a socialist perspective.

That being so, why is it that in speaking of these countries the term used is the "non-capitalist way" and not the "socialist way"?

As a rule, the countries which are building or have built socialism are doing or have done so under the leadership of a class party, a vanguard party based on Marxist-Leninist principles. At present some of the new countries have, with the aid of a mass party and not a vanguard party, opted for a way which can be essentially defined as the socialist way. While the objectives in either case are identical and the methods of attaining them more or less similar, the instrument is different. This, in our view, calls for deep-going theoretical analysis, since the vanguard party was, until recently, considered an indispensable instrument for building socialism. Indeed, there is so far no objective proof that a mass party can bring the socialist revolution to its goal. All we know is that so far mass parties have been able to take a road which, generally speaking, is marked by socialist features, but we have no final proof that these parties can carry the development through to the ultimate goal. We are bound to admit, therefore, that certain mass parties constitute a vanguard force, that a mass party can follow a line whose

implementation and whose objectives fit into the socialist perspective.

According to one concept, the activity of a mass party of this kind ensures non-capitalist development, opening the road to a new and higher phase, the socialist phase. As for advancing along this road, leadership by a class vanguard party is considered indispensable.

The advocates of this concept can draw on historical experience in the sense that socialism has so far been built only under the leadership of a vanguard party. However, the lack of experience in building socialism under the leadership of a mass party is by no means evidence of inability on the part of the latter to guide the advance to socialism.

Our position on this issue is that there is no qualitative distinction between the non-capitalist and the socialist ways. But socialist development is a stage by stage process: socialist changes in the sphere of production and distribution, building socialism, consolidating socialist society, and building communism.

We believe that in the conditions provided by liberation from colonial rule a mass party can carry the socialist revolution through to the end. And we will try to prove our point without claiming any monopoly of the truth in the matter. On this issue as on any other, the last word will be said by time; experience will show. But even if the attempt to build socialism under the leadership of a mass party should fail, it would be wrong to conclude that socialism cannot be built. For, to go by this kind of logic, one could have inferred from the defeat of the Paris Commune and the Russian revolution of 1905 that a vanguard party is unable to take power and build socialism.

Before proceeding to a specific examination of the possibility of building socialism under the leadership of a mass party it should be noted that there are important distinctions between the numerous ruling parties in the African countries. The point is not to examine these distinctions here but to stress that in dealing with the problem under discussion we take into account only those mass parties

- in which unity has been achieved by free consent;
- which are based on democratic centralism;
- which have firmly declared for the socialist road of development and base their activities on the theory of scientific socialism;

—which pursue a genuinely socialist policy.

To attempt an answer to the question whether a mass party meeting the foregoing requirements can in definite conditions carry the socialist revolution through to the end, it is first necessary, in our opinion, to compare the conditions in which those parties that have built socialism had to operate with those in which the mass parties intent on building socialism are presently operating.

The spread of socialist ideas in Europe in the second half of the last century was due mainly to the growing realisation of the completely unwarranted social injustice of arbitrary power. The sharp antagonisms of the time, aggravated by the rapid industrialisation, led to an ever more distinct division of the peoples into antagonistic social strata. The writings of Marx and Engels, which gave a solid theoretical basis for the hitherto unclear socialist ideas and which led to the rise of the Communist movement, were a reflection in ideology of the conflicting interests which spilled over into the class contradictions.

The capitalist era—undoubtedly the worst period in human history—gave final form to the division of society into antagonistic classes. Lenin's writings and the rise of Communist and Workers' parties were directly prompted by social relationships under which man was of no account. These social relationships naturally led to the founding of a revolutionary vanguard party openly demanding the forcible seizure of power to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat which would pave the way for a classless society.

All the class vanguard parties, whatever their name and the way in which they won power, rose from a society in which contradictions had reached an extraordinary degree of sharpness and which was divided into antagonistic classes.

The conditions in which some mass parties in Africa set about building socialism were different.

Towards the end of colonial rule African society bore the following characteristics:

—feudal overlords had become helpers of the colonial authorities, losing all prestige; they could rely on the forces of the colonial system;

—under colonial rule, the proletariat developed as a social stratum. Although the proletariat is small in number compared with the remainder of the population, it constitutes, in alliance with other social strata, a sizable organised force.

It comprises all of Africa's wage workers irrespective of their social condition. A working class in the European sense does not exist as such;

—a stratum of traders, mostly middlemen using foreign private capital, have almost completely monopolised imports and exports and own the scant means of production available;

—impoverished peasants make up the bulk of the population. Many of them own land, but they must pay rent to the tribal chiefs.

While African society in the twilight of colonial rule has antagonistic interests and displays all the signs of an inevitable break-up into antagonistic classes, it is distinguished by at least two important features.

First, the division of society into definite strata is not yet complete. Social relations—relationships between exploiters and exploited—have retained the patriarchal forms which conceal their true nature.

Secondly, the presence of the colonialists, that is, foreigners, blunts the conflict of interests in African society. The paramount contradiction of colonial times is the antithesis between the interests of the colonial powers and the basic interests of the oppressed peoples. This contradiction forces all others into the background.

These two features explain why vanguard parties in the usual sense of the term, that is, class parties, have not appeared in Africa. By the end of colonial rule the situation had become more favourable for social differentiation but it would be wrong to claim that society is already divided into antagonistic classes. Contradictions and social distinctions are not sufficiently pronounced to do away with the solidarity of African society.

Thus, the absence of a vanguard party is due to the absence of economic and social soil out of which a party of this kind grows.

This is borne out by the history of the African Democratic Association (RDA), a progressive anti-colonial movement rather than a vanguard party. Its more mature members were well aware of the direct connection between colonialism and capitalism, but for strategic reasons they relegated the fight against capitalism to a secondary place. The need to solve the main contradiction of the period, that is, to destroy the colonial regime, impelled the Democratic Association to give priority to national objectives. The situation was such that

the masses while mature enough to resist the colonial régime were not sufficiently mature to wage a class struggle.

Some branches of the Association which took a different way were unable to achieve their aims. They had to fight on many fronts at once, at a time when the masses were not ready to render them effective help.

Branches of the African Independence Party (AIP), likewise put forward national liberation, and not the seizure of power by the workers and peasants, nor the fight for socialism.

When the African states first gained independence, conditions did not favour the founding and the functioning of a vanguard party. Today, however, the situation in many countries is much more favourable. Indeed, the policy of encouraging foreign and national private capital pursued by a number of governments tends to aggravate existing contradictions, and eventually new conditions will no doubt lead to the formation and growth of a vanguard party.

Not so in those countries where the activity of the ruling mass parties is directed towards gradually solving the basic contradictions of society.

In contrast to the former, the contradictions in the latter case instead of becoming aggravated are ironed out. Socialisation of the means of production and distribution has increased the number of working people in the state sector, those natural supporters and defenders of the Party's socialist orientation. Originally this orientation relied chiefly on volitional factors, but since then the changes in the economic structure have extended the objective base of the fight for the socialist way.

Simultaneously the objective base of the forces opposing the socialist orientation of the Party is shrinking.

At a time when the objective base of the fight for socialism is being extended while that of those opposed to socialism is shrinking it would be paradoxical to alter the nature of the instrument of this evolution. Fundamental structural reforms, which add up to a genuine revolution, were effected under the leadership of the mass party, which even though it was a heterogeneous group, pressed forward on its course. And there is no reason to believe that this instrument which has proved adequate to solve basic contradictions, will turn out to be less so in dealing with lesser contradictions.

A serious objection can be raised to this proposition, namely, that there remains the core of the anti-socialist forces,

which is dangerous in itself and is building up its fighting capacity; the anti-socialists are becoming more desperate as they try to check socialist construction, and, aware that their positions are hopeless, may resort to direct action to overthrow the regime.

There is something in this objection, for objectively the counter-revolutionaries are building up strength. Ghana has shown that this process may even reach culminating point. The question is whether the growth of a mass party into a vanguard party can prevent this.

To answer this question, we should imagine the possible results of the development of a mass party into a vanguard party.

In addition to the purely practical problems that the development would engender, it would result in subjective contradictions arising from the expelling of large numbers of members being added to the objective contradictions and conflicting interests. Ex-party members may well be expected to retain some influence and to reinforce the core of the opposition. At best they could be a vacillating group likely to ally itself with the opposition at any time. This aggravation of the political contradictions could affect the armed forces and impel them to embark on hazardous ventures.

That is why we think it would be wrong at the moment to add to the number and gravity of the contradictions in the countries currently building socialism under the leadership of the mass party, and to turn undercurrents into open political struggles, particularly now that we know time is working for us. No party aware of its responsibility has ever rejected a part of its membership of its own free will, thus reinforcing the opposition, particularly since neither the moderate nor the wavering elements in the party take any action detrimental to the general line.

If the objective base of socialism is extended in step with the implementation of structural reforms, the party will become sooner or later and at all levels the exponent of the will of the progressive forces. At a definite stage the dialectic of development will lead to qualitative change in the party.

The qualitative reshaping of the party coming from its local organisations in keeping with objective requirements will take place in conditions guaranteeing the complete safety of the change. At the same time the political struggle will enter a new and higher stage characterised by the growing

isolation of the forces opposed to socialism and by a rapid contraction of their objective base.

We think this is the direction the well-considered strategy of a party determined to carry the socialist revolution through to its completion, with a maximum guarantee of success, should take.

As we see there can be no one answer to the question about the nature and structure of a party rallying the masses to accomplish the socialist revolution. The answer will differ according to whether it concerns parties in opposition and striving for the socialist revolution, or ruling mass parties that have begun to carry out the socialist revolution.

Regarding some of the parties of this type, including our own party, the Sudanese Union, we think they should pursue to the end the efforts to build socialism while retaining their present character. If it is true that every new situation necessitates new solutions, there should be an original solution to the problem of building socialism in those countries which begin to do so—immediately upon shaking off colonial dependence.

The experience gained so far in building socialism shows that the same ways, means and strategy cannot be wholly applicable in every case. Here we would like to make a remark about the peaceful character of our revolution. In principle, we are neither for nor against armed force. We favour it only when it is discovered to be absolutely necessary, and we oppose it when we consider it to be useless, and when it can be avoided. Some people are prone to treat any revolution accomplished without bloodshed in a condescending way, for they see armed force as the only criterion of revolutionary quality. We pay homage to those parties which had to use force to achieve their goal, for many of their members gave their lives in the process. Those parties did so because they had no choice—because in conditions of peace the balance of forces was against them, whereas the resort to force tipped the scales in their favour. However, there is a yearning for armed struggle also among the African mass parties building socialism, and some of their members even develop an inferiority complex because there is no such struggle.

Being neither revolutionary anarchists nor nihilists, we regard the resort to armed force as an extreme means, to be used only when all other means have proved ineffective.

We want to make our society socialist by peaceful means. We realise and appreciate the difficulties. We therefore believe that every real socialist can and should make an objective appraisal of our experience and the experience of other brother parties.

We think, however, that it would be untimely to deliver a categorical judgement on the work of our parties, since their activities are only now beginning to unfold. To do so, would, in our view, cause confusion in the mass parties, which are wrestling with enough difficulties as it is, as they blaze their own trail to socialism in the new conditions of the second half of the century. Such judgement could injure the prestige of these parties and, objectively, strengthen the opposition. That is why we think theoretical research should draw a distinct line between the strategy of the mass parties in power and working to build socialism, and the strategy of the progressive opposition in those countries where the parties in power are not striving for a genuinely socialist perspective, and where development may, given certain conditions, lead to the rise of revolutionary vanguard parties.

AHS

THE FIGHT FOR THE LIBERATION OF SOUTHERN AFRICA

J. B. MARKS

The liberation of Southern Africa remains the most important and urgent question on the agenda of the African revolution. As long as the most highly developed part of the continent with its enormous human and material resources is under the control of imperialism and local white minority governments it will not be possible to consummate our revolution.

All over Africa the central issue is that of the struggle of the people for complete independence and social progress. The achievement of these aims is opposed by imperialism, neo-colonialism and internal reactionary forces and groups which are allied to or utilised by international imperialism. Formal political independence has by and large been achieved without the people resorting to armed struggle except in the case of Kenya and Algeria. But there is a part of Africa which will perhaps constitute the most difficult problem. This is the white-ruled southern part of the continent, where white racialists and imperialism are determined to perpetuate the most ruthless oppression and exploitation of the people.

Southern Africa can be regarded as comprising the countries of Malawi, Lesotho, Botswana, Swaziland, Zimbabwe (Rhodesia), Mozambique, Angola, Zambia, South-West Africa and the Republic of South Africa. Some of these countries have already achieved independence under majority rule by Africans; they include the Republic of Botswana, the Kingdom of Lesotho, the Republic of Malawi and Zambia. These states are now

part of the Organisation for African Unity and, whatever their difficulties, are striving to consolidate their freedom.

Mozambique and Angola form part of the Portuguese colonial empire. The Portuguese fascists claim that these countries are part of metropolitan Portugal and are "overseas provinces". In fact the Portuguese "provinces" are classical colonies in which the majority are subjected to ruthless oppression and exploitation.

Zimbabwe and Swaziland are colonies of Britain. Swaziland will in due course gain independence as a Kingdom with Sobhuza II as head of State. Zimbabwe has been seized by a group of white politicians led by Ian Smith. For years the country has been governed contrary to the interests of the people by this white minority, with the support of Britain. After the "rebellion" of the Smith clique which unilaterally proclaimed the "independence" of Rhodesia, a fierce struggle is being waged by the Zimbabwe people for freedom.

South-West Africa is a territory illegally annexed by the Republic of South Africa, and is in fact subject to imperialist rule by that country. The Republic of South Africa is regarded as an independent state with a seat in the United Nations and all the attributes of sovereignty. But for the majority of the people there is neither freedom nor independence. There is only racialism and the most brutal fascist oppression and exploitation. South Africa is not merely the most reactionary citadel of imperialism in Africa, it is also the most ominous seat of subversion and counter-revolution against the African people.

In spite of the variety of conditions—economic, political and social—the countries of Southern Africa in certain important respects can be considered as a single geopolitical area or region, from the standpoint of our strategy and tactics in the fight for freedom. The justification for this is that Southern Africa forms a very close economic area whose centre is the mining and industrial power of South Africa. The whole region revolves around the commercial activities of which Johannesburg is the main headquarters. In fact imperialist strategy treats the whole area as a single unit.

To begin with, the economic stake of international imperialism is very large in Southern Africa. Britain, the United States, France, West Germany and Japan have huge investments here, exceeding those in the rest of the continent put together. Dominant among these imperialist investors is

Britain. The Republic of South Africa alone accounts for over £1,000 million of British investments and Zimbabwe for some £200 million. Zambia similarly has millions of foreign capital, invested particularly in its great copper mining industry. A partner of Portuguese colonialism in Africa, Britain has a variety of interests in Angola and Mozambique, too, in concerns ranging from railways, mining and sugar plantations to shipping and clearing agencies and banking.

The labour required in the enterprises belonging to imperialist capital is supplied by the underdeveloped countries of Africa to the Republic of Zambia, South Africa and Zimbabwe. The Kingdom of Lesotho has approximately 120,000 of its citizens at any one time working in the mines, farms and industries of the Republic of South Africa. Over 80,000 of them work in the mines. The Republic of Botswana has about 25,000 of its people labouring in South Africa.

In terms of a Convention entered into between Portugal and South Africa an average of 100,000 Africans are recruited each year by the Transvaal Chamber of Mines from Mozambique. In exchange South Africa pays £2 per labourer and allows the Portuguese authorities to collect taxes in South Africa. Apart from this annual quota another 200,000 Africans from Mozambique are working in the Republic of South Africa and in Zimbabwe. Thus, over 80 per cent of the labour in the mining industry of the Republic of South Africa comes from outside the country.

Apart from supplying labour, the Portuguese colonies, particularly Mozambique, handle a vast quantity of exports and imports to and from the Transvaal. In terms of the Portuguese-South African Convention already referred to, 47.5 per cent of the seaborne import traffic to the area of Johannesburg as well as exports of 340,000 cases of citrus fruit must pass through Mozambique railways and be handled at the port of Lourenço Marques. The vital importance of the ports of Lourenço Marques, Beira, and Luanda to the economies of Malawi, Zimbabwe, Zambia and South Africa explains much of the politics of the Southern African region.

For the rest, trade, finance, banking, insurance, communications show the close links and dependence of these countries on one another. One of the tasks of states as they achieve independence is the struggle to break out of the stultifying embrace of these economic bonds of steel whose control is in the hands of the white minority and their allies,

the imperialists. Zambia is engaged in such a painful struggle today. The economic interdependence of these countries is reflected in the way political events in each country affect the other.

Nowhere is this more graphically illustrated than in the continuing Rhodesian crisis, which is the most crucial issue facing Africa today. Taken by itself the problem would, perhaps, not be so intractable. But the fact is that every move taken on Zimbabwe affects the Republic of South Africa and the Portuguese colonies. The determination of the Republic of South Africa to resist the emergence of an independent Republic of Zimbabwe means it is no longer possible to view this problem entirely in isolation. The freedom of Zimbabwe is closely bound up with developments throughout Southern Africa. The same applies to events in Mozambique, and other parts of the region.

The Zimbabwe crisis has exposed more clearly than ever the deep complicity of Western, and particularly British, imperialism in the enslavement of the Africans in Southern Africa. It is of course not the first time that a British Government has betrayed the rights of an African majority. In 1910 in South Africa a similar intrigue was resorted to by the British Government.

It has also revealed the design to hang on at all costs to the whole area as a bastion or fortress of white supremacy and imperialist control. In the end, Africa and the whole progressive world must force a showdown on the whole range of urgent questions of Southern Africa, and support in every way the freedom fighters of Southern Africa who are fighting on the numerous sectors of this region, or face an imminent danger of an imperialist counter-offensive launched from the South.

The Unholy Alliance and the Collaborators

Imperialism has on more than one occasion shown ample evidence of determination to protect its interests in Southern Africa at the expense of the freedom and independence of the majority of the people. The white exploiting minority are the base on whose support the imperialists rely for their oppression of 30 million Africans. In the Portuguese colonies, Zimbabwe and the Republic of South Africa (including South-West Africa) the whites not only occupy all the key positions

in the political, social and economic fields but also are the backbone of the armed forces without which this disgraceful system would not last one single day.

The powerful military and security system is not so much a defensive as an offensive arm for subverting neighbouring African states and suppressing the freedom movements. It is against this formidable enemy that the freedom movements in each unliberated part of the South have to fight, enjoying very haphazard help from liberated Africa. What is needed is greater commitment, co-ordination and planning in full consultation with the leadership of the national movements in each country. It was the isolated struggles of our peoples which caused our defeat by the Imperialists in the last century. Our freedom must not be delayed by the similar lack of co-ordination of the struggle in the different areas.

As already indicated, our enemies have vast military resources at their disposal.

According to a study of the London Institute of Strategic Studies entitled "The Military Balance 1965-1966", the armed forces of the Republic of South Africa are one of the biggest on the African continent. It should be remembered also that these forces are drawn exclusively from among the white minority in the country. There are 26,500 regular troops; para-military forces number 29,600 police; there are also 51,000 commandos organised in 210 units.

The air force which totals 4,000 men has at least 100 combat aircraft and 60 helicopters plus 250 aircraft attached to the commandos.

Portugal, according to the same study, has over 100,000 troops in Africa, with 30,000 in Mozambique, 20,000 in "Portuguese" Guinea and 57,000 in Angola. She has 14,000 men in the air force with 350 aircraft in Africa.

Rhodesia has 4,300 in the regular force, 6,400 para-military troops (police) with 28,500 in reserve. The airforce has six squadrons of first-class aircraft.

It should be expected that the imperialist-supported Institute of Strategic Studies may minimise for propaganda purposes the actual strength of the forces commanded by this Unholy Alliance. But their admissions are significant enough. Concentrated in Southern Africa against the liberation movements and independent states are formidable military forces under the control of desperate and ruthless men who know

they are doomed to defeat by history and will therefore fight to the last ditch before they disappear.

The struggle for the defeat of such dark forces who are supplied and supported by the imperialists requires a cool and realistic assessment based on serious political and military considerations by the leadership of the liberation movements in each country if we are not to suffer avoidable setbacks.

Often people who are not prepared to think carefully about such matters expect the freedom fighters to engage the enemy without proper organisation, planning, equipment or bases in friendly neighbouring states. Too often liberation movements are lectured and instructed by some ultra-revolutionaries to "go and fight!"

Our people everywhere in Southern Africa have fought and will continue to fight for their liberation but on one condition, namely, that we fight with modern arms in hand. We are no longer prepared to call on our people to fight with sticks and stones as they have done for decades at the cost of thousands of lives. Surely it is not too much to expect that our friends in Africa and all over the world will at least ensure that the peoples of Southern Africa are trained by the thousands and fully armed to fight the enemies of progress on our continent. *Armed counter-revolution must be faced with armed revolution.*

The Forces of Change

The break-up of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland and the emergence of independent states in Malawi and Zambia was a big reverse for imperialism and white reaction in Southern Africa. Similarly the emergence of such states as the Republic of Botswana and Lesotho is an acute embarrassment for the protagonists of white supremacy. This is the case despite the well-known economic dependence of these states on the white-ruled countries. Nothing can alter the determining facts of the situation which is one of 30 million Africans fighting for freedom against oppression. As far as the white supremacists are concerned any authority by Africans anywhere in Africa is anathema and sticks in their throats.

The main revolutionary force, however, is not so much independent states as the masses of labouring people in Southern Africa who know what white supremacy and ra-

cialism mean. These are the millions who toil in the mines and plantations of Zambia, Zimbabwe, South Africa, Angola, Malawi, Botswana, Lesotho. They are the vanguard of the struggle for the elimination of racialism and the foreign economic interests which profit by the present set-up. Those who are in the free countries of Zambia, Malawi, Botswana, Lesotho wish to see their brothers and sisters free in the remaining areas of colonialism and white rule in the South.

But it is not only the basic forces of labouring people and farmers who share these aspirations. The intellectuals, businessmen, students and youth and even chiefs have suffered from the humiliations of race oppression. All these forces together under the leadership of the working people constitute a broad front of the national-liberation movement embracing people of different ideologies and beliefs, religious and non-religious, Communist and non-Communist, to achieve not only the first step of formal political independence but also the further tasks of economic and social reforms.

In all the countries now remaining under white minority rule armed struggle is the only perspective left for the people. Throughout the area the main task is the preparation for and the launching of revolutionary armed struggles. Quite clearly opportunities arise for close co-operation among all freedom fighters and their organisations. This does not mean that the conditions in the different countries are the same or that the strategy to be followed is identical. In fact, it cannot be so. It is important always that the independent political and military leadership must be developed in each separate country. But in order to prevent the enemies from concentrating their forces against each liberation movement, ways have to be found to build up and strengthen the struggles in all countries in co-operation.

One theory that must be combated is that according to which the fight can be conducted in each country in complete isolation from the others. Nor can we accept the idea that the problem can be tackled in one country at a time. Nobody can tell where the revolutionary breakthrough may occur next. Therefore the fight must be intensified in all countries of Southern Africa where imperialism rules. Imperialist occupation of Africa began in the South. Let it now end in the South.

THE RHODESIA CRISIS: ITS SOURCE AND NATURE

STEPHEN NKOMO

Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) represents the highest stage of classic colonialism whither Britain, ont content with administering the colony from Whitehall, exported her kith and kin to exercise overlordship on Rhodesian soil, not on a temporary basis but permanently. Thus Rhodesia became, de facto, an overseas province of Britain with all the resources belonging to Britain; the administration was a settler administration with Africans as slaves deprived of all fundamental rights, thus becoming foreigners in the land of their birth. It is this classic situation which led the settler regime formally to declare that Rhodesia was a white-man's country in the heart of Black Africa—a public declaration of the enslaving of the four million African owners of Zimbabwe.

Rhodesia, a vast economic domain of British, South African, and American capital, is administered by the white settlers. The condition under which imperialists receive maximum benefit from Rhodesia can be stated briefly as the maintenance of the existing political and economic structure. The reasons for this are not far to seek. The preoccupation of monopolies of the advanced capitalist states in their economic expansion is:

(a) to exploit the natural resources of the less developed countries in order to feed the manufacturing industries of their own countries with cheaply obtained good-quality raw materials;

(b) to sell low-quality manufactured goods at high prices in the less developed countries, thus amassing huge profits;

(c) in exceptional cases, to set up manufacturing plants for consumer goods in some of these countries and then use the latter as distributing agencies for neighbouring territories. By so doing, cost of production and distribution is greatly reduced, thus creating conditions for the realisation of maximum profits.

Rhodesia is a victim of all these three aspects of capitalist exploitation.

In pursuit of these three objectives, Britain has invested more than £200 million in Rhodesia. South Africa has around £175 million and the United States, too, has large investments. Export of capital to Rhodesia depicts the international conspiracy by finance capital to maintain the existing political-economic relations.

Leading investors in the Rhodesian economy are well-known monopoly groups operating through subsidiary companies. To quote only a few, British monopolies include: Hawker Siddeley, British Motor Corporation, British Petroleum, Imperial Chemical Industries, English Electric, Dunlop, etc. American companies include: Mobiloil, Standard Oil and several others. These investments constitute the base of the Rhodesian economy, covering production, distribution, and even services. Mining, manufacturing, agriculture and distribution are thus controlled by foreign capital. The capitalist states which represent these monopolies and protect their interests abroad have no regard for the political and economic position of the indigenous people. Indeed it would be paradoxical to expect this from men whose God is gold and whose travelling pass to their heaven is profit.

These large foreign investments are not designed nor are they intended for humanitarian purposes, and most certainly they are not a form of aid to Rhodesia. Their mission is simple—to make maximum profit. By African standards, Rhodesia's manufacturing industry is developed. The instruments of production used both in the extracting and manufacturing industries are modern. The value of the commodities produced is expropriated by the capitalists, with an insignificant part paid to the African workers in the form of a subsistence wage. Robbed of his land and cattle, the African has nothing left but his labour—for sale.

Rhodesia is a leading producer of tobacco, chrome, and asbestos, and these are targets for foreign investments. The safety of this capital depends on its being administered by

"safe hands". The Salisbury regime therefore represents the interests of these monopolies and the latter support it if they are to see their wealth safe. Monopolists are themselves represented by the Governments of their own states. This is the basis of the international conspiracy over Rhodesia and reveals who the real enemy is—the chief shareholder—Britain, together with fellow conspirators.

The Role of the Settlers

The question now arises: Why is the present crisis centred on the minority white settlers? What are they defending and why this dangerous conflict? The answer is complex, but here we shall only give some guidelines.

As already mentioned, the white settlers are the mere administrators of this economic empire, but they are carrying out this duty at a *price*: they must have high standards of living and absolute power to maintain their privileges. They realise that with democratic institutions, Africans would assume these powers and thus break the levers of the privilege and the luxury which are the result of an unfair distribution of wealth amongst the inhabitants of Rhodesia. To achieve this the white minority ensured their position by first breaking the economic independence of the African people.

Under the Land Apportionment Act land was divided into two sections—poor, non-fertile and arid land for the Africans and rich land for the Europeans, whether they used it or not. By this system four million Africans are crowded into less than half the land acreage in Rhodesia and more than half belongs to 5,000 white farmers and estate owners. In rural Rhodesia there is a sharp class distinction between rich white farmers with vast tracts of land and the impoverished African peasants with insufficient and non-fertile land. Moreover, the white farmers receive financial assistance for the development of their farms from the finance houses of the monopolists, while the African peasants are deliberately barred from such opportunities. This is designed to make Africans quit the rural areas and become wage-slaves in industry and commerce. Competent or not, the whites must remain at their posts and prevent Africans from taking any of these well-paid jobs.

Faced with contradictions inherent in this set-up, and threatened by the emergence of "Black power", the white minority took refuge in the doctrine of white supremacy. According to

this doctrine any white person, irrespective of ability, is superior in all aspects to all Black people, and the duty of the white is to guide and "civilise" the Blacks. Government must therefore be exercised by and remain in "civilised hands". Racism, like fascism, becomes a creed, an instrument to attain the ends outlined above—the maintenance of privilege by a minority. The threat to peace and the underlying cause of the Rhodesian crisis is, therefore, not so much Ian Smith's racism but the fundamental basis that brought about the concept of white racism.

Because of its vested interests, Britain is not prepared to act against the Rhodesian minority. After Smith's unilateral declaration of independence, Harold Wilson laid an international smokescreen saying that he would crush the Smith regime by means of economic sanctions. The sanctions did not fail as some people believe, the point is that they were *never* applied and *could not* be enforced. We have already said that the Rhodesian economy is closely interwoven with foreign monopolies and that nearly all the enterprises in Rhodesia are subsidiaries of foreign companies. Sanctions against Rhodesia would, in fact, be sanctions against the foreign monopolies. And the British Government, itself a representative of the monopolies, can hardly act against its own clients. Britain herself is faced with an economic crisis over the balance of payments and is in no position to act in a way that could bring more difficulties to her already ailing industry. Mandatory sanctions against Rhodesia under Chapter 7 of the United Nations Charter would militate against the interests of the British, South African, Portuguese and American monopolies, which would sabotage effective application of any sanctions.

The fact stands out clearly that the crisis in Rhodesia, though unique in its nature, is not unique in its essence. The struggle of the people of Zimbabwe is a struggle similar to that being waged by peoples all over the world—the struggle against imperialism. The fight for national liberation in Zimbabwe is closely linked with the revolutionary actions of other peoples of the world in their determination to get rid of imperialist oppression. The challenge to the African people of Zimbabwe is to solve the crisis in accordance with the objective conditions in Zimbabwe. The nature of the struggle has peculiarities, and in the next pages, we attempt briefly to evaluate the nature of the conflict.

The Nature of the Conflict

The African people in Zimbabwe, plagued by a tyrannical regime whose creed is to maintain repression by fraud, force, and fascist methods, unanimously endorse the conclusion of the Zimbabwe African People's Union that the ulcer in our body politic must be removed by force and that this is the only method by which we can achieve our independence.

The following factors account for this conclusion:

Firstly, an antagonistic contradiction exists between the African masses on the one hand and the interests of the minority of white exploiters on the other. The desire of the white minority to maintain the political and economic status quo—the repression and exploitation of the majority—is in diametrical contradiction to the demands of the African people for a democratic government and a just distribution of the wealth of the country among all its inhabitants. The luxury, privilege and economic power that the white settlers enjoy today can only exist under the present political structure, and restoration of democracy would be the knell of their doom. On the other hand, the political, economic, and social plight of the African masses can only be improved by a democratic government, i.e., a government of their own choice which represents and serves *their interests*.

All peaceful means to solve the crisis and bring about change have met with rebuff and hostility from the colonialists. The time has come when the masses must impose their will, and the only method is force. The alternative is national subjugation.

Secondly, imperialism is in essence a violent imposition of foreign domination over another nation. It lives and grows only on force, and the use of force increases as the opposition to it grows. Rhodesia is no exception. The minority regime has developed one of the best military and para-military troops, police and security forces in Africa. The reasons for this are obvious. The troops and security forces are part of the superstructure to entrench white supremacy and economic privilege, to crush opposition and finally to uphold the interests of the white colonists.

The violent nature of imperialism is being proved and confirmed by the activities of the imperialists in Africa and Asia. In Vietnam a grim war of national liberation is being waged by the Vietnamese patriots to rescue their land from US

imperialism. In Rhodesia the cold-blooded murder of men, women and children, imprisonment and torture of thousands of patriots are acts of violence against the African people in reply to their demand that their country be restored to them. The perpetual state of emergency in Rhodesia is actually a state of war. The massive repressive legislation in the guise of "law and order" is, both in content and application, no different from martial law. The African people accept this challenge of imperialist violence and reply accordingly. *We have to be violent in a violent situation, we must fight when a war is imposed on us, defend our rights in the face of aggression. There can be no peace when the foundations of peace have been unilaterally undermined. We are convinced that only in this way shall we achieve our destiny—a free and independent Zimbabwe.*

In view of the violent nature of imperialism and the executors of its diabolical policy, the struggle for the liberation of Zimbabwe is developing into a national-liberation war. At this point of confrontation, the colonialist and imperialist forces, despite the inherent contradictions among them, have remarkable methods of allying themselves as they fight for survival. They are engaged, throughout the world, in manoeuvres and intrigue to stifle all liberation movements. The forces against us are no deterrent, for our victory does not depend on the whims and wishes of the imperialists and their lackeys, but on our own strength. Armed with the resolve to put an end to the colonialist set-up in Rhodesia, the African people of Zimbabwe are employing different forms of struggle. The enemy is strong but its strength is being reduced by our effective blows. Through revolutionary activity, we shall increase our strength, remedy our shortcomings and assume the offensive. The Zimbabwe African People's Union, after a thorough analysis of the objective conditions in Rhodesia, sees the sole solution in a national-liberation war. It is a process already in motion, undergoing various stages and requiring complex planning, correct strategy and tactics.

(a) At the first stage our strategic task was to rally the masses in a bid to overthrow the colonial regime by means of mass protests, demonstrations and other non-violent actions. These, however, led to violent clashes with the security forces. This form of struggle, though successful in overthrowing colonial regimes elsewhere, failed to produce similar results in Rhodesia. However, we benefited from the fact that

our people became more organised, united by a common aim and determined to overthrow the white-settler dictatorship. Resistance movement activities have become countrywide since 1960. Besides our activities at home, we launched an extensive international campaign of pressure on Britain in the hope of securing a peaceful solution of our problem. Although the colonial regime was not overthrown by these activities, it was shaken. This stage continued till 1964, when the dictatorship of the colonialists launched its offensive, thus bringing us into the next stage;

(b) The settlers' offensive was a diabolical plan to disrupt our organisation and unity and thwart the revolutionary spirit of the African masses. Applying the tactics of fascists, the white settlers began with suppressing civil liberties and destroying all vestiges of political rights. All political and labour organisations were declared illegal, freedom of speech and assembly was thrown overboard. More than 50,000 political leaders and workers' representatives, peasants and other patriots were hauled, without trial or investigation, into prisons and detention camps where they are to remain indefinitely. This step was taken under the misguided notion that only a "few agitators" were fanning discontent and that their removal would cause panic in our ranks. To their disappointment, the African masses held firmly, maintained their resistance and improved their tactics.

Enraged by the resolute stand of the masses for democratic change, the settler regime deployed thousands of troops and police in a vain attempt to crush countrywide resistance. We were thus driven to the defensive, but we maintained our unity, secret organisation and firm determination to topple the regime.

On November 11, 1965, the Smith regime took the last pill to cure the headache caused by African resistance. It unilaterally declared Rhodesia independent. This was a declaration of war on the African people, and our struggle for liberation entered the next stage—the first stage of a full-scale war of national liberation;

(c) With Smith's declaration of independence the situation was not favourable for our struggle. Although the masses under the leadership of ZAPU were determined to smash the Smith regime, the struggle was limited by the existing conditions. But within that limit we conducted preparation for

a counter-offensive, for a shift from the defensive of the second stage to the offensive.

A war of national liberation, unlike a palace revolution, is not fought and won or lost over one night or in one month. It is different qualitatively and is fought by qualitatively different methods. Qualitatively different because it involves the rallying of the whole nation for a war against a well equipped army by people who have no arms or knowledge of military science.

On the other hand, we have advantages on our side. The masses are determined to overthrow the alien regime. We have their unqualified support and loyalty. We are learning the methods and tactics of the enemy and perfecting our own in the course of revolutionary activity, arming ourselves as the struggle goes on. There is no alternative to this in a war of national liberation. Our struggle takes various forms of guerilla warfare, sabotage, etc., and though the beginnings may be relatively small, these stages are indispensable preparation of a strategic counter-offensive.

With the blanket of secrecy cast over the events in Rhodesia, the fascist regime has managed to suppress the news about the actions now being fought. To quote Reuter's and UPI reports from Salisbury dated September 3, 1966: "Armed bands seeking to overthrow the Smith Government are fighting a *grim battle* with the security forces in the dense bush of Rhodesia's northern borders" . . . "Only senior members of Prime Minister's administration and security forces know the extent of this *secret warfare* or how many men are involved on either side."

All rural areas are occupied by the security forces not as a preventive measure against an uprising, as Smith claims, but because armed struggles are being waged in every corner of Zimbabwe. Brutal murders, rape of women and girls, raids on villages, and torture of peasants are but a few acts of the Smith forces. These are but a part of the price we have to pay in our determination to regain our land and assume our dignity in the community of nations.

In a recent broadcast, Interior Affairs Minister William Harper declared his regime had "shot whole gangs of these terrorists—not one surviving—where they resisted arrest", and went on to say they had captured nearly all the armed men who had entered Rhodesia. These statements are misleading and are designed to have that effect. The rebel regime is

aware that the people who are waging the struggle for liberation are sons and daughters of Zimbabwe and live in Zimbabwe. There is therefore no question of their having "entered" Rhodesia. The suggestion that nearly all the "terrorists" have been arrested or shot" is propaganda designed to comfort the colonialists. There are no terrorists in Rhodesia but all Zimbabwe Africans are against the regime, and the only way to arrest or shoot "all terrorists" will be physically to wipe out all Africans in Rhodesia. Although we had losses, which is normal in any struggle, it is an illusion that the revolutionary tide and activities can be halted.

Daily clashes prove our stand. Weapons, aircraft, bombs cannot deter or defeat us. We have greater weapons to match this—the masses in organised struggle, and yet more powerful—the moral right.

We are confident that with the tireless application of the available human and material resources our struggle will unfold into the fourth and final stage—a full-scale people's war. The key to our victory is development of the resistance until it culminates in the armed resistance of the whole nation. Our task at this stage, therefore, is active mobilisation of the people and material resources for solution of the crisis by a war of national liberation, by armed struggle to repel imperialist violence.

WE BUILD AS WE FIGHT

VASCO CABRAL

We in "Portuguese" Guinea have not only liberated more than half of our country's territory, we are building in the liberated areas a new life of peace, happiness and progress.

Militarily the Initiative has been wrested from the Portuguese colonialists, who are now compelled to stay in the barracks, receiving supplies by air or sea. Our troops periodically mount attacks, inflicting heavy losses on the enemy and expanding the liberated area. Our armed forces are growing in numbers and acquiring new equipment. For instance, we now have medium and heavy artillery.

In addition to the military operations, our African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde Islands (PAIGCV) conducts large-scale political and educational work; educating politically-conscious fighters for the interests of our people is seen as its principal task. We are first of all freedom-fighters who have had to take to arms because it is the only way to free our people from the foreign yoke.

During the ten years of the existence of our Party we have won victories and have accumulated a wealth of experience. True, grave mistakes too, have been made, but these are being rectified. We consider it right to work in many directions simultaneously: not only to fight against the enemy, but also to conduct political work, develop the economy, organise a health service and public education, promote the training of personnel. We are doing this because the fight for complete national independence does not end with driving out the colonial administration.

In short, our policy is to combine destructive and constructive work.

In destroying the enemy's economy and weakening his positions we carefully study the situation and choose our targets in keeping with the common interests of our struggle.

The economic structure forced upon our country is a single-crop one, based on ground-nuts in the continental part and on maize in the islands. We decided to sabotage in every way the cultivation of the colonial crops, especially ground-nuts, in the areas still under colonial rule, through passive resistance by the population and the armed actions of our guerillas.

At the moment our Party is pursuing two main economic tasks: (1) to begin the reconstruction of the country while the war is still going on, and (2) to supply ourselves with everything necessary primarily through our own efforts.

We are promoting agriculture by tending the sown area, organising timely and high-quality field jobs, and introducing new crops. Special attention is paid to livestock and poultry farming, fodder procurement and preservation of pastures. In some areas we have sharply increased the output of agricultural produce, particularly rice, which is now our staple crop. Now we can feed both the population and our armed forces. Moreover, part of the produce remains for export.

Our Party is creating conditions for introducing, at the appropriate moment, rational planning of all our economy.

New social relationships are developing under the guidance of the Party, which encourages mutual aid between families and villages. Currently we are organising jointly worked banana and pineapple plantations and, where conditions favour this, experimental agricultural co-operatives. Property abandoned by the colonialists and their henchmen is administered by citizens' committees.

Mindful of the public welfare, we are improving the health service and care for the wounded. Schools have been opened to train junior medical personnel. The health of our civilians and soldiers is looked after by doctors who have been trained abroad.

From July till September 1966 we conducted refresher courses which enabled about 200 teachers to catch up with developments in pedagogy and other subjects. The matter of training personnel has always been a prime concern of the Party. Between 1961 and 1964 we trained three times more people than in the five centuries of Portuguese colonial rule.

In 1966 we had on the liberated territory 127 schools with 13,500 pupils, as against 50 with 4,000 pupils in 1965. This is proof of the determination of our people to wipe out the legacy of colonial obscurantism and prepare the young generation for building the new life.

We consider that if the economic backwardness is to be eliminated as speedily as possible, priority must be given to training junior technical personnel. This will enable us to organise an agriculture-based economy of the transitional period and prepare the ground for industrialisation, the cornerstone of genuine progress.

The view of our Party is that we should not occupy ourselves solely with problems of the armed struggle. We see our liberation as a series of successive stages, and we disagree with those who hold that the concentration should be on liberating the whole country first and thereafter begin to organise life in a new way. For us the revolution is a continuous process of social reconstruction.

AHS

NEW TYPE OF RELATIONS

Some Aspects of the Co-operation Between African and Socialist Countries

KHALED MOHEI EL-DIN

For a long time, the white man in Africa symbolised slavery and exploitation. This situation changed with the rise of the socialist countries, which established with the developing countries of Africa relations based on equality and mutual respect. Africa came to know a new kind of white man, a fair partner and a friend helping the Africans to achieve freedom, independence and social progress.

The imperialists argue that the signs of civilisation in evidence in Africa are due to the colonisation of the continent and that the African peoples can make progress only by relying on the imperialist West.

Historical reality gives the lie to this claim. Actually, the signs of civilisation—roads, bridges, cities, industry—do not disprove the existence of backwardness. These seeming elements of progress were created for the purpose of plundering Africans. They are little more than camouflage for the appalling backwardness of the continent.

Progress is gauged not by the semblance of civilisation. It requires a solid groundwork for economic and technological development, which alone can bring the people prosperity and happiness.

A country which sets out to accomplish this task is bound to take the non-capitalist road of development and subsequently to advance to socialism. In the economically weak countries, the capitalist road signifies dependence on foreign monopolies, that is, continued backwardness. This is the reason for the emergence of the non-capitalist road, an objec-

tive necessity realised by those revolutionary leaders who want their countries to be genuinely independent.

But try as it may, Africa cannot cope singlehanded with the formidable problems of achieving speedy and comprehensive progress; aid is needed from the more developed countries. This aid comes to it from socialist and imperialist countries alike.

Western aid does not enable Africa to make real progress, for it bypasses those branches of the economy that are indispensable for genuine advance. In the case of U.S. aid, for instance, only 10 per cent is spent on industrialisation.

An analysis of the pattern of French aid to Africa shows that a substantial proportion of it is earmarked for military purposes, a bigger police force and stronger security agencies, the upkeep of French experts and officials employed in the countries concerned, and the French government agencies operating on the continent.

Soviet aid, on the other hand, is distributed in an entirely different way. Seventy per cent of the loans and credits granted to the developing countries by the USSR is used for industrial construction and the organisation of profitable production.

The trade policies of imperialism are designed to drain Africa of its riches. Ever lower prices are paid for African raw materials. The price of cocoa-beans, for example, which in 1954 stood at 58 cents per pound on the New York Stock Exchange, dropped to 37 cents in 1955, 20 cents in 1962 and to a meagre 16.3 cents in 1964. The same fate befell copper, which sold at 42 cents in 1956 and 28 cents in 1963.

The fall in prices paid for African raw materials is accompanied by rising prices for imported manufactured goods. A jeep, for example, which in 1954 equalled the price paid for 14 sacks of coffee, now needs 39 sacks.

Owing to non-equivalent trade with the West, the developing countries have during the last decade incurred losses several times as great as the total amount of Western aid to Africa.

Thus trade and economic relations with the imperialist countries are whittling down Africa's riches, leading to increased exploitation of the people. On the other hand, the socialist countries establish with the newly-independent countries mutually beneficial relations based on equivalent exchange.

Co-operation with the socialist countries is important not only because these countries treat the underdeveloped countries as equals. Its importance is not limited to mere advantage, low-interest loans, or disinterested aid in building enterprises and in training personnel. Nor is it limited to the socialist countries' support in establishing new, fairer relations on the world market. The value of this co-operation lies, first and foremost, in the fact that it enables the newly-free countries to attain genuine independence and get rid of every form of pressure.

Had it not been for the material and moral support given to many African revolutionary states by the socialist countries, the imperialists would not have had much difficulty in bringing these states back into their orbit and, pressed by the need for aid, some progressive regimes would have had to accept a number of compromises with the imperialists.

Africa's aid from the socialist countries makes the imperialists revise their attitude, ease their terms somewhat and agree, in a number of cases, to build important projects. This is something they would never have done unless the developing countries had had the option of readdressing their requests for aid and support to the socialist community.

It should be said that the socialist countries need for themselves the means they disinterestedly make available to the peoples of the one-time colonies. They cannot meet by themselves all the immense requirements of the developing countries. Hence they should not be expected to shoulder the whole burden of direct material and technological aid. The important and decisive thing is that the aid they extend to the African countries is an example and a weapon for the latter, and indeed for any developing country, in the fight to secure Western aid without strings.

The aid given by the socialist countries enables the African states gradually to win more favourable terms from the West.

Another important fact is that the socialist countries help the developing countries in building state-owned plants, unlike the West, which prefers to put its aid into building private enterprises. Aid from the socialist countries strengthens the public sector and helps to implement the principle of government control of the economy. In other words, it helps Africa to make real and important headway.

For all the manifest importance of co-operation with the socialist countries, certain objective factors in Africa today

adversely affect the trend towards closer relations between African and socialist countries.

Among these is the West's political, cultural and ideological influence, which is gaining ground in the administration and in the armed forces of some countries. Contacts between certain African countries and the socialist countries are seriously handicapped by survivals of anti-communism, by fear and mistrust of communism that are fomented in a variety of ways. These realities make it necessary for every advocate of co-operation to exert much effort in the ideological field to weed out the survivals of anti-communism.

To promote co-operation between the socialist world and African countries it is, moreover, essential to combat monopoly domination of the world market and imperialist provocations in the international arena which, increasingly, assume the form of naked aggression.

The newly-free countries must solve the problem of non-equivalent trade which forces them constantly to solicit loans from countries that enrich themselves at their expense. Besides, they should find a radical solution to the problem of material and technological aid, making it possible for them to receive this aid from different sources without any strings.

In this connection, the special nature of the aid Africa gets from the socialist countries should be re-emphasised. The purpose of this aid, which has manifold aspects, is to afford Africa the opportunity to shed all dependence and lay the foundations of genuinely progressive development.

It is true that such aid is a subordinate factor in the struggle of those countries and that the basic element is the consciousness of the leadership, ruling this or that country. But subordinate factors have often proved to be of basic importance.

The African peoples have a long and hard fight ahead to lift themselves out of age-long backwardness. Success in this endeavour necessitates a mustering of all their strength and energy. Socialist aid plus revolutionary national leadership are the earnest that the African masses will see their hopes of progress, prosperity and complete independence come true.

MILITARY COUPS D'ÉTAT IN AFRICA

TIGANI BABIKER

The political situation in Africa is characterised by a vigorous intensification of struggles and conflicts between imperialism and its class allies on the one hand and the vast mass of the people on the other. Faced with the choice between two diametrically opposed paths of development, all classes and forces are energetically participating in making the decision. The revolution in Africa has thus entered upon a new stage. Still directing its main blow against imperialism and neo-colonialism, it is passing over to the struggle for the radical transformation of society.

The revolution now has before it several interdependent tasks: to completely eradicate all survivals of colonialism, to ban the road to any neo-colonialist penetration and expansion, to prevent the draining of national riches by foreign monopolies—in a word, to secure full independence and sovereignty; to build strong independent economies; to check the growth of a capitalist class; to fully democratise the political system; to raise the living and material condition of the working people—in a word, to introduce long-needed social transformations.

These tasks are much more complicated than those posed during the struggle for independence. They involve a break with long-established bonds of influence and authority and with old ways of thinking and living. This makes the process of organising the masses extremely difficult and slow.

On the other hand these tasks, affecting as they do the deep-seated interests of imperialism and the exploiting classes, call forth from them desperate resistance. In their efforts

to crush the revolution they resort to the use of various weapons ranging from the deception of the people to the organisation of violence and coups d'état.

A crucial issue in the new stage of the revolution is that of political power.

The new African countries inherited from colonialism a highly developed state machine. Behind the parliamentary forms of Western democracy several features of this accursed inheritance can be discerned.

First, and this was its main function during colonial rule, it is an organ of coercion. The arms of such an organ were a few administrators vested locally and centrally with virtually unlimited powers, a penal code which deals ruthlessly with the least sign of discontent, a police force trained mainly for handling mass "unrest" and a tribal administration enlisting the chiefs in the service of colonialism. The armed forces were often called upon to perform police duties against the national-liberation struggle.

Secondly, a bureaucratic apparatus was created, whose chiefs wielded the actual power in determining economic and other policies. Today, behind the facade of parliamentarism, it is the same bureaucracy which is the real policy maker. Also, it is here that the African bureaucratic bourgeoisie is born, inevitably connected with foreign firms, with the diplomats of the imperialist countries and with the African exploiting classes. Naturally this bureaucratic bourgeoisie is dedicated to the capitalist path of development.

Thirdly, colonialism, which had done much to destroy the traditional tribal system, has preserved the worst and most negative aspects of that system in what came to be known as tribal administration. In this manner they were able not only to create an auxiliary, and cheaper, apparatus to discharge the minor functions of coercion (taxation, minor offences, etc.), but to perpetuate tribal conflicts and impair national unity.

Thus the state machine left over by colonialism is one of coercion, of facilitating the penetration of imperialist capital and policies, of helping the growth of capitalism and placing the exploiting classes in the positions of real power. These classes, which as a rule come to power after independence, inherit the whole colonial state apparatus, preserve it intact and make use of it in furthering their own interests and the interests of neo-colonialism.

The shortcomings of the left-over colonial state apparatus and the Western forms of democracy are becoming increasingly obvious. Nigeria provides the most glaring example of the policy of tribal division systematically pursued during the days of colonial rule. Kenya has lately shown the workings of "parliamentary democracy" when though the progressive Kenya People's Union (L.P.U.) won a majority of the votes, the ruling party, KANU, got away with the greater number of seats. In most African countries, corruption and self-enrichment at the expense of the people are rampant.

In their efforts to resist the revolution, the reactionary ruling circles use the state apparatus for deceiving and terrorising the masses. They abandon even Western democracy, tear constitutions to pieces, ban revolutionary parties and place severe restrictions on the freedom of expression and movement. They shun parliamentary forms of struggle and resort to violence by plotting assassinations and staging coups d'état.

The question of political power lies at the heart of the current struggles in Africa.

The revolutionaries are fighting for a type of state which really expresses the aspirations of the people, and which ensures their participation in the management of the affairs of government, economy and other spheres of life. Such a state will prevent the growth of capitalism and the encroachments of imperialism. It is along this path that African countries like the United Arab Republic, Mali, Tanzania and others are moving.

The reactionaries, on the other hand, seek to prolong their rule by preserving the fundamental features of the colonial state machine in order thereby to protect their interests and the interests of neo-colonialism.

The ideologists of reaction and imperialism try their best to gloss over the issue of political power. They hammer incessantly on general talk about "dictatorship" and "democracy". They are even speaking today in Ghana about "good government". But the truth is that every form of political power, whether parliamentary, multi-party, one-party or open military dictatorship, reflects the interests of a certain class or classes in society. It is a known fact that in the African progressive countries the state is pursuing a class line by suppressing the remnants of feudalism and the bourgeoisie (industrial, commercial or bureaucratic) and by eliminating

the positions of imperialism. The state is thus reflecting the interests of the workers, peasants, intellectuals and national bourgeoisie. Similarly, in the reactionary regimes the state represents the interests of the exploiting classes and those of neo-colonialism.

Coups d'état, whatever their content, are forms of struggle aiming immediately at the seizure of political power. Though carried out by a special organ of the state apparatus, seemingly isolated from society and political strife, coups d'état constitute part of the class struggles and reflect class interests.

It is from this angle that I wish to look into the coups d'état which have taken place in Africa, hoping thereby to make my contribution to the discussions dealing with the vital problems of the present stage of the African revolution.



Historically, with the exception of the National Liberation Army in Algeria, the armed forces in Africa came into being as part of the colonial coercive apparatus. With very few exceptions, they did not, as in Egypt, take part in the national-liberation struggle. In fact they were often called upon to perform police operations against the liberation struggle of their own or other peoples.

One of the distinctive features of the armed forces in Africa is that, unlike those in Latin America or the developed capitalist countries, the majority of the officers are drawn from the educated petty bourgeoisie and even from the educated sons of workers and peasants. In this respect they form part of the African intelligentsia. The old generation of officers, normally holding the higher ranks, were directly trained by colonial instructors or in the military colleges of the West. They are in general not only oriented, by virtue of their training and education, towards Western norms and ideals, but form also, by virtue of their rank, part of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, with a stake in the preservation of the capitalist path of development. The majority of the younger generation of officers, however, have, in all probability, participated, at least in their school days, in the anti-imperialist struggles. Therefore they are more likely to be imbued with hatred for imperialism, to be connected with the younger people at present leading the revolutionary struggle and to

be more amenable to revolutionary ideas. Needless to say the vast majority of the soldiers comes from the peasantry which is deeply interested in the introduction of radical social transformations.

It can thus be seen that though colonialism had striven to create an institution completely isolated from the rest of society, the armed forces could not in fact be tightly closed against the influences affecting society as a whole. Class interests motivate the attitudes of their different components. Political views find their way to the minds of the officers and soldiers alike, determining their places in the political struggles.

But in the newly-independent African states, the armed forces have another distinctive feature which is of extreme, decisive importance. In contrast to all the other class organisations, they are much more organised, disciplined, mobile and technically advanced. Moreover, they are, of course, armed. Thus they provide a ready striking force. The use of this force depends on the ascendancy of this or that political trend within its ranks.

When the army intervenes in politics it does so as part of the class forces in society. Coups d'état are continuations of the class struggles or the struggles between imperialism and revolution. In coming to power the army gives its weight to one or the other side. In this respect the army cannot be merely an instrument in the struggle, but becomes itself part of it, thus tearing down the traditional artificial wall separating it from the social and political transformations in society. The "theory" of the "neutrality" of the armed forces, consistently propagated by the exploiting classes, is thus forcefully refuted.

Permit me to cite two examples from two neighbouring countries—Egypt and the Sudan. More than fourteen years ago the revolution in Egypt, for various historical causes, took the form of a military coup d'état, organised and led by revolutionary young officers. Six years later a coup d'état was staged in the Sudan by the old officers in command of the army. The contrast between old and young, though significant, is not of decisive importance. But while in the first case the army liberated Egypt from colonialism, overthrew the monarchy, liquidated the big feudalists and capitalists, nationalised all foreign interests and eventually took the path of non-capitalist development, in the second case the army

opened wide the doors of the Sudan to imperialist capital and influence, enriched the bureaucratic bourgeoisie and the middlemen of foreign firms and suppressed the mass of the people.

It can thus be seen that coups d'état do not change the nature of the struggle; they only change its form. The revolutionary officers of the Egyptian army carried to victory the national-liberation struggle aborted by the intrigues of imperialism, the monarchy and reaction. The coup d'état of 1958 in the Sudan managed to stave off the rising revolutionary popular tide which threatened to sweep away the then existing reactionary government.

The more recent coups d'état in Africa may not all be as clear-cut as the foregoing examples, but they reveal the same relation to class politics.

Leaving Algeria and Ghana temporarily aside, the rest of the military take-overs occurred within reactionary pro-imperialist regimes. They were invariably preceded by severe political crises. While the reactionary ruling circles proved incapable of taking matters in hand through the ordinary channels, the revolutionary forces were likewise incapable of organising themselves effectively. The crises reached such stages that they could not be solved except by the intervention of the armed forces.

But the similarity ends here. In other respects these coups reveal an interesting variety as to the manner in which they were organised and carried out or to their consequent developments.

In the Central African Republic, Dahomey and Upper Volta, it is a clear case of pro-imperialist military dictatorships replacing pro-imperialist civilian regimes. The army came to power as a more reliable agent of French imperialism to protect its interests against those of other rival powers. The overthrown politicians, who were thus punished for displaying unforgivable weakness in upholding the interests of their masters, were among the first to hail the coups and to serve under them.

In the Congo (Kinshasa) General Mobutu, notorious for his services to imperialism and for his role in the murder of Patrice Lumumba, assumed power in the name of the army. But the events that developed there since then can be interpreted only in the light of objective conditions which are forcing even the hands of Mobutu. True, the rivalries and

contradictions of various imperialist powers could be seen behind several moves of the Mobutu regime, but that regime has taken many steps which accord with the national interests of the Congolese people. Whatever the original motives of the Mobutu coup, the class struggle and the struggle between the Congolese people and imperialism are imposing their will on the course of events.

Nigeria, long acclaimed in the West as the model African state in democracy and stability, was the scene this year of three coups within less than seven months. The army had overthrown a government generally recognised as corrupt and pro-imperialist with a strong feudal basis. The development of the military take-over is still not clear. It began by a mutiny of young officers, reportedly radical, followed within a few days by a full army take-over, with a mandate from the former Federal Council of Ministers, which placed the insurgent junior officers under custody. This was in turn overthrown by young officers, whose leader comes from the North.

The full implications of these changes will only emerge with time. But the central issue during the last ten months was that of the type of state and the degree of unity. General Ironsi was evidently against a federal state and hurried through several decrees establishing unitary government. This policy was bitterly opposed by the feudal North which was the scene of bloody riots. The bourgeoisie definitely favours unitary government, a unitary market and therefore an end to feudalism. Did the Ironsi regime represent the interests of the bourgeoisie of Western and Eastern Nigeria? Does the present regime, which abolished Ironsi's unitary decrees, represent the interests of the Northern feudal class or a compromise between it and the bourgeoisie? Was the Ironsi regime itself a move by the Nigerian propertied classes to forestall more radical changes at the hands of the junior officers? Whatever the answers, the events in Nigeria reflect intense class struggles, which cannot be veiled even by the advent of the armed forces to power. Moreover it should not be forgotten that imperialism, which is bent on dismembering Africa and every single African state, is deeply interested in influencing the course of current events in Nigeria.

What emerges from this account is that the military coups under review reflect the struggle in Africa, of which they are an inseparable component, and the balance of forces within

the countries affected by them. Regardless of the intentions of their initiators, these coups manifest the mounting discontent of the mass of the people. But they reveal a lamentable degree of lack of revolutionary organisation and leadership.

On the other hand these coups stress the weakness of the positions of the reactionary forces and their failure to win their peoples over to their policies. Where such forces are sufficiently strong and are still exerting considerable influence, such as in Kenya, Tunis, Ivory Coast and others, they are content, up to now, with resorting to demagoguery, deception and anti-democratic measures.

These coups reveal also that imperialism retains influential positions in Africa, generally among the bureaucrats of the state apparatus, but markedly within the armed forces of many countries—a fact of alarming significance.

But reactionary army take-overs cannot change the objective conditions which give rise to political crises. They may be able to deal without much ado with revolutionary leaders and organisations. But in the course of time they will have to face the same conditions and crises which brought down their predecessors. They change the form of the struggle, but not its content. Since the revolutionary needs remain without satisfaction, the political situation is not fundamentally changed.

On June 19, last year, President Ben Bella was ousted from office in Algeria. Little changes were introduced in the composition of the government. Ben Bella was admittedly devoted to the revolution and had won prestige both in Algeria and in the outside world as a great revolutionary leader. Though it was an internal matter, his ousting caused great concern among all friends of the Algerian revolution. The Boumedienne regime seemed at first to have lost orientation; but of late it took several measures, both in internal and external spheres, which indicate its dedication to the cause of the Algerian revolution. Since this subject is going to be discussed in all probability at this gathering, I shall not attempt to enter into further details about it at present.

I was in Ghana that the most blatant counter-revolutionary coup d'état was plotted and carried out by a pro-imperialist anti-socialist military and police junta. Imperialists and reactionaries all over the world greeted the news with unbounded joy. That is understandable, for the overthrow of the

revolutionary regime of Dr. Kwame Nkrumah was the severest set-back suffered by the revolution in Africa.

How did counter-revolution succeed so easily in Ghana?

The answer to this painful question covers a wide range of the pressing problems of the revolution in the whole continent. The most important among these are:

First, the attitude towards the state apparatus inherited from colonialism, particularly towards bureaucracy and the armed forces. Bureaucracy, with its egoistic tendency of enriching itself at the expense of the people through graft and favouritism, with the key positions it occupies in the state machine and its connections with the local and neo-colonialist exploiting interests, is a great source of danger. The armed forces, with the immense power they command, are another great source of danger. Without placing them under safe control, they can do grave harm to the cause of the revolution, as the events in Ghana have ruthlessly proved.

Secondly, there is the relation of the broad mass of the people to the revolution. A people's revolution, especially of the type of the present stage in the African revolution, is unthinkable without the widest and most active participation of the masses in the affairs of the state, production and other spheres without their political organisation as the makers and defenders of the revolution. Without this, whatever the benefits they receive from the revolution, they are prone to fall prey to the subtle methods of reactionary propaganda and to raise no hand in defending a regime which fights for their own interests and welfare. Such an attitude was unfortunately displayed by the working masses of Ghana.

Thirdly, there is the question of the revolutionary vanguard party. If a people's revolution is unthinkable without the widest organisation and participation of the masses, it is likewise unthinkable without a vanguard party, armed with scientific revolutionary theory and capable of leading the masses. Dr. Nkrumah's efforts to transform the Convention People's Party into such a vanguard party did not materialise. There were great deficiencies in party work and organisation. When the time of trial came, even party members failed to rally to the defence of the revolution.

Such, in my opinion, are the lessons driven home by the success of counter-revolution in Ghana.

The coup d'état in Ghana is part of a general imperialist plan to check the advance of the African revolution. Beginning

with the piratic aggressive operation of the American, British and Belgian imperialists, against Stanleyville in November 1964, neo-colonialism stepped up its activities. Progressive leaders like Ben Barka and Pio Pinto were assassinated; the campaign of slander against the progressive regimes was intensified; the efforts to split the Organisation of African Unity were doubled; economic and diplomatic pressures against the progressive regimes were organised; coups d'état were plotted and carried out; agents were hired to assassinate the leaders of the UAR; the white racist minority declared the "independence" of Rhodesia, etc., etc.

The general line pursued by imperialism in its efforts to regain, maintain and extend its domination consists of an overall plan to arrest the popular revolutionary movement all over the continent. The main imperialist blow is directed against the progressive regimes, the greatest achievements of the African revolution. It seems that during the last two years imperialism has achieved no small measure of success.

But counter-revolution, by its very general character, opened the eyes of the African revolutionaries and drew them together. It is becoming clearer with every passing day that a setback for the revolution in one African country, is also a setback for it in the whole continent. For example, the intrigue against revolution in the Sudan inflicted great harm to the Congolese revolutionaries. The African revolutionaries are realising the indispensability of unity. Our great historic meeting in Cairo is a great indication of this realisation.

Revolution cannot be stamped out. It may receive setbacks; in that case it will only retreat temporarily, but can never be "finished off". Even under pro-imperialist military dictatorships the objective conditions which generate revolution continue. In fact possibilities arise for broadening the struggle by attracting even those who, while not subscribing to revolutionary ideas, are none the less opposed to the restriction of democratic rights and freedoms. And it will be necessary to find forms of effective co-operation with them. But the struggle for the overthrow of the pro-imperialist military dictatorship should aim not merely at changing the form of government but at the radical revolutionary transformation of the whole of society. Only this can be the solid basis for the cohesion of the revolutionary forces, the working people and the intellectuals and for their victory.



Reactionary, pro-imperialist coups d'état signify that imperialism and its internal allies, being unable to defeat revolution by the traditional methods, have resorted to the use of arms.

What should be the attitude of the revolutionaries to this challenge?

In my opinion they should learn to master and use all weapons to ensure victory. But revolution is not merely conspiratorial. The essential prerequisite for the popular revolution is the building of a vanguard party capable of rousing the masses, of organising and of leading them in the struggle against imperialism and the internal enemies. If this is achieved, then all methods must be used—including coups d'état.

This brings me to the question of what should be the general attitude towards the armed forces.

In the progressive African states the maintenance of highly trained armed forces, equipped with the latest weapons and technique is an extremely costly burden. The money and efforts expended in this field are much needed for economic and social progress. But such a burden is a revolutionary necessity at present. The defence against foreign aggression, the suppression of the internal enemies and assistance of the revolution in other areas where it stands in need underline that the sacrifices undertaken by the progressive regimes and their peoples are absolutely obligatory. The United Arab Republic provides us with two excellent examples: ten years ago its armed forces, together with its valiant people and enjoying the support of all peoples, especially the Soviet Union, were able to inflict ignominious defeat on the British-French-Israeli aggressors. Today these same armed forces are heroically assisting the revolution of the Yemeni people and defending their republic. Suffering heavy sacrifices on both occasions the Egyptian people, under the leadership of President Nasser, are not defending themselves only, but are also discharging their international and revolutionary duties with great honour.

On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that six years ago the Congolese revolution could not get the effective assistance it needed, and that today the people of Zimbabwe are falling prey to the aggression of a white racialist minority which cannot be defeated except by force.

It is thus obvious that, with the increasing aggressiveness

of imperialism, the maintenance of armed forces, with a high degree of preparedness, is absolutely necessary. Needless to say, this is a matter of concern to all revolutionaries.

Latest techniques and arms are not the only requirements for full preparedness. The army rank and file must be imbued with patriotic and progressive ideas and should be educated in the spirit of defending the fatherland and the revolution at home and abroad. The armed forces must take an active part in the political life of their countries. All this cannot be guaranteed without full control by the revolutionary party in power. This is the only way to prevent the emergence of such traitors as Ankrah and his associates in Ghana.

In the remaining African states the theory of the "neutrality" of the armed forces must be rejected. This "theory" is propagated by the reactionary classes; but they are the first to repudiate it and to use the army for their own ends. If the revolutionaries accept this theory they will only give thereby a free hand to the enemies of the people.

The majority of officers and soldiers, by their very class interests and education, are objective adherents of the revolution. Systematic work should be conducted among them to draw them to the revolutionary cause. The armed forces in the newly-independent African countries had not developed into established institutions closed against progressive ideas. The attitude these forces take in politics depends on the ascendancy of revolutionary, centrist or reactionary ideas within its ranks. Reaction, through class connections and through contacts by the diplomatic staff of imperialist embassies, is actively enlisting the armed forces to the side of counter-revolution. Hence revolutionaries would only be neglecting their duties if they did not do all in their power to draw the armed forces to their side. Commanding the combined force of the mass of the people and the army, the victory of the revolution will be assured.

Meanwhile revolutionaries should campaign for the introduction of certain reforms. Among these the most important, in my opinion, are the following:

— To bring an end to the "mercenary" aspect of the military service. Defence of independence should not be a wage-earning job for an exclusive caste. The aim should be a citizen army which is part of the people and military training extended to the entire youth.

— To abolish undemocratic and degrading practices inheri-

ted from the colonialists. Flogging and other spirit-breaking "disciplinary" penalties and the habit of appointing soldiers as domestic servants for officers are not in keeping with the dignity of a citizen of a free country. Discipline, which is absolutely essential in military service, should be based on understanding and not become a means of inculcating meekness.

— To abandon the dangerous policy of dependence on imperialist countries for armaments and instruction. Wherever this is necessary African states can safely rely on the selfless aid of the socialist countries which have proved in deeds that they are the true friends of the African people both during the struggle against colonialism and after the attainment of independence. At the same time the African states should establish, as far as is technically and financially possible, their own armament industries and training institutions.

Such measures, if taken, will reduce to a great extent the dangers of using the army for reactionary ends and will increase in the same measure its revolutionary potentialities.

The increased activities of the imperialists in Africa are part of their increasing aggressiveness in other parts of the globe. Acting as all the doomed do, their actions do not signify any change in the balance of forces in their favour; on the contrary they stress the desperate corner into which they were driven by the revolutionary forces all over the world.

Objective conditions open big and real prospects for fresh and far greater victories in Africa. The close alliance of the revolutionary forces of Africa, of the socialist countries, of the national-liberation struggle in Asia and Latin America and of the working-class movement in the capitalist countries is a vital and obligatory condition for the defeat of imperialism and its domestic allies.

THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION— COMPONENT OF THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS

MAC LADRIN

Modern history is a long succession of conflicts, some open, others concealed, but all invariably dramatic, between oppressed peoples and classes, on the one hand, and their oppressors, on the other—a record of successes and defeats for these peoples and oppressed classes in the fight against their oppressors, a fight which adds up to the world revolutionary process. The fact that the successes vary in magnitude, assume different forms and often are remote from one another in space and time frequently conceals the logical and political interlocking in the ever-lengthening chain of history leading Man towards his ultimate goal—a society in which all will be free, happy and equal.

The world revolutionary process entered upon its decisive phase when the question was posed of abolishing the entire system of exploitation. This happened in October 1917. For the first time in history the oppressed classes of a country took over power and began to build a new kind of state presaging the future of humanity as a whole.

Previous revolutions, such as the French Revolution of 1789, for instance, posed the question of the emancipation of the individual. But even when the bourgeoisie of countries that had engaged in the slave trade (Britain and France) declared for freedom for the slaves, it reserved the right to oppress other peoples and to continue colonial plunder over vast areas (Latin America, Asia and Africa).

In the nineteenth century the world revolutionary process acquired its own theorists in the persons of Marx and Engels.

But at the time the slogan "Workers of all lands, unite!" directly applied only to the technologically most advanced part of the world whose class structure was the main object of Marx's research. In those years proletarians were to be found only in limited areas, and because of this Marxist revolutionary theory had less bearing on the masses in those parts of our planet which today are called—though not quite correctly—the third world.

After the October Revolution of 1917 the world revolutionary process acquired a new and broader connotation of unity as exemplified by the slogan: "Workers of all lands and oppressed peoples, unite!" Because of this Lenin is for all peoples a towering figure in the revolutionary movement and in the process of world development in general.

The new relationships which crystallised between the formerly oppressed peoples of the Tsarist empire and Soviet Russia created both in theory and in practice a prototype of the future relationships between all nations, big and small, of the world. *The USSR developed into a great power which defeated fascism, weakened imperialism, and created the conditions for the rise of the socialist world system and for an unprecedented growth of the revolutionary forces throughout the world.*

Since then the advance of the world revolutionary process has been marked by signal triumphs. The Chinese Revolution, the establishment of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the emergence of Cuba as the cradle of socialism in the Americas, the winning of national independence by the peoples of most Asian and African countries, and the momentous achievements of the international working class, are some of the landmarks in the revolutionary reconstruction of our world.

By unleashing the Second World War imperialism accelerated its own downfall. For, despite the devastation and sacrifices, the progressive forces everywhere were able to strengthen their unity. And after victory the conditions emerged for changing the balance of forces on the international arena. There is no doubt that the African revolutionary movement gained enormously from these changes.

The people of Algeria gained national independence after eight years of war during which the Algerian question deeply stirred the entire world revolutionary movement. The vast majority of African countries won liberation through political struggle marked by countless sacrifices (Um Nyobé, Moumié,

Lumumba) and heroism but which did not take the form of war against the colonial powers. The reason why there was no such war was not that the imperialists were any more humane in 1960 than they had been in 1947, when in Madagascar, for instance, they slaughtered 90,000 people rather than make the slightest change in the machinery of oppression. The reason was that the overall development of the popular political struggle throughout the world in 1955-60 enabled the peoples of Africa to deal a decisive blow to imperialism, which had suffered a resounding defeat ten years earlier at the hands of the Chinese revolutionaries, who abolished the oppression which had ground down their country since time immemorial.

Whatever the policy pursued by the newly-independent African countries, the very act of their gaining independence and the national and international consequences following therefrom all add up to a victory for the world revolutionary movement. This is at once the contribution made by the peoples of Africa to the revolutionary process and a consequence of this process.

An important role in smashing the colonial system was played by the organisations of the working class in the imperialist countries which took an active part in the struggles that completed the first stage of the African revolution. The example of such a great liberation movement as the African Democratic Union and its relationships both with the French working class (the General Confederation of Labour and the Communist Party) and with the international democratic trade union movement (the World Federation of Trade Unions) shows the extent to which the African revolution was in contact with the world revolutionary movement.

This solidarity of the revolutionary forces in the world with the African revolution is not a transient thing. It is a manifestation of the global character of the world revolutionary process. Imperialism knows this full well. By its long succession of criminal acts—first the attempts to crush the Russian revolution and then the policy which led directly to the Second World War with the aim of destroying socialism; the current rearming of West Germany and the organisation of provocations against the socialist countries; the attempts to isolate China and the war of aggression in Vietnam; the murder of Lumumba and the overthrow of the government of President Nkrumah; the threats to Guinea and the blockade

of Cuba—all show that imperialism, headed by the U.S. imperialists, is fully aware of the nature of the contemporary revolutionary movement as a continuous, indivisible chain of revolutionary transformation. The African revolution is a link in this chain.

This continuity is not always easy to discern and understand. At one time—due to the systematic imperialist propaganda which in order to isolate our African revolutionary movement, skilfully capitalises on some of its features, such, for instance, as the originality and uniqueness of African culture and political life—it was denied that any such inter-connection existed.

As the various components of the world revolutionary process are brought into motion, the process as a whole develops unevenly, experiences ebb and flow. *At the first stage following the Second World War the African revolutionary movement surged to the crest of the wave caused by the action of all the progressive forces of the world; this determined both the external conditions and the forms of the political and military battles fought at the time.*

Imperialism, having suffered defeat in the cold war of its own making, had to agree in principle to peaceful coexistence with socialism. It suffered defeats in Korea and Vietnam. And it suffered a setback in Africa, where, hard pressed by the peoples fighting for their lawful rights, it had to grant independence to many countries.

But imperialism has not become reconciled to its fate. It continues to commit acts of aggression and to plunder peoples which it believes are on the peripheries of the world revolutionary movement, at the fringes of the world revolutionary process. If it no longer harbours illusions as to the possibility of destroying the Soviet Union and the other European socialist countries, it continues to exert every effort to retard the development of the world revolution by waging war and conducting subversive activities against the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In this period of growing aggressiveness of imperialism the African revolution is entering upon its second phase, more complex than the first. It is necessary to win national independence for those millions of Africans still suffering from colonial oppression and waging war against direct imperialist political domination. Racial discrimination by governments of exploiting minorities in the service of imperialism has yet

to be abolished and the sovereignty of the South African and Rhodesian peoples ensured. The peoples which have won national independence are faced with urgent tasks of national upbuilding in the economic, political and cultural spheres. And, lastly, Africa has still to take its rightful place in the world, to make its weighty contribution to the defence of peace and the fight for progress.

These are formidable tasks, and it should be frankly said that the initial steps towards their realisation are costly for the African revolutionary movement. It is faced with numerous obstacles: economic instability in most of our countries; dependence of many on imperialism; subversion by the imperialists and local reactionaries everywhere; coups, differing in nature but invariably associated with all kinds of complications, and in some cases, as for instance in Ghana, directly aimed against the interests of the African peoples; absence of a developed democracy, and cultural backwardness; constant efforts on the part of imperialism to divide the revolutionary movement and overthrow the progressive regimes.

The success achieved in the process of decolonisation in Guinea, Mali, Congo (Brazzaville), the United Arab Republic and in some other countries does not alter the overall picture presented above.

That the African revolution is encountering formidable obstacles is not surprising in view of the fact that the world revolutionary movement is beset by what perhaps are the most serious difficulties of growth it has ever experienced. But, the gravity of the times notwithstanding, there are theorists who advise the African revolutionaries to isolate themselves from the other progressive forces in the world. Some claim that scientific revolutionary theory is not applicable to African conditions. Others hold that the developments in our society cannot even be examined by the methods of the most progressive social science. And still others argue that the imperialist threat emanates not only from the West but also from the East, and that the world today is divided not into progressive and reactionary forces but into rich and poor countries (bourgeois nations and proletarian nations).

These claims have two things in common: firstly, they are intended to cover up the deep-seated reasons for the economic backwardness and to keep the peoples dependent on neo-colonialism; secondly, they obscure the chief global contradiction of our time, which in the final analysis is the conflict

between imperialism in all its forms, and socialism in all its forms.

The main object of this propaganda is, on the one hand, to divide the peoples, to perpetuate the dismemberment of Africa into economically weak states completely at the mercy of external factors, and, on the other hand, to make it appear as if the African revolution stood outside the mainstream of world development with a view to making it more vulnerable to the ceaseless overt and covert attacks by home and foreign reactionaries.

But the African revolutionary movement as a whole does not accept these concepts. It is closely linked with the other progressive forces in Asia, in the Americas and in Europe. It has taken its place in international, Afro-Asian and tricontinental organisations, has joined the fight for peace together with people of good will in all countries, and maintains fraternal contact with European working-class organisations and the socialist world.

Socialism is finding a growing response not only in the ranks of the African revolutionary movement; it is increasingly winning over all patriots striving to ensure their countries' progress. Many political leaders and African democratic parties have openly declared that for them scientific socialism is a source of inspiration in tackling their economic and political problems. The youth, especially the students, are as a rule supporters or sympathisers of socialism.

But acceptance of socialism in principle is no substitute for a profound study of African reality, for the concrete and correct implementation of theory in everyday life. It is in this connection that problems most frequently arise both before the revolutionary parties and the movements of the neo-colonialist countries and the democratic African countries engaged in building their statehood.

As for the diverse, more or less deformed variants of socialism that have sprung up in recent years in Africa, it can be said without going into detail that the very fact of their emergence is proof of the defeat suffered by the ideology of capitalism. This, to say the least, is a concession made by vice to virtue.

The imperialists and their neo-colonialist allies are doing their utmost to erect a wall between the African revolutionary movement and the socialist countries. Whenever some

agent of imperialism seizes power his first step is to break diplomatic and trade relations with the socialist countries.

But the African revolutionary movement is aware that it cannot stand up to the gigantic political and economic machine of imperialism without aid from the socialist countries and co-operation with them. Could revolutionary Guinea have withstood the economic blockade in the early years of independence without Soviet aid? Or could the democratic regimes in Mali and Congo (Brazzaville) solve their problems without co-operating with the socialist world? Is imperialism in any way interested in increasing the cultivated area in the UAR, and did it not refuse to build the now famous Aswan Dam? The thousands of Africans who graduate annually from the universities and colleges of the socialist countries are the only alternative to the intellectual Malthusianism rife in the neo-colonialist countries of Africa where education and training of personnel has been left entirely in the hands of the imperialists.

After winning political independence the African countries found themselves facing complex problems, the most important of them relating to economic development. An almost complete absence of industry, negligible use of power resources for building the national economy, a backward agriculture, non-equivalent exchange on the world markets, shortage of technical specialists, and other pernicious consequences of colonial rule which reduced the entire continent to a mere source of raw materials—such is the situation in which our peoples have to solve what is one of the main tasks of the second stage of the African revolution—the task of weakening imperialism, depriving it of its hinterland through independent development of Africa's vast potential resources and their use in the national interests.

The fight for economic independence is a blow at the very heart of imperialism, and hence the growing aggressiveness of the latter in the face of the victories gained by the peoples in this sphere. The imperialists' hatred for that section of the African revolutionary movement which has taken over power in the democratic countries of the continent is expressed in their efforts to overthrow the regimes in these countries. Every possible means—conspiracies, subversion, reactionary coups economic blockade and political assassination—is used to retard progress.

In the colonial countries the imperialists are waging a ruth-

less struggle against the patriotic parties whose programmes call for economic and political independence. In particular, in Angola and "Portuguese" Guinea they support the less progressive and less popular groups with the sole purpose of safeguarding their basic economic interests after the inevitable victory of the national-liberation movement and the ending of colonial rule.

The African revolution is opposed not only by international reaction. In the countries which have set to work to overcome backwardness, the conservative classes and strata, conscious of the threat the reforms and proclaimed aims bode for them, are openly entering into an alliance with foreign imperialism and undertaking the role of its agents at home. Those who persecute the patriots in the neo-colonialist countries and those who support the subversive activities of the CIA in the democratic countries are the deadliest enemies of the people.

To foil the strategic designs of the imperialists all sections of the African revolutionary movement need unity—unity of all the patriotic forces in each country, unity of all the popular forces in the various countries, solid support for those governments which have chosen ways of development corresponding to the fundamental interests of their people. Our revolutionary movement should rid itself of the petty differences sown by imperialism. The danger of recolonisation which hangs over the continent, following the retreat of imperialism to positions prepared in advance, faces the African revolutionary movement with the need to mobilise all its forces for joint struggle for complete freedom and independence.

Working towards this end, the revolutionary movement plays its part in the world revolutionary process, making a major contribution to the world-wide struggle waged by the peoples to put an end to imperialist exploitation. *Unless the African revolution solves the tasks confronting it, imperialism will continue to threaten the peoples of the world, confident that it has preserved the strategic and economic reserves needed to ensure its neo-colonialist domination over our continent.*

The identity of the aims of the African revolution and the world revolutionary process is, therefore, no fleeting phenomenon. It is a fundamental question of strategy.

Each link in the revolutionary chain has its particular function, plays its specific role. Our task is to do away with the disastrous consequences of colonial rule, win economic

independence, defeat imperialism on our own territory, and create a political and social system that will facilitate the all-round development of our peoples and rule out the possibility of internal and external enemies restoring their positions.

The specific nature of the tasks of the various contingents of the revolutionary movement at each given span of time sometimes creates the impression of contradictions in the world revolutionary process. But revolutionary theory and practical co-operation between the African revolutionary movement and all other forces of the world revolution show that we have one enemy: imperialism and its allies, i.e., those social forces whose interests run counter to the immediate and ultimate aims of the revolution. Hence the building of a united front for liberation from colonialism and neo-colonialism in Africa is inseparable from the common struggle of all the peoples against imperialism.

The march of history has resulted in a situation where the African revolutionary movement, the socialist countries and the international working class have coalesced into a single whole. As part of the whole our movement can develop and triumph by marching together with the other components, all of which must stand united. Common struggle tolerates neither neutrality nor hegemonism.

The struggle under way in our time between imperialism and socialism is becoming increasingly complex. The various contingents of the world revolutionary movement take part in this struggle in different conditions, but each bears its own share of the responsibility for the outcome, which determines the development of the world revolutionary process. Historically, the African revolution is a part of this process. When it enters upon its decisive phase—the abolition of the old relationships of dependence and the establishment of social justice in Africa—it will merge on a still more profound basis with the rest of the world's revolutionary forces.

While deriving its strength primarily from its own wellsprings, the African revolution has time and again seen how this strength is multiplied by the solidarity of the socialist countries and the world working class. The steady strengthening of the unity of the revolutionary process is a guarantee of its further development, of further success for all its components.

THE EMERGENCE OF A REVOLUTIONARY VANGUARD IN THE CAMEROONS

ABDOULAYE KONE

The Cameroon People's Union, now on the way to becoming a vanguard party, was founded on April 10, 1948. At the time, as in the preceding period, our people were subjected to the most ruthless exploitation. But race discrimination, forced labour, physical violence, the vicious system of degradation and humiliation and the dismemberment of the country by the imperialists awakened in the masses a sense of national dignity, an awareness that they belonged to an oppressed nation.

The popular discontent found expression in diverse forms, and mainly through uprisings, strikes and demonstrations, which towards the end of the First World War increasingly assumed a political nature. After 1945 many internal and international factors helped to accelerate the growth of national consciousness. One of these factors was the placing of the country under United Nations trusteeship after the Second World War, when it came to be formally regarded not as a colony but as a territory on the way to independence under the temporary administration of France and Britain.

Another significant factor was the participation of Cameroon volunteers in the Second World War on the side of the Allies. While in Europe they absorbed the ideas of freedom and independence which were already shaking the positions of imperialism and colonialism. As we know, these ideas appeared and gained ground especially after the Great October Revolution and the rise of the powerful socialist camp.

The emergence of the Cameroon People's Union on the political scene sharply changed the overall situation in the coun-

try, ushering in a new era and opening to the Cameroon nation perspectives of development diametrically opposed to the future which the colonial powers were preparing for it.

The struggle waged by the masses developed into an organised, nation-wide struggle; it transcended the bounds of purely economic demands and became essentially a struggle for political power. The Cameroon People's Union enlisted hundreds of thousands into the political struggle, making it the common cause of broad sections of the population.

The objective situation in the national and international political arena which determined the class base of the Union, its organisational structure, and its strategic and tactical line, also accounted for its signal success towards the end of the first stage of its activities (1948-1955).

The Cameroons entered the post-war period as a colonial, semi-feudal and semi-patriarchal country the main branches of whose economy were controlled by the imperialist monopolies to the detriment of the interests of the bulk of the population. Everybody, from the emergent working class to the incipient bourgeoisie, including the peasants, experienced national oppression and hence could be enlisted in the struggle against their common enemy—colonialism.

Proceeding from this, the founders of the Union created it not as the party of a particular class, but as a movement destined to unite in its ranks the workers, peasants and members of the bourgeoisie—all those resolved to fight colonialism, for national sovereignty and the restoration of the country's territorial integrity.

In this way people of different social origin, including patriotic members of the lower feudal strata, found themselves standing side by side.

From the very outset the People's Union set itself the aim of defeating colonialism, winning independence and reuniting the Cameroons. In order to put forward demands of such magnitude at a time when no country of France's African colonial empire could even hope to win internal autonomy the founders of the Union utilised the international trusteeship status of the country and the opportunities this afforded for political struggle.

Our main strength derived from the oppressed and exploited masses and all the emerging classes subjected to colonialist national oppression. The only kind of class struggle under-

standable to the masses was resistance by the entire people to French and British colonialism.

As we worked towards our goal we saw our main task in isolating the henchmen of imperialism, the middlemen of colonialism, such as the feudal element and the parliamentary bourgeoisie who had joined forces with the colonialists and sought to win over the middle strata. The Union worked through numerous cultural and other public organisations set up throughout the country to strengthen its link with the peasants, the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie.

Fighting for liberation under the leadership of the Union, the people of the Cameroons had the support of other African peoples whose national consciousness had been awakened and who had joined the battle against colonialism. They enjoyed the support of the working class and other democratic forces in France, the socialist camp and the entire world revolutionary movement.

In the spring of 1955 the revolutionary movement reached culmination point. An insurrection seemed inevitable. In effect people's rule had been established which challenged the corrupt and loathed colonial rule. In April 1955 the people issued their historic statement proclaiming the downfall of colonialism in the Cameroons. The slogan of immediate independence was now advanced and taken up by the masses in place of the old demand that the United Nations set the time limit for the proclamation of the Cameroons as an independent state.

The colonialists, however, taking advantage of the international situation, anticipated the uprising and slaughtered more than 5,000 Cameroon patriots in June 1955. The terror was so brutal and sudden that our Party did not have time to bring its reserves into action, nor was it able to effect an organised retreat. The reorganisation of the Party in the difficult conditions of illegality required time.

Today the significance of the gains made by our people under the leadership of the Union in combating colonialism and capitalism is easy to see. Witness the high level of the national consciousness and the failure of the policy of ultra-colonialism as evidenced by the winning of independence and the partial reunification of the Cameroons.

It is above all to the credit of the People's Union that it dispelled the myth of the invincibility of colonialism and the invulnerability of colonialist property, that it led its people out from the darkness of the colonial night, developed their

national consciousness and clearly charted the path to liberation.

In the Cameroons today the members of the Union are looked up to as the embodiment of courage, a high degree of national awareness and supreme devotion to the nation's cause. They are esteemed by the masses as an example to follow, and thousands of young people who are increasingly gripped by revolutionary enthusiasm are rallying around them.

Throughout the nineteen years since its founding the People's Union has been the unquestioned leader of the fight for genuine independence and democracy. If today the people of the Cameroons are striving towards real social revolution—and any serious observer will confirm the fact—this is thanks to the Union, which has helped to imbue the minds of the people with national awareness and a striving for democracy and progress.

Ever since the foundation of the Union the people have forced the imperialists and their agents to retreat. The independent statehood gained on January 1, 1960, was one of the greatest victories for the people, and the same can be said of the numerous economic and social reforms effected since then, and above all of the partial reunification of the country in the autumn of 1961.

The expansion of foreign-monopoly capital is continuing in new forms. In the past 20 years French, West German, British and U.S. companies and monopolies have invested more than 160,000 million colonial francs in the Cameroons, and they control all the key branches of the economy, including mining, manufacturing industry, transport and foreign trade.

The present government has placed itself in the service of the foreign companies and monopolies. Its role consists in ensuring the political and other conditions for the infiltration of foreign capital and providing guarantees to imperialist investors.

The social scene, which is constantly changing under the impact of the influx of foreign capital, is marked by the following features:

—first, the working class is growing in numbers and in maturity;

—second, the peasantry remains the biggest class, accounting for 85 per cent of the population, although its numbers are declining due to migration to the towns and the proletarianisation of many poor peasants;

—third, the economic and political interests of the national and small urban bourgeoisie are suffering heavily from the policy of infiltration and plunder pursued by the foreign capitalists;

—fourth, the feudal element and the "bureaucratic" bourgeoisie are the only social groups which are gaining politically and economically from the existence of the neo-colonialist regime. This stratum is closely associated with foreign capitalists.

In other words, despite the fact that it has won independent statehood, our country is not genuinely free but remains semi-colonial and semi-feudal.

In the semi-colonial and semi-feudal Cameroons the revolution must necessarily be at once national and democratic in character. Its main aim is to abolish neo-colonialist domination and to establish a new democracy which would pave the way to socialism.

Today the People's Union is called upon to lead the struggle in far more complex conditions than yesterday, when the issue was the overthrow of colonial rule with the help of a broad-based party.

Ever since the promulgation of the "Lot-cadre" of 1966 and the creation by the French imperialists of favourable economic and political conditions for the development of the bourgeoisie, the Cameroons have been an arena of a steadily mounting class struggle. Indecision and doubt have gripped many of the urban petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. Corrupt elements seeking to enrich themselves regardless of the means often augment the landowning class and the "bureaucratic" and "parliamentary" bourgeoisie.

In view of these objective processes, the People's Union, in order to retain its vanguard positions and the confidence of the people, must base itself only on the most revolutionary classes in the country—the working class and the poor peasantry.

At the present stage of the struggle the main force of the revolution consists of the workers and poor peasants, while the middle and well-to-do peasantry as well as the urban small bourgeoisie provide a reserve of strength for us.

The main objective is a dual one: isolation of the top bourgeoisie, which has allied itself with the foreign monopolies and is seeking to win over the peasants and alienate them from the revolution; and neutralisation of the French imperialists,

who must give up their policy of imposing puppet regimes on our country.

Basic conditions for success are:

(1) strengthening the People's Union, the vanguard party of our revolution, in the organisational and theoretical respects; to this end constant attention should be paid to the political and ideological education of the members;

(2) an alliance between the working class, which is gaining strength, and the peasantry and the middle strata under the leadership of the proletariat and the People's Union;

(3) an alliance of all patriotic forces within the framework of a broad united front.

The present stage is marked by a decline of the revolutionary movement which began with the outlawing of the Party in 1955. But today, twelve years after the events which compelled our Party to go underground and to begin the armed struggle, the conditions are maturing for a new nation-wide up-swing. In these circumstances active preparation of the forces of national and social revolution acquires decisive significance.

AHS

MAINTAINING AND CONSOLIDATING PROGRESSIVE AFRICAN STATES

MICHEL KAMEL

African countries which stand for freedom and independence are today facing fierce economic, political and military pressures as well as reactionary and imperialist conspiracies aimed at overthrowing their governments.

In some cases, these attempts have been repelled, as happened at the time of the tripartite aggression against Egypt in 1956, which aimed at the overthrow of the progressive patriotic government of President Nasser.

But in other cases such attacks were successful. This was seen in Ghana when a handful of officers and soldiers seized power from the progressive government. This lightning coup took place without serious difficulty, and—until now—without effective resistance from the masses and their democratic and political organisations.

Such experiences are not confined to Africa. The small but heroic people of Vietnam are standing up to the biggest military machine in history and inflicting heavy losses on it. On the other hand, countries like Ceylon and Indonesia have fallen victims to reactionary forces and imperialist domination.

Clearly these different results did not happen by chance. There are objective reasons and specific laws determining why some progressive regimes were able successfully to withstand aggression, conspiracies and coups and others were not. Studying the actual experience of the national-liberation struggles in various countries will help to clarify the means of consolidating progressive regimes and protecting them

against all challenges. It is the more important to do this at the present time when imperialism is intensifying the battle on all fronts.

The key question in the defence of any system of government is the attitude of the people towards it, the extent to which it is supported by the masses. Everything depends on how far the revolutionary forces in power have succeeded in uniting and mobilising the masses, in gaining their understanding and support for the tasks of the period following the gaining of political independence. The national economy must be freed from foreign control and developed. Difficulties must be frankly put before the people; mistakes and negative aspects must be admitted, as well as achievements and positive aspects.

The people must be organised on a democratic basis that allows them to take part in policy-making, in planning and administration of the country; that wins support through persuasion and conviction. A structure built on such foundations cannot be undermined or overthrown.

There are many and complicated problems facing new, revolutionary regimes. But their most essential tasks in solving their problems and maintaining power against hostile forces, are: firstly, to crown political independence with the freeing of the national economy and to develop the country's resources in the interests of the working people; and secondly, to establish a true people's democracy, both socially and politically.

Economic Development

The people do not fight for abstractions. To them independence does not mean merely flags aflutter, U.N. delegations and foreign embassies, and the transfer of authority from white hands to dark ones. The national struggle is one for land and better conditions of labour and living; it is a struggle to end backwardness, unemployment, hunger and poverty. It means education, progress, decent living standards, security in old age and from persecution. It means equal rights, freedom of speech and opinion, the right to take part in making and carrying out the policy of the country.

An independent government that does not meet these needs will forfeit the confidence and support of the people. It will

become isolated from the masses who are the source of the strength of any regime of national liberation.

It will not be difficult to overthrow such a government. The struggle will not be seen as one between the people and a handful of imperialist agents or reactionaries. It will appear as a dispute for power between small groups in closed arenas beyond the control of the people.

The main problem for Africa, then, is to overcome backwardness. Our national-liberation movements are faced with a choice of methods of overcoming backwardness, of uplifting the lives of the masses of the people. But it is hardly worth discussing the capitalist method of development. Essentially, our path must be the non-capitalist one, paving the way to socialist transformation. The international relationship of class forces; the character of our epoch; the effects of centuries of colonialist plunder, domination and exploitation on our economies; the consequent feebleness and backwardness of local capitalism; the fact that Africa is part of a world in transition from capitalism to socialism—all these factors combine to exclude the possibility of successful development along capitalist lines.

Even the African capitalists are aware of this. They fear investing in our developing industry. They cannot face outside competition. Even if they protect themselves by duties, the home market is limited and they are incapable of successfully competing for export markets. They lack the big capital resources needed for modern projects. Obsessed by insecurity, African capitalism fears socialist tendencies, fears the masses. It resorts to a parasitic existence, seeking wealth from commerce, commissions, and speculations and even illegal activities like embezzlement, bribery and black marketeering.

So capitalism plays no active part in developing the national economy. Being mainly parasitic, capitalism confines its production activities mainly to agriculture. Where the capitalists contribute positively to the development and advance of production their parasitic character can be overlooked. But where they make little or no such contribution, capitalism becomes wholly parasitic and cannot be tolerated.

In Egypt for example, though capitalism was relatively developed, the Egyptian bourgeoisie refused to invest capital in industry after the July 1952 Revolution. Capital holdings of companies fell, and investments were channelled into non-productive activities. The state offered generous inducements

to stimulate the private sector and to attract savings towards industrial development. Laws were passed exempting industrials from taxation of their profits and allowing them duty-free imports, etc., in accordance with the plan to double the national income in ten years. But despite these inducements the Egyptian capitalists boycotted the plan, and even conspired to sabotage it.

This decided the issue. The genuine revolution enabled the Egyptian people, directing all their efforts towards production, to make sure first of "their full control over all the means of production" as mentioned in the Charter.* Development is the way of overcoming backwardness. Local capitalism is incapable of realising it or substantially contributing towards its realisation.

A rapid rate of development is essential to bridge the wide gap between the African countries and those which are industrially advanced. This calls for the mobilisation of all material and human resources, and thorough planning to use these resources to the best advantage. To achieve these aims, complete control of all means of production must be in the hands of the people, as well as control of internal and foreign trade and distribution. Society must be enabled to devote to development an increased share of the social surplus of the national income. Foreign development loans must be free from conditions infringing on independence.

It is thus clear that a state public sector of the economy is essential, to guide the process of development, in addition to launching mixed enterprises (public and private capital). State control is needed to direct all such projects, develop manufacture, raise labour productivity in agriculture by mechanisation, and ensure co-ordination within the economy.

Africa has vast agricultural potentialities. But it is impossible to found national economies free from imperialist influence, and able to stand up to imperialist pressures and manipulations, unless rapid industrialisation is achieved. Only thus can the economic fetters of imperialism be broken, the productivity of labour developed, and a basis laid for accumulation of the national wealth and increased national income, at a rate far higher than that which could be sustained by agriculture alone.

Moreover, industries raise the cultural level of those they

* *The Charter*, English edition, Information Dept., Cairo, p. 51.

employ, indeed the cultural and ideological standards of society as a whole. Industrialisation promotes national consciousness and brings into being an organised working class able to lead the work of socialist transformation.

In terms of industrial output, Africa is the most backward continent. It produces one-seventh of the world's raw materials, but only one-fiftieth of manufactures. The share of industry in Africa's total income is less than 14 per cent. That is why average income per head is 89 dollars compared with 1541 dollars in the USA, according to the publication *Industrial Growth in Africa*, issued by the United Nations in 1962.

Neo-colonialism no longer retards all forms and levels of industrialisation in the developing countries. It opposes above all the introduction of heavy industries, but allows the export of processing industries which provide it with new opportunities for exploitation. The neo-colonialists help in expanding the capacity of national African markets to buy the products of American and European heavy industries.

Where countries are still bound to imperialism, not masters of their own economies and unable to control their foreign currency resources, it is vain to speak of overall planning and effective development. Such countries cannot take effective decisions regarding priorities and allocation of investment. This is the position of countries confined within the sterling or franc areas, where foreign banks dominate finance and Western monopolies command foreign trade.

Imperialism uses these fetters not only to ensure the economic—and hence political—subordination of African countries, but also to undermine progressive governments and revolutionary trends. Faced by new imperialist techniques, national-liberation movements cannot stop at political independence, they must proceed to liberate the national economy as well.

When Guinea dared to vote against the French Constitution in 1958, she was faced with stoppage of all aid, withdrawal of all experts and other personnel and economic blockade by France. The government of Guinea had to choose between submission to imperialism or liberation of the economy and taking revolutionary measures, however difficult, to break all forms of subjection. It took the latter course, breaking in 1960 from the franc area, establishing its own central bank and issuing its own currency. It nationalised the French banks thus controlling all banking and credit systems.

Egypt's experience contains many examples of the need to break imperialist ties as the condition for overall development and planning. In 1953, when we needed capital to overcome backwardness, the American Embassy in Cairo issued a statement on the conditions for American investment in Egypt. These were:

1. Protection against confiscation and expropriation.
2. Assurance that the investor can, if he wishes, liquidate the project.
3. Provision for reasonable profits.
4. Acceptable rates of taxation without discrimination.
5. Practical social and labour legislation.
6. Stable government.

These conditions speak for themselves.

It refused to finance cotton—Egypt's principal crop. Our credits abroad were frozen, to stop us buying wheat, medicines and arms for defence against the imperialist-inspired Israeli aggression. Even the offer to finance the High Dam project at Aswan was withdrawn.

The revolutionary steps taken—nationalising banks, insurance companies and the main industries—proved a basic condition and an unavoidable necessity for starting economic development, eliminating backwardness, and defending national independence and the progressive government against imperialist aggression.

Even after progressive regimes succeed in breaking the major economic ties with imperialism there remain in varying degrees the subversive effects of imperialist domination in the world market.

True independence requires that we do not concentrate only on traditional and cash crops, but diversify crops and expand trade activity. To overcome dependence on imperialist monopolies and the European markets, there must be direct trade relations with the socialist countries. Increased production of consumer goods and foodstuffs must be accompanied by the making of new products to reduce reliance on exports. State monopoly of import and export trade is essential. Co-operation between countries producing the same commodities for the world market is necessary to raise the international prices of these products.

Foreign Trade

Between 1951 and 1961 raw material prices—excepting crude oil—fell by 33.1 per cent, but the prices of manufactures rose by 3.5 per cent and of machines by 31.5 per cent.

We can see the dangers of the domination of international capital over the world market from what happened in Ghana. Cocoa constitutes more than half of Ghana's foreign trade. Through its control of the world market, imperialism depressed the price of cocoa year after year. In 1954 it stood at 58 cents per pound, in 1955, 37 cents, in 1962, 2 cents, in 1964, 16.3 cents.

Dr. Kwame Nkrumah points out in his book *Neo-colonialism* that while cocoa production rose from 210,000 tons in 1954 to 590,000 ten years later, the total proceeds of the sale actually dropped from £85.5 million to £77 million. "85 per cent of Ghana's volume of trade remained with the Imperialist West."

Thus, dominating world markets, imperialism can exhaust the people's vast efforts to increase production, frustrate development plans, increase poverty and decrease the return from labour. The difficulties thus created by them are used by imperialism and its agents to arouse discontent and to put the blame on the public sector and socialist ideas.

Artificial depression of prices is the material base on which imperialism relies to spread dissatisfaction and lack of confidence. The people do not feel a rapid improvement in their living standards. It is vital to explain the reasons and sources of the difficulties and to mobilise the working people.

Equitable Distribution of Gains and Sacrifices

To ensure mass support it is essential to achieve material gains for the masses that they can see, especially in the immediate post-independence period. At this stage imperialism is forced to give up some of its gains, and it is important that the distribution of such gains should be just, without favouring any particular class or group. The relative increase of national income should benefit the working masses and raise their living standards.

At the same time the people must be fully conscious that these gains are the fruits of political independence. This need for political education applies especially to the youth, who as a rule did not fully realise what life was like under colonialism.

This is where the role of the Party comes in, and the tasks of its leading cadres. The Party must explain to the masses how national liberation has bettered their lot, and awaken them to the new horizons which open out before them.

But these horizons can only be gained at the cost of strenuous efforts. Short-sighted propaganda which promises easy solutions to the problems of underdevelopment, rapid achievement of prosperity immediately after independence, will defeat its object and negate the effect of even those gains which have been won. In this way expectations are disappointed and illusions shattered. The people do not value even such gains as have been achieved, comparing their condition not to what existed before independence, but with the dazzling picture that had been presented to them. They lose confidence in the system and regard it as a failure; they feel they have been cheated. Naturally, hostile forces take advantage of such feelings to attack the government.

A similar mistake is made by some leading officials when they resort to exaggerated claims, issuing inflated figures of production and claiming achievements that are obviously false. This also undermines public confidence. For example, the UAR information department issued a film about the agrarian reform law, showing the "new peasant" living in a villa of many rooms, eating luxury foods, dressed in fine clothes, etc. Everyone knew this was an absurd exaggeration, and so the film met with great disapproval. The law itself was made fun of. Forces hostile to the revolution took advantage of the film for their own purposes.

Where gains are made, these should be associated in people's minds with the government and its policies—not merely as a natural sequence of events. This will help to rally the people around their leaders.

Some things lead to a cleavage between the masses and their political leaders. Often austerity measures have to be called for, to provide capital accumulation for the expansion of production, especially industrial production. For a time, gains in income have to be postponed. But, at the same time, neo-colonialism creates patterns of so-called prosperity in certain regions of Africa. These are meant to be shop-windows to advertise the alleged attractions of capitalism and of collaboration with imperialism. A feigned "prosperity", incapable of enduring, is created. Aid, grants, loans, surplus U.S. farm products, etc., are poured in and the market flooded with

consumer goods, French perfumes, English woollen goods and American cars are held up as evidence that capitalist methods and collaboration with the West are better than embarking on independent development and industrialisation, with all the problems and hazards that they involve.

But the recent economic collapse in the Lebanon—held up as a model of capitalist “prosperity”—is evidence of the shaky basis of this propaganda. Revolutionaries must expose this false picture of “prosperity” which benefits only a privileged minority and is hostile to the people. We must show up the flimsy basis of their “successes” and how, in some of these countries even the salaries of civil servants depend on Western “aid”.

Revolutionary governments and parties must mobilise the masses by explaining, without exaggeration, the gains and the plans, convincing them that the road to progress lies only through development and planning, winning their support for the outlook and policy of the leadership.

To the African mind, imperialist exploitation means privilege. Capitalist firms obtain privileges and concessions, certain commercial firms monopolise imports and exports. The white man enjoys all the privileges and rights of which the “natives” are deprived, and there is discrimination in wages, housing, and every field.

If, after independence, the new African powers-that-be take over not only the top positions, but also all the privileges that used to go with them, such as high wages and better living conditions, a rift is bound to develop between the masses and the national leaders. The people will consider that the new leaders have merely taken over, though on a smaller scale, the role of the colonialists. It would not be surprising, then, if the masses were passive and isolated, and failed to defend the ruling power in the face of an attack.

It is particularly important in developing countries to set a good example of austerity on the part of public men, as a cornerstone of the strength and security of the state. If a few intellectuals and top officials enjoy outrageous advantages and live extravagantly in palaces with luxurious cars, etc., this is bound to lead to dissatisfaction in view of the vast discrepancy between such conditions and the low standards of living in developing countries. Eventually this must

lead to the collapse of national unity and the alienation of the people from the government.

Calls for "austerity" will be ridiculed by the masses if this merely means more privileges for politicians, statesmen and capitalists. Austerity must, in the first place, be applied to precisely such people, not to the workers and peasants who have always suffered deprivation.

Class Motives and Characteristics

Imperialism seeks, in its own interests, to create a privileged class whose economic position and future is linked with the West, a class which enables imperialism to dominate a developing country. Gabon is a striking example; the population is less than half a million, but there is a parliament of 65 members each getting 165,000 francs a year. Workers there earn 700 francs a year for their hard labour.

In Dahomey, 60 per cent of the national income goes to paying the salaries of officials.

Such policies led to a revolt of the people in Congo (Brazzaville), when the former President Youlou began building himself a palace in the style of Versailles, importing materials for this project by aircraft, at the expense of this small and poor nation.

Similar extravagant tendencies, if allowed in countries under progressive governments, can only result in the drifting away of the people, exposing the government to easy attacks by hostile forces.

Of course, even under progressive regimes, there are certain examples of extravagance and privileges though these differ in degree. These are often justified on the grounds of reality and necessity. It is said that developing countries badly need technical and administrative personnel to direct the state machinery and production operations. The shortage of qualified people makes it necessary to attract them by offering certain inducements and privileges. There is some truth in this argument, but if certain privileges are necessary in the interests of promoting development, these must be within reasonable limits, in conformity with the particular conditions of the economy, and understood and approved by the people.

Another matter requiring attention is the narrowing and eventual abolition of differences between town and country.

Often the reverse is the case. The cities increase in wealth and their residents acquire more rights, but the countryside remains backward and its inhabitants in poverty. This is a real danger to progressive regimes, for the countryside is the major fortress against hostile forces.

Class Struggle and Democracy

Which are the forces that are for the revolution and which are against it? A correct answer to this question is essential for the defence of the revolutionary regime. In answering it one must bear in mind the two-fold character of the revolution, national as well as social. One must remember that while the answer must be precise, it must also take into account the characteristics of different classes in society, and the fact that alignments may change with changing conditions, not only within the country but also internationally.

We must also distinguish which are the main forces of the revolution, and which subsidiary. Sometimes representatives of subsidiary forces, usually of a wavering and hesitant type, may penetrate into leading positions. That is why one has witnessed reactionary coups and movements emerging from within the ranks of the main progressive party and its leadership.

Nation and Class

Some African leaders and thinkers maintain that African societies are homogeneous, without class divisions. Class struggle is repudiated, or at any rate underestimated.

Such views are based on the observation that African societies are not sharply divided along class lines on the European pattern.

All the same the internal struggles in the new states are of a class nature, and this is clear from the violent disagreements following independence over such issues as the choice of the way of development, the stepping up of political and ideological struggle, the clash between socialist and anti-socialist trends. There are conflicts between different parties, or between different currents within a one-party system—each current or party having a programme and outlook whose contents reflect specific class interests. Often what appear to be tribal conflicts contain class motives and factors.

Such struggles show that African societies are maturing,

bringing class struggle to the fore as the main and decisive element in determining the future. Nor should one overlook the international character of imperialism and the polarisation, on a world scale, of class struggle.

A class outlook is essential for the defence of the revolution. To think only in terms of "the nation as a whole", to open the doors of the "national union" to all without exception, can wreck the revolution. It was illusions of this sort which enabled Syrian reactionary forces, occupying leading positions in the National Union to strike a blow at revolutionary unity by the secession of Syria in 1961. The leadership of the Egyptian revolution hastened to distinguish friends—the alliance of the working people... the peasants, workers, soldiers and "non-exploiting" national capitalism*—from foes—the alliance of feudalism and capitalism.

Opponents were removed from the main posts in political and mass organisations. It was laid down that in agricultural co-operatives, eight out of ten members must own less than five feddans, and half the seats in People's Councils were allocated to workers and peasants. Such measures frustrated plots against the people of the UAR from within and without.

The "New Capitalist Class"

In a previous era the capitalist class led many national revolutions and developed the economy and industrialised it. Today the African capitalist class can no longer do these things or play a decisive part in fighting imperialism, especially after independence. Instead it seeks to collaborate with imperialism as the junior partner in opposing the socialist trends now merging with nationalism. This is because this class cannot stand up to competition with the international monopolies, and has acquired a speculative and parasitic character.

The neo-colonialists know this and use it. It goes all out to win over the African bourgeoisie, to corrupt it by conceding some crumbs of investment profits, commercial agencies, commissions, and positions of branch managements and directorships.

Of course the foreign monopolists look for agents among

* Non-exploiting capitalism is a political term used in the national "chart" meaning the national bourgeoisie, one of the forces of alliance within the Socialist Union.

those who in one way or another took part in the national movements, those among the merchants, bureaucrats and intellectuals who are not regarded as hostile to the revolution. The imperialists gradually transform such people into opponents of socialism and the non-capitalist path. When more revolutionary measures are taken, elements like this become more hostile, but usually they pretend to support the government, waiting for a chance for treachery. Meanwhile they avoid putting their capital into production or stable projects, concentrate on speculation, bribery for import permits, monopolies and the like. They are not, as were the "classical bourgeoisie" in the past, interested in fighting feudalism and its ideology and in developing industry. Instead they seek to enrich themselves through the abuse of state power. The new capitalist class is out to legalise robbery, speculation, black marketeering, bribery and "commissions" from contracts and foreign aid.

Such parasites and bourgeois elements are a grave danger to independence. Adventurous and treacherous, and to tolerate them in leading political and economic positions can only lead to dissatisfaction among the people and create a situation of unrest, fertile soil for conspiracies.

It is the class nature of capitalism, not its size or wealth that leads to danger. Not that national capitalism is necessarily hostile; but its representatives should not be permitted to occupy leading places; they must participate in the national alliance only under conditions that allow the workers and peasants the final say and the main influence. Economically, capitalist interests must be subordinated to those of the public sector and the national plan, and opportunities of private accumulation of capital must be limited.

Here, we must distinguish between productive capitalism—i. e., that which takes part in production activities and may, with the above limitations, be encouraged; and parasitic capitalism—i. e., that which uses its capital in unspecified, non-productive ways. The latter should be liquidated and its activities taken over by the public sector.

The Intellectuals

Usually the intellectuals have occupied a prominent part in the African revolution. The feudalists were discredited in the course of the fight against imperialism; the bourgeoisie

was very weak; there were few mass organisations. No single class was in power. The crying need for educated people in political, economic and cultural work, the more so in conditions where new production techniques call for scientific training, has led to a premium being placed on intellectuals—compare the formation of a "Students' Government" during the early stages of independence in the Congo—the group sometimes referred to as "the elite". Certainly the intellectuals occupy a position of influence over the masses, and shape the forms of political thought.

Most of these intellectuals, educated under imperialist rule and often granted scholarships to imperialist countries, are imbued with bourgeois ideas and help to propagate such ideas among the masses. Some of them are related to the socially-privileged classes. Inheriting the positions formerly occupied by colonialist authorities they were encouraged in their capitalist aspirations and the urge to seek personal power and privileges, to isolate themselves from the people's movement and shun public supervision.

No doubt there is much in common between the drive of the bourgeoisie to cling to its capital and its special interests, and that of the bureaucracy to hang on to its privileges.

Neo-colonialism is very conscious of the possibilities of winning over this section of the intellectuals by waging ideological and psychological warfare. The leading U.S. cold war strategist Meyers calls for a "comprehensive strategy" to combat "Communist and nationalist ideas". Dwight B. Vassal, heading a special committee on this subject in the U.S. Senate declared that "words and ideas are just as important as bread and rifles".

Hence generous provision is made for many scholarships in the imperialist countries. Cultural exchanges are encouraged. African markets are flooded with magazines, newspapers, reports, reviews and bulletins. Mission schools are opened. Western broadcasting stations are beamed on Africa—such as the Voice of America, 761 hours a week, and the BBC, 600 hours a week. Foreign news agencies operate in Africa. Imperialist information centres, backed by lavish funds, have 239 branches in 105 towns. Then there are the Moral Rearmament Movement, the American Peace Corps, the French Volunteers for Progress and innumerable missionaries.

These influences, directed particularly at the intellectuals, surround the Africans on all sides, from mission schools and

universities staffed with Western personnel, to the foreign-owned African press, radio and cinema.

All these influences are brought to bear by the imperialists in an attempt to impose bourgeois and anti-African ideas. Historical and especially African realities provide every opportunity to counter these destructive influences and win the African intellectuals and middle classes for the cause of liberation. But our patriotic governments must understand the importance of theory and make strenuous efforts to counter these poisonous and destructive campaigns of the imperialists. They should set up national news agencies and strengthen the national organs of information and propaganda. It is necessary to reform educational syllabi and supervise cultural and publishing activities. Vanguard governments should co-ordinate their efforts to protect the peoples of the liberated countries from imperialist ideological invasion.

Social consciousness reflects social conditions, living standards, work in production. Yet it is relatively independent. Especially in economically and socially backward countries, social consciousness is a positive and effective factor, acting as a motive force of development.

Peasants and Workers

The peasants are the main force behind the national movement. The workers, in alliance with the peasants, are the driving force of socialist transformation.

The countryside is the bastion of the revolution.

A reactionary coup d'état depends on a handful of armed men. They seize the radio station, the presidential residence, the airport, the ministries, the headquarters of the governing party. All these places are concentrated in the capital.

If the government has "shrunk" from a country-wide presence, cutting off the city from the village and the town-dwellers from the peasants, and the whole country becomes the capital only, then the overthrow of the progressive regime would be extremely easy. A gang of adventurers could capture power without difficulty, for the national-liberation regime has cut the arteries connecting it with the countryside. But if the revolution has extended to cover the whole country, organising and mobilising the peasants, it would be unassailable. Any coup which captured the capital would find itself surrounded, an island in a sea of hostility.

Following independence the liberation forces inherit a situation of rural backwardness and neglect. Any economic development has been restricted to the towns and coastal regions, towards which the population drifts, in search of relatively higher wages, leaving the farmlands short of labour. The progressive forces, considering industrialisation a radical solution of their problems, tend to neglect agriculture and fail to reach a proper balance between the two sectors.

Serious consequences can follow.

In the city are concentrated not only most state executive bodies, but also trade, finance and industrial activities.

In the countryside, the role of the Party contracts; it becomes isolated from the peasants.

Unemployment problems are aggravated by the drift of peasants to the towns, in search of better wages and urban facilities.

Agrarian problems multiply because of growing rural poverty, and the prevalence of subsistence farming.

The conflict between town and country becomes sharper, as the townfolk increasingly enjoy the gains of the revolution while the peasant masses are deprived of them.

There is no proper balance of exchange between town and country. Industrial production is affected because the masses lack purchasing power. Urban growth leads to increased consumer demand for foodstuffs and raw materials, but the countryside is declining and unable to meet these demands. The goods have to be imported, and this slows down capital accumulation for investment in production.

All these things lead to passivity and indifference among the peasants and create a climate of disaffection and rebellion. The revolution loses its principal ally and the soil is prepared for counter-revolution.

The Workers

A number of factors have impeded the development of the African working class and limited the trade union movement to economic struggles. Usually the organised workers were those employed in government enterprises and utilities. In the mines, migrant labour prevails and workers return to their villages when their term of contract is over. Often bourgeois political parties dominate the worker's organisations, and imperialist policy has been to divert the trade union movements

from participating in the national-liberation struggle. These features of the African labour movement in many countries led to a tendency towards reformism and opportunism, in a political climate saturated with capitalist ideas.

The greatest revolutionary struggles of Africa, confronting hostile forces with revolutionary violence and warfare, have been conducted by the exploited peasants. Algeria lost 1,000,000 martyrs, Kenya 200,000 and Madagascar 80,000 in armed struggles of the peasants for liberty and independence. It was the African peasant who forced the imperialists to change over to neo-colonialist methods, to concede political independence. As long as African struggles are mainly of a national liberationist character, the peasants form the principal army of the revolution and the countryside is the battlefield.

A dialectical, scientific approach is needed to the problem of class leadership. It is naive and dogmatic to maintain—generalising from conditions totally different to those in Africa—that the working class must necessarily lead national revolutionary struggles. It has been observed that this generalisation has been repeated in relation to countries where a working class hardly exists. On the other hand, we should not fall into the other extreme of asserting, as did Frantz Fanon, that "in colonial countries, the only revolutionary class is the peasantry".

In any case, this question is subject to evolution, depending on conditions in each country and the stage it is in. Generally, the peasants are the principal force in the national revolution, the workers in socialist transformation. For the latter stage, the working class, being in close connection with modern production with its social character, is the natural leader. Its close connection with the most advanced means of production enables the working class to assimilate the ideology of scientific socialism and put it into practice to win socialism.

Perhaps the dual character of the African revolution with its national and social aspects has led to some confusion. Certainly both workers and peasants are the two main forces of the revolution. But, indisputable facts show, despite the growing importance of the industrial working class, that the decisive battles in the history of the continent, which brought about a big turning point in the liberation movement, resulted directly from peasant struggle and thus the task of defending progressive regimes falls mainly on the peasants.

That is why it is so important to avoid concentrating all

forces on the city and neglecting the peasant bastion in the countryside, allowing the gap between urban and rural living standards to widen, and shrinking the government into the city. A progressive regime which makes these errors is opening the way to its own overthrow.

Democracy

Democracy, in both its social and political aspects, is the key to the problems of national action for progress, the source from which the revolution draws its forces and energies, will mobilise the working masses and express their aspirations.

The social aspect of democracy deserves more attention from revolutionary democrats. It comes prior to the political aspect. We cannot preach to the peasants that they should take part freely in political activity while they are fettered by feudal relations which forces them to submit to those who employ them.

Our concept naturally differs from the pattern of formal bourgeois parliamentarism offered by the West, which has repeatedly demonstrated its unsuitability for African soil—the latest example being the collapse of the Western-imposed pattern in Nigeria.

Egypt's National Charter defines the features of people's democracy as follows:

"First—Political democracy cannot be separated from social democracy. No citizen can be regarded as free to vote unless he is given the following three guarantees:

- He should be free from exploitation in all its forms.
- He should enjoy an equal opportunity to have a fair share of the national wealth.
- His mind should be free from all anxiety likely to undermine the security of his life in the future."

Just as the availability of luxury goods is not an evidence of prosperity, so the existence of more than one party does not prove the existence of democracy. This is primarily a question of power; in essence, a question of class.

If power is truly in the hands of the workers and peasants—the broad toiling masses who are the mainstay of the national movement and of socialist transformation—then there is a force capable of defending and maintaining this power.

* The Charter, p. 42.

It is not enough for the leaders to proclaim that they represent the working masses of the people. The workers and peasants must be convinced from their own experience that the system represents them, protects their interests, seeks to safeguard their future and realise their aspirations for a better life.

Despite "good intentions" revolutionary leadership may fall victim to imperialist, capitalist and opportunist pressures to permit certain sections advantages and privileges at the expense of the masses of the people. They may take such positions under the persistent pressures directed by groups in key political and economic positions. Little counter-pressure is felt, because it is dispersed mainly in the countryside, far from the centres of political activity. Worse still if the party and executive organisations are inefficient, absorbed in bureaucracy or even capitalist activities.

This can serve to cut off the leadership from the people; and unless it can break out of such encirclement its position will become precarious. In Egypt, reactionary forces have tried persistently to isolate the revolutionary leadership. They have not succeeded, because the leadership is indeed revolutionary and has always been able to renew its links with the masses—but this does not mean that the forces of reaction will give up their attempts.

The Party and the State

Following liberation, and coming into control of the "magical" state machinery, with all its authority and power, the new leadership often resorts to a "short cut"—that of imposing decisions from above, through administrative action. Certain leaders think or behave in terms of the concept of domination by the "enlightened, creative minority" over the "backward, sluggish masses". Such ideas of an "elite" are popular with Western-influenced intellectuals, isolated from their own people, who refuse to accept criticism from colleagues or to yield to opposition from the people.

Usually, the advent of independence is not accompanied by the withdrawal of colonialist civil servants. Because of shortage of trained and experienced administrative staff, these officials are kept on to train indigenous personnel. Usually they try to "train" them in their own outlook and behaviour of contempt for "natives" and worship of everything foreign.

They are joined by experts imported from capitalist countries, and some Africans who have been educated in the West.

Top state officials are influenced by such elements to see social problems with the distorted vision of capitalist prejudices and servility to imperialism—the more so since many of these top officials themselves were formerly junior employees under the imperialists. Their motives in seeking independence were to take over the privileged positions occupied by the foreigners rather than to change the social system.

A spontaneous grouping takes place, comprising a section of the local capitalist class, reactionary intellectuals and opportunists who have wormed their way into influential state positions.

Reactionary civil servants can sabotage any revolutionary government policy which they think does not conform with their interests or views, by procrastination and delays, shielding themselves behind the intricacies of various laws inherited from the past.

In Egypt, fortunately, our revolution did not depend for the implementation of its policies, laws and measures, on the old bureaucracy, but on new organs directly attached to the Presidency. That ensured, for example, that the forces entrusted to implement such revolutionary measures as the Agrarian Reform Law were themselves composed of loyal enthusiasts.

Instead of handing over implementation of policy to the existing bureaucracy, a revolutionary government on coming to power should take measures to ensure that the executive really serves the revolution. This will be done according to the conditions of each country, but some important general principles apply everywhere.

It is necessary to rid the administration and civil service of their old, colonialist-appointed, heads.

There must be strict Party control and supervision without turning the Party into a branch of the government. Revolutionary cadres must be trained and given responsibility.

The workers must take part in the management of public projects, and self-management schemes encouraged, so that the masses take more and more important responsibilities in production and public services.

Steps should be taken to isolate reactionary and unreliable groups and class elements.

Rejecting the bourgeois conception of "separation of powers"

a unitary authority must be established—the power of the working people. But concentration of power in the hands of a single individual must be avoided.

Collective authority must be reinforced, to counter the dangers of a cult of the individual developing—in fact a cult of power—with all its harmful results and its accompanying hypocrisy, deception and opportunism. These were revealed by the Ghana events, and the sudden switch of loyalties by Ministers, army generals and party leaders.

Top level government work must be considered as a form of militant action. It calls for sacrifices, dedication, contentment with modest salaries and setting aside of ambitions for personal gains and privileges. The Party must allocate people who meet these requirements to state departments, and check on their work within their Party organisations.

The Armed Forces

The army and security forces occupy the most important position in the state machine. That is why the imperialists concentrate on securing contact and influence in these forces.

Most armies in Africa were created during the period of colonial occupation to serve as a police force for suppression of the people.

Only three countries south of the Sahara—Sudan, Ethiopia and Congo (Kinshasa)—have armies exceeding ten thousand troops. Fourteen states have armies of less than two thousand. Yet these armies play an increasingly important role in political conflicts.

Most armies in Africa did not participate in the national liberation movements; indeed they were used against them. Often the officers are Europeans, and African officers are trained either in the imperialist countries or by Western instructors. Contempt for civilians often prevails in such armed forces, together with disrespect for civil authorities on the grounds that they were recently established. Unlike those in North Africa, such armies lack the qualities which enable the armed forces to be a dependable source of stability and progress in society.

Through their military aid, missions and experts, imperialist circles set up firm relationships with certain officers, especially those who served under them in the past, who took part in colonial wars and have acquired a Western militarist out-

look. Before withdrawing, the imperialists try to make sure that such men will take over top army positions.

In 1964 there were 3,000 French military experts and instructors in Africa, and 1,500 Africans were sent to France for military training. Similarly there were 600 British army experts in Africa, and 700 Africans received military training in Britain. About 20 per cent of the army staff in Ghana were trained at Sandhurst in England, and British officers continued to hold top positions in the Ghana army until 1961. Ankrah and the other leaders of the reactionary coup were trained by the British.

No less than 14 African states have agreements with Israel, a neo-colonialist base, for the training of their armies and the supply of arms.

An increasingly important role is being played by West German imperialism in establishing contact with African armies. The Federal Republic of Germany has concluded agreements for the provision of experts and instructors and other military aid, with seven African states in the major strategic regions of the continent.

All these facts must be borne in mind when we recall all the recent coups d'état aimed at replacing the government in power by military rule, as in Congo (Kinshasa), Ghana, Dahomey, Nigeria, and the Central African Republic.

Sometimes it is suggested that these dangers should be guarded against by keeping the army out of politics and politics out of the army. This Western concept is quite unsuitable for African conditions, where the army has an important role to play after independence. It is quite natural for the imperialists to want the army, which it needs for colonial wars, to be "non-political". If the soldiers of the imperialist countries acquired political consciousness they would never agree to take part in such wars as those in Vietnam, Algeria and the tripartite aggression against Egypt, or to become gun-fodder for the sake of the imperialist monopolies.

Political consciousness in the armed forces of the developing countries is a guarantee of their participation in the liberation movement and in reconstruction.

Imperialism wants soldiers who are human robots operating advanced weapons, but the people's interests demand that our army men are politically-conscious citizens, aware of the country's problems and helping to solve them.

The concept that when the army enters politics it does so

to impose its own point of view with its weapons, overlooks the fact that national armies are made up mainly of the sons of the working people. If some armies have been used to strike at the masses and suppress the national movement, this was not because such armies had taken part in politics, but precisely because they were excluded from politics, and subjected to mechanical training, requiring unthinking discipline. The attempt in Ghana to exclude the army from politics had just the opposite effect to what was intended.

In many African countries the role of the armed forces made the revolution possible. In addition to the role of the army in Egypt, there was the positive army action in Zanzibar, paving the way for the progressive Republic of Tanzania. There was also the example of the armed forces in Congo (Brazzaville), who refused to carry out ex-president Youlou's orders to open fire on the demonstrators before the presidential palace, thus forcing him to resign.

Certain basic policies should be followed by progressive governments bearing in mind the experience of Egypt, which tried to give the army a political education and break the barrier between the military forces and the popular masses.

Political education and activity are among the principal subjects in the training of officers and soldiers, who, following the revolution and the July 1961 series of social laws were given the right to vote and are included in the revolutionary alliance of working people.

The army participates in production side by side with the workers and peasants (as at the Aswan High Dam, military factories producing consumer goods, and in land reclamation projects), thus strengthening the ties between the soldiers and the working people.

A national militia should be set up, and placed under army command to avoid possible conflicts.

African countries should avoid dependence on the West for arms and training, especially of Staff Officers.

Political Organisation and Mass Mobilisation

All the tasks referred to above are the responsibility of the Revolutionary Party, the leader of the struggle for liberation and the building of socialism. Once a correct policy has been worked out, everything depends on organisation. In the words of Felix Moumie, "Every African wishes to be free, but

the strength of the people cannot be realised unless it is organised".

The period after independence, with its many challenges and increased fierceness of struggle, requires intensive organisation and mobilisation. It requires heightened vigilance on the part of the revolutionary leadership, faced with mounting resistance from neo-colonialism and from sections within the country who consider formal independence the final goal and oppose measures for radical transformation of society.

Disunity within the national movement usually follows the gaining of independence.

There is a widespread idea that, its aim accomplished, the national movement has no further purpose. The assumption of power is seen as a substitute for party organisation and the rank and file tends to disintegrate.

The struggle against direct imperialist control has compelled all the national forces to unite, but with the coming of independence internal conflicts break out over which path of development to follow. There are struggles for power and over the distribution of posts left vacant by the departure of the colonialists. Disunity at the top levels aggravates disintegration throughout.

If difficulties of development form the economic basis for counter-revolutionary activities, organisational laxity creates a political climate for their success.

A revolutionary leadership which fails to recognise facts like these is putting a noose around its own neck and handing the rope to the enemy. Only mass organisation and persistent mobilisation can guarantee the safeguarding and extension of the gains of the people.

Some people acknowledge these truths theoretically, but do not carry them out in practice. They are satisfied with the outward forms of organisation, gathering large numbers of people into the party by administrative means, but without effectiveness or activity. Sometimes leaders, overwhelmed with administrative work, neglect party activity.

If all the main Party cadres are assigned to state administrative duties, and the State is made to substitute for the Party in communicating with the masses, this cannot but lead to the atrophy of the Party.

Often some leaders tend to "escape" the criticism to which they are subjected inside the Party, by retreating within the State machinery where they are protected by discipline and

subordination. Strong and well-established Party traditions, often lacking in newly-formed parties, are needed to produce leaders willing to accept criticism and opposition.

The Party leadership should always be able to distinguish supporters from enemies at every strategic stage. It should isolate hostile groups and paralyse their activities; mobilise the working masses by arousing their enthusiasm and initiative and treat in-between, vacillating sections with statesmanship.

The criterion for assessing different social categories is their class origin, the attitude of various classes towards social revolution in the world of today.

For example, both in Niger and in Guinea, revolutionary governments were in office in September 1958 at the time of the referendums organised by de Gaulle, and both called upon the people to reject the French constitutional proposals. In Guinea 95.4 per cent voted "No", thus removing the country from the "French Community". But in Niger a majority voted against their government, for neo-colonialism.

This happened because the Niger government had taken no active steps against the feudalists, who retained their privileges and their influence over the voters. The Guinea government had already in 1957 abolished the previous system of tribal chiefs, dealing a severe blow to reaction. The administration was democratised by providing for the direct election of chiefs, replacing feudalist influence with the power of the people. After these revolutionary class measures, Sékou Touré declared: "The power positions of feudalism have collapsed and the evils of the countryside are sure to disappear." This and the broad activities of the Guinea Democratic Party showed their effectiveness in the 1958 Referendum.

At one stage mistakes were made in Egypt by trying to achieve class reconciliation between social forces in a state of hostile contradiction. During the first stages of national liberation, when hostile class contradictions had not emerged, large sections of the national bourgeoisie were attracted to the national alliance and the National Union. But two months after the July 1951 decrees laying the foundations for the advance to socialism, the forces of reaction conspired to overthrow the government and succeeded in separating Syria from the UAR. President Nasser pointed out, addressing the National Union of Popular Forces:

"I believe there was one defect in the National Union: we

gave reactionary forces an opportunity to infiltrate into the National Union and control its leading positions. We had good intentions in this, we wished to resolve class struggle through peaceful means, and establish a sort of peaceful coexistence of classes within the framework of national unity. We permitted all people to join the Union, even reactionary forces."

Each decisive measure taken by a revolutionary government encounters resistance from antagonistic elements, fresh sections of which break away from the revolution to join the opposition.

In Ghana, both open and concealed opposition were transferred to the ranks of the Convention People's Party following the dissolution of the United Party in 1964. In Mali, revolutionary measures were followed by an attempt by reactionary forces in July 1962 to overthrow the legitimate government in Bamako. The attempt failed and the government lost no time in purging its ranks of hostile elements.

Thus, it must be anticipated that every move by revolutionary forces towards social progress will result in a change of attitude by certain forces. Organisational steps should be taken to remove opposition elements from positions of strategic importance, and thus to protect the Party.

Few African progressive parties had clearly defined programmes, especially on questions of social reform. Many such parties lacked scientific method and a plan for the post-independence period.

This characteristic distinguishes African liberation movements from that of all progressive parties in other countries, which came to power with fully elaborated programmes, covering both political and social aspects, as well as questions of strategy and tactics. This safeguards the stability and integrity of such parties, because all their members know exactly where they are going. But most African parties and liberation movements are in constant evolution; as each stage of development is reached the need for new revolutionary steps is apparent. These parties accordingly amend and extend their programmes, but groups within them lag behind. Either they break with their parties, or they remain within them, pretending to agree with the new developments, but in reality only awaiting an opportunity to seize power.

Thus, sudden and unexpected changes occur in the positions of various forces during the process of development of the

revolution. This calls for dynamic qualities in the leadership, the capacity for constant alertness and swift action.

A great source of danger in African countries has been the failure to analyse and define class distinctions. Inability to distinguish which intellectuals are revolutionary and which reactionary; which sections among the capitalists are patriotic and which hostile, permits hostile elements to hold key posts in the economy and in mass organisations. Such people pretend loyalty to the party, its principles and slogans, its policy and leadership, but meanwhile they are plotting against the state.

These conditions call for great care and vigilance, relying on close supervision by the party and the masses. In developing countries fully developed classes, definable by their property and their relations to production, are not to be found. Classes are in the process of formation; new bourgeois elements sprout daily hatching the seeds of opposition movements and coups d'état.

It is vital, then, to evaluate the leading personnel. Their work, their relationships, their public and personal activities must be closely watched. It is here that we realise the need for a party tradition of criticism and self-criticism, to check opportunism and careerism, and to implant socialist morality in place of backward values. But this supervision of personnel must be carried out on a party, democratic and collective basis, avoiding administrative action and police methods.

The solidity and coherence of a progressive regime depends first and foremost on the extent to which the leading Party is conscious, vigilant and popular. The Party must be truly the expression of the interests of the people, above all of the workers and peasants. This means it must be in close contact with the masses. Knowing the needs, feelings and aspirations of the masses can never result from bureaucratic meetings, but only by studying the actual conditions of the people, being with them every day, absorbing, assimilating and generalising their views, so that they can be crystallised and expressed into definite objectives and action to attain them.

We must be vigilant against overcentralisation and confinement to the city limits; against the entrenchment of the system of administration by decrees from on high. Party units must be extended in town and country, drawing in workers and peasants.

The Party leadership should be entrusted to scientific socialists, who understand the dimensions of the struggle and

the laws of social development, who are politically and ideologically mature. The vanguard of the Party must be a solid, ideologically united nucleus: a condition imposed by the realities of the fierce struggle in Africa, and the nature of our big mass parties, composed of people of varying class origins and ideologies.

Democratic centralism should be strictly applied within the ranks of the Party. Open discussion and democratic procedures must be widespread to win mass support through conviction and persuasion. The role of the Party is not merely to inform the public about the programme and policy and invite them to carry out the objects defined by the authorities. Winning mass support means constant debate, explanation, education on current affairs.

That is just why the Party and its main leaders must not be swallowed up by the state machinery, so that they appear merely as a communication system to hand down instructions and decisions.

Party members must set an example which convinces the masses that they are those closest and most loyal to the revolution; not those who seek personal benefits and privileges which place them in the ranks of the "rulers". This is the only way to win the respect and the confidence of the people.

Vigilance must be exercised against antagonistic tendencies in the Party, even when concealed behind pretended loyalty. And these trends must be defeated ideologically before organisational steps are taken against them. We must never be satisfied with unprincipled and unsatisfactory compromises.

Finally, it must be recognised that the threat of counter-revolution must be met on an all-African scale, uniting the forces of the vanguard countries and liberation movements to counter the continent-wide plans and conspiracies of the imperialists. We must safeguard and consolidate the revolutionary positions already won and advance to liberate all the peoples of our continent from colonialism and neo-colonialism.

RALLY THE PATRIOTS AND REVOLUTIONARIES

RICHARD ANDRIAMANJATO

Madagascar is an island of strategic importance due to both its geographical location and to its considerable deposits of fissile material. These assets impart to our country special value in the eyes of the imperialists, who resort to various methods to maintain and extend their domination, from fomenting intertribal and religious strife to supporting the Malagasy bourgeoisie.

The colonialists have always sought to rob our people of their dignity and to break their will for national independence. With this aim in view they have never hesitated to take the most ruthless measures, as they did in 1947 when 90,000 of our countrymen were slaughtered.

Ever since our country, like most African countries, hoisted the flag of independence the imperialists have been trying new forms of expansion. The greatest single menace in our view is US imperialism, which is anxious to move into the position vacated by the former colonial power.

The Americans have built in Madagascar a satellite-tracking station which they hope to develop into the biggest NASA base outside the USA. Now that France has set out to safeguard its independence from aggressive blocs, the Americans are casting covetous glances at Diego Suarez Bay, where they would like to have a big military base. They have been pursuing the notorious policy of "handouts" or free gifts with the result that Madagascar has been flooded with the surplus products of American industry; the "gifts" are used as an instrument of political corruption and blackmail.

We are calling attention to the case of Madagascar because we consider that all Africa and each African country are confronted in varying measure with similar problems.

The imperialists want to turn Africa into a strategic stronghold. And they stop at nothing in their efforts to do so.

While it is true that the forces of imperialism and reaction have become more active, we should not underrate the inter-imperialist contradictions. We should bear in mind that the main purpose of neo-colonialism in respect to Africa is to perpetuate exploitation and keep Africa as a component of the capitalist world economy. We can hold our ground against the united strategic front of imperialism and reaction only if we close our ranks on the continent as a whole and in each particular country.

The instrument of revolutionary unity in our country is the Independence Congress Party of Madagascar (AKFM), a coalition of several parties advocating scientific socialism, which, unlike the many pseudo-socialist theories, makes it possible to analyse all national and international phenomena in an objective light in search of the best solution to the many vital problems of the country.

The firm socialist orientation of the AKFM at a time when public opinion in the country had been poisoned by anti-communist propaganda was a genuinely revolutionary factor. The rise of the AKFM in our country initiated a development which is bound, despite all the artifice of capitalism, to culminate in the establishment of a system of social justice and in deliverance from imperialist exploitation.

AKFM realises that in its every move it will be confronted with difficulties arising from the very nature of our country and its population, from survivals that have left a deep imprint on local political thinking.

A prime need is the unity of all the national forces. But our attempts to achieve unity have not so far yielded the desired results. This relative failure was due to organisational shortcomings in the national movement and to a certain over-estimation of our revolutionary potentialities.

We need an objective analysis and a sober appraisal of the situation if we are to advance to unity. We must be prudent and avoid making things more difficult. We know, for example, that the imperialists often take advantage of religion to bolster their position. However, this should not prompt us to lump together religion and imperialism. Our experience has

shown that religion as such does not necessarily promote reaction. Sometimes it can and should be a factor making our task easier.

In tackling the problem of alliance and fronts, we should take stock of the political trends, which vary from country to country.

We should also recognise that the forms of action are not always identical, and that unity by no means implies uniformity. The widely differing conditions in our countries may enable us to use legal means in one case and underground methods in another, but our goal in either case will be the same, namely, to further the interests of our people by abolishing relations based on force.

Africa needs aid from the socialist countries to win complete freedom. We believe this aid should go, first of all, to those governments sincerely striving to lead their peoples to socialism. However, the socialist countries should not neglect their relations with other African countries inasmuch as these relations objectively help to strengthen the positions of the revolutionary forces in the countries concerned, to arouse and promote anti-imperialist consciousness.

Our people are learning that unity of action of all the revolutionary forces of the world, primarily those championing socialism, is indispensable if mankind is to be freed from injustice and the imperialist threat of destruction.

THE INTELLECTUALS AND THE AFRICAN LIBERATION MOVEMENT

THIERNO AMATH DANSOKO

The intelligentsia plays a very important role in the common front of anti-imperialist struggle, for, possessing a higher level of education, it is natural for it to be more active politically than the other classes and social strata of Black Africa. It is not accidental, therefore, that it has exercised—de facto, at least—political and ideological hegemony in the liberation movement in these countries. The weakness of the bourgeoisie and the working class and the backwardness of the peasantry in all respects make conditions for this hegemony perfectly obvious.

This social stratum arose concurrently with colonialism, and has developed parallel with the putting into operation of the administrative and economic organs of the colonial apparatus. To make it easier to exploit the vast areas of Tropical Africa the colonialists had to train auxiliary personnel from among the local population. Educated in a spirit of complete negation of affinity to the society from which they emerged, these officials regard West European values with awe and fear. Having suppressed by force or simply destroyed the resisting communal and tribal aristocracy, the colonialists created and supported this elite in which they sought—not without success—to find propagandists of colonialism.

This idea was expressed very succinctly by Maurice Delafosse, former French Governor in West Africa:

"This will be a source of trust, on the part of a population so remote from us, in the principles and methods which we would have been unable to impose by force and which it

would of have been very difficult to introduce through persuasion if we had been their exponents. In addition, we need interpreters to be understood by the natives, and intermediaries of native origin but associated with the European environment by their education, in order to induce the natives to comprehend and accept this foreign civilisation."

The aims are thus defined very clearly. Bréviér, Governor-General of former French West Africa, was even more outspoken:

"Colonial duty, political and economic necessity set a dual task before our educational policy: on the one hand, to form local cadres called upon to become our assistants in all fields and ensure the development of a carefully selected elite; on the other, to educate the masses in a spirit of rapprochement with us..."

"From the political viewpoint, the issue is one of explaining our efforts and intentions to the natives, to attach them to French life. From the economic viewpoint we have to prepare the producers and consumers of tomorrow."

As regards the conditions for access to this elite of petty officials, their principles are equally clear. Governor-General Roume was quite unambiguous about it:

"We regard education as something very precious which can be distributed only on a sufficiently valid basis, by restricting the number of beneficiaries through special selection. We pick our pupils primarily from among the children of chiefs and aristocrats... The prestige due to origin should be backed up by the respect which possession of knowledge evokes."

Colonialism strove to apply this principle of social segregation throughout its history.

It was a matter of increasing the effectiveness of the colonial apparatus by making the upper crust of African society vitally interested in taking part in exploitation. A few children of peasants and workmen found their way into the colonial administration only because sometimes, for various reasons, the aristocrats gave them their children's places in schools. This control became weaker much later, and the democratic movement made education more accessible to the children of workers and peasants.

But imperialism has never, on its own initiative, changed the principles of forming the African intelligentsia. The same principles were applied in British territories, as is seen from

the results of a 1953 survey of the incomes of the parents of the students of the university college in Ghana. Out of a total of 208, 12 per cent of the families had an annual income of more than £600 sterling, 38 per cent, between £250 and £600, and about 50 per cent, about £250. Those were only cash incomes. The significance of these figures will be clear if it is recalled that it was only in 1962, nine years later, owing to the tremendous efforts undertaken by the patriotic regime of President Nkrumah, that the average annual income per head of the population reached approximately £94. And that was not an accidental phenomenon, for the British introduced a system of indirect administration and always sought to rely on the local nobility, and also allowed, within certain limits, the emergence and development of the rural and urban bourgeoisie in Nigeria and Ghana.

Social segregation is not the only characteristic feature of the colonialists' cadres policy. The growth of the intelligentsia was restricted to a strict minimum needed for the normal functioning of the colonial machine. For instance, the number of teachers and junior medical personnel graduated annually in the former Federation of French West Africa never exceeded 60. The inter-African conference on higher education held in Tananarive in 1962 put on record that 34 states and territories of Tropical Africa had only ten higher educational establishments with a total student body of 2,270. In its twelve years the university college in Ghana turned out only 400 specialists with diplomas. The university college of Ibadan, capable of turning out more than 200 specialists a year, graduated not more than 500 in eleven years. Belgian colonialism did nothing to create even a semblance of systematic professional training, which strangely contrasted with the scope of church education. Indeed, Belgian colonialism strictly adhered to its famous principle: "No elite, no trouble." On the day when independence was proclaimed, in a population of 14 million, one could count only 1,500 people with a certain degree of education—the African elite whose level was limited to possession of an identification card, the possibility of obtaining an insignificant administrative post, and a permit to stay in the European quarter after 8 p. m. The basis for higher education for the Congolese was laid only in 1964.

Thus, all methods were applied to regulate the formation of cadres. To get an education in the metropolitan country,

one had to be rich and have loyal parents. The number of scholarships was strictly limited. In Ruanda-Urundi, a deposit of 50,000 francs was required to be able to leave the country for education abroad.

Small wonder, therefore, that at the moment of independence the African countries had a ridiculously small number of cadres with a higher education. In the Congo, for instance, there were only five graduates. In 1964 Zambia did not have a single engineer or architect. At the same time, the developed countries have up to 1,000 scientific workers per million citizens. The proportion for the African continent as a whole is 40 per million. In Tropical Africa the situation is much worse.

Of course, despite all the obstacles the number of African students has grown considerably. The winning of independence made possible a considerable increase in the number of scholarships. There are more than 10,000 African students in France and as many in Britain. More than 2,000 young Africans are studying in the United States. The successes of the national-liberation movement are accompanied by ever broader participation of the socialist camp in the training of African specialists. The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia have set up two universities for students from the developing countries. These universities admit African students from all countries regardless of their material status. The other socialist countries are constantly increasing the number of scholarships granted to African students. Thousands of young people are studying in Arab countries, thus contributing to the revival of a centuries-old tradition which had been broken by colonialism. A new phenomenon in the Arab world is that young students from Tropical Africa are receiving there a modern specialised education, whereas formerly the education of young people there was exclusively religious.

As the number of higher-school students grows noticeable changes are taking place in specialisation and in the choice of professions. In the colonial period, most young people received a legal, medical or pedagogical education. Today the emphasis is on technical education in different branches. This year alone 5,220 Nigerians graduated from higher schools at home and abroad. They include 573 engineers, 376 agricultural specialists and 424 specialists in the natural sciences. Thus, there is an increase in the number of specialists working in the decisive sectors of scientific research and production. This trend will continue in the future, because our independence

and the success of our effort to ensure a high rate of development depend in large measure precisely on these cadres.

The conference on problems of public education in Africa which was held in Addis Ababa in 1961 outlined a twenty-year plan one of the aims of which is to ensure the admission of 20 per cent of secondary school graduates to higher educational establishments in Africa itself, and appealed to the participating states to pursue, in the field of secondary and university education, a policy more conforming to the demands of rapid economic development, and to see to it that towards 1980 students of higher technical schools and natural sciences faculties make up 60 per cent of the total student body.

Some conclusions can be drawn from this brief excursion into the history of the emergence and development of the intelligentsia in Tropical Africa:

1. Imperialism was compelled to pursue a policy of selection of cadres, for our countries were colonies subjected to exploitation;

2. Most of these cadres hailed from the aristocratic circles of African society or the elite created by colonialism;

3. They were subjected to intensive ideological and political indoctrination to turn them into assistants of colonialism;

4. These cadres were so few that when independence came an acute shortage of specialists became evident;

5. Deep-going reforms are needed to increase the training of specialists. This calls for changing the system and programmes of education which in the majority of the now independent countries remain as they were under colonial rule. This reform will benefit the people only if it provides, among other things, for instruction in the native languages, which is decisive for doing away with the cultural backwardness and illiteracy of the masses.

The question arises: to what degree has imperialism succeeded in achieving its aims, i.e., implanting its assistants in the various parts of the colonial apparatus, destroying the spirit of national renaissance and recruiting propagandists of foreign domination?

There is no doubt that colonialism has many zealous agents. Many indigenous officials believed in the "civilising mission" especially since the constant ideological perversion enabled this stratum to rise to a position undoubtedly privileged as compared with the super-exploited masses on whom most onerous and humiliating demands were made. The upper crust

frankly did not believe in the possibility of liberation. They counterposed to the slogan of independence such demoralising ideas as "We cannot even make a needle" or "They want to return us to barbarism". What they were most interested in was regular salaries and a secure pension. We know that some African statesmen received independence with much reluctance, and sometimes imperialism itself compelled them to pretend that they supported the striving of the masses for independence.

All this is indicative of the magnitude of depersonalisation resorted to by imperialism. In some countries of Tropical Africa, such as Senegal, Nigeria, Dahomey, Togo and Ghana, one can find whole families of intellectuals three generations of whom lived in the conditions of this destruction of the national sentiment and eulogy of colonial and Western values.

This alienation, experienced in the period of colonial rule, is manifested in the attitude of the politico-administrative bourgeoisie towards neo-colonialism. Complete mistrust in the masses and mechanical acceptance of models offered by the former metropolitan countries are political features of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie. The rejection of Africanisation of the cadres and of their promotion in the most important sectors of the administration and economy are to a large degree a direct consequence of the colonial complexes.

This alienation affected the masses as well. If its influence is somewhat less, this is due first and foremost to the resistance of the social and cultural structures of the Negro Africans to the process of depersonalisation.

This aspect of the problem is treated amply in Professor Abdon Mounhi's fundamental work *Education in Black Africa*.

It should be noted, however, that despite the political and ideological indoctrination, despite the selective character of colonial education principally intended for the upper crust of the colonised society where colonialism secured subordination and loyalty, it was precisely in this elite that the first political and patriotic cadres emerged. Sons and grandsons of notables and persons of high standing whose loyalty was often beyond question can easily be found among the leaders of all ideological trends now existing in Tropical Africa. Even in its colonialist form capitalism unavoidably created forces antagonistic to it. The race feeling evoked by the centuries of racial oppression acts among the intellectuals as a catalyst of the awakening of national self-consciousness. It was quite

natural that as soon as the local and international conditions became favourable, the intellectuals began to oppose the colonial regime. An important role is played by the students in the metropolitan countries. With the help of their cultural and other organisations they ideologically accelerated the awakening of consciousness.

Acquaintance with the European and internationalist working-class movement which supports the struggle against colonialism, had a tremendous impact upon the intelligentsia. This influence and the successes of the socialist camp induced many African intellectuals to study Marxism-Leninism. In that way they became ideologically equipped for the confrontation with the immediate tasks of liberation and the future tasks of social transformation. This helped them to get rid of the more negative aspects of education received in bourgeois universities. The influence of bodies like the Communist Party of Great Britain, the French Communist Party and the General Confederation of Labour vastly promoted the growth of maturity of progressive and nationalist groups in the British and French colonies after the Second World War.

It is absurd to debate why the working class, or some other class, of these countries, did not play the leading ideological and political role at the initial stage of the struggle for national liberation in the conditions of Tropical Africa. The working class is not only weak; in some countries it is only coming into being, and in those countries where it exists it is still young, it does not have a proper culture, it has just emerged from among the peasantry. Its consciousness does not transcend the bounds of the aspirations of the petty bourgeoisie. This in no way contradicts the Marxist doctrine. At the initial stage of the national-liberation movement the problem is not to know which class is more revolutionary from the viewpoint of future revolutionary transformations—for this is undoubtedly the working class—but to fully realise that the intellectuals alone could pose the problem of independence with all its implications. It was they, naturally, who could comprehend the colonial system and find a positive alternative to colonial rule. In this struggle the working class fought valiantly together with all other patriotic classes and strata in Tropical Africa for political independence and progressive development. But the political and ideological leadership of the intelligentsia was practically indisputable.

After the winning of independence the question arises how the intelligentsia will evolve in the conditions of the demand for accelerated development. Everything now depends on the social structure of the country and the degree achieved by the struggle of the classes, and also on the conditions in which independence was obtained, on the trumpcards which imperialism possesses and the possibilities for playing them. Of course, these trumpcards are counterposed by the existence of a powerful socialist camp. It is perfectly obvious that the intelligentsia of Tropical Africa is closely bound up with the destiny of the main classes, both new and old ones. Hence the existence of different trends in it:

a) some groups of the intelligentsia adopt the positions of the traditional or the new propertied classes, or of both. In this case they degenerate into the bureaucratic, political and administrative bourgeoisie and openly ally themselves with imperialism. It is these groups that produce the ideologists of neo-colonialism and anti-communism;

b) in some other cases the intelligentsia voiced the patriotic sentiments of the masses and a striving to direct the national-liberation movement along progressive lines by cardinally changing the socio-political situation. The most radical wing reflecting these trends favours the non-capitalist road leading to scientific socialism.

Incidentally, all these trends are dynamic and not static, and it is necessary to bear in mind the problems pertaining to the problems of power in societies like ours which are in movement. Most unexpected changes are possible in the political storms raging on the continent.

Along with expressing chiefly the interests of the classes, these trends at the same time express the internal structure of the stratum of intellectuals, which is far from being homogeneous. Indeed, in Tropical Africa, as the French Marxist Africanist Barbet quite correctly puts it:

"... The African intelligentsia falls almost wholly into the category of wage earners (chiefly employed in the public sector). Those in the liberal professions constitute an extremely small group. Whatever particular problems facing the intelligentsia, it differs very distinctly from the petty bourgeoisie..."

The African intelligentsia consists of groups differing in their levels and material conditions, which are often contradictory. After independence the modern social differentiation,

which appeared simultaneously with the introduction of colonial capitalism, was greatly accelerated. The politico-administrative bureaucracy, the higher officials, the caste of politicians began rapidly to enrich themselves at the expense of the state. For these strata, the exercise of power and membership of the ruling party are merely means of misappropriating public funds. The African press abounds in instances of this unscrupulousness. In the neo-colonial regimes this handful of shameless upstarts participates in neo-colonial joint stock-companies and concludes deals with these companies at the expense of and to the detriment of the state. With the help of machinations it transfers funds abroad. In Senegal one can often hear people referring to a government minister as to "Mr. Ten Per Cent", referring to the commission he receives from colonial firms.

This bureaucratic stratum often has extensive contacts in the country, enters into alliances with the traditional aristocratic circles, plays on regionalism and tribalism. The propensity for the squandering of public funds does not diminish under progressive regimes, but it is limited by the possibilities the masses possess for putting an end to it. The feudal lords of all kinds of origin, the traditional, religious and other dignitaries, under progressive regimes, dispose of much less means for bringing pressure to bear upon progressive power, and sometimes have no political authority whatsoever. But the very presence in the supreme state and party organs of this politico-administrative bourgeoisie, which is as corrupt as it is arrogant, dangerously exposes the national and democratic revolution to manoeuvres on the part of imperialism.

This bureaucratic bourgeoisie allied with the urban propertied classes and plantation owners played the chief role in the ideological preparation of the coup of Ghana. It had repeatedly tried to overthrow the regime of President Nkrumah. It succeeded, under the guidance of imperialism but in keeping with its own interests, in utilising the nationally non-integrated army whose leaders had never concealed their pro-imperialist leanings. This politico-administrative bourgeoisie is undoubtedly the chief enemy in the context of the struggle of national classes for the simple reason that it is the brain of domestic reaction and the main ally of imperialism. Progressive regimes must fight jointly with the masses against the domination of this parasitic stratum in the organs of the popular regime.

Salaries paid for the performance of public functions are the only source of income for the majority of intellectuals. Attempts to create a stratum of middle entrepreneurs in the countries of French colonisation were undertaken not long ago. The number of persons of liberal professions is very small compared with the chief mass of intellectuals. This explains the militancy of their trade unions and their radicalism oriented, if not on socialist, then at least on *étatsist* solutions. From this point of view they support the most progressive trends and take part in the struggle for the most profound social and economic changes. It is not accidental that in all neo-colonial regimes in Africa one can see a veritable campaign against the intelligentsia, which is demagogically accused of fighting only to seize power.

It is perfectly obvious that by virtue of its work, its incomes, the prestige with which it associates the very performance of its role, and its political position, which is contradictory and undecided in relation to the conflict between the chief classes, the intelligentsia as a social entity is always susceptible to both right and left opportunism.

Like the petty bourgeoisie it is characterised by political instability. Inevitably the difficulties involved in national and democratic development call for measures of restraint and austerity. These measures are not always welcomed by the intellectuals—especially when the top men in the state do not themselves practice austerity and even misuse public money. If the level of the liberation movement as a whole is not sufficiently mature, the intelligentsia tends to resist a policy of healthy development, inevitably involving immediate restrictions. Instead it tries to maintain its own living standards. This can cause great confusion and even a breach with the peasant masses—especially when, at the same time, the intellectuals are calling for greater independence from the imperialist monopolies.

This sort of confusion can upset the balance of forces and even weaken the unity of strata and classes interested in deep-reaching changes. Often the political-administrative bourgeoisie and the traditional conservative forces make use of such contradictions to discredit the intellectuals.

"Left" extremism is another characteristic trait of the intelligentsia. This deviation, which is a constant threat in such countries as ours, chiefly derives from the difference in the experience of the intelligentsia and other progressive classes

and strata. All the difficulties born of struggle are sublimated in a doctrinaire exaltation of "socialism". Neither the phase nor the level of struggle are taken into account any longer. No one cares whether the conditions for this or that solution exist. The confusion between general national tasks and problems of socialist construction proper becomes such that concrete problems of development towards socialism are eluded and posed on the plane of purely verbal and moral demands. It is this doctrinaire conception that is the source of sharp criticism and doubts as regards the patriotic regimes of Africa. This attitude greatly harms the development of the revolution of national liberation, especially since it ideologically arms the reactionary forces opposing progressive regimes.

It should be said that this deviation also results in a certain anti-intellectualism which sometimes is to be found in the progressive African states, where the intelligentsia is often sweepingly condemned and the merits and abilities of honest patriotic-minded intellectuals are not recognised.

The young African officers, just as the young generation of intellectuals, have grown in the period of national demands. They have not experienced the ideological pressure of colonialism. They are less alienated culturally, and their cultural level is higher. They form part of the intelligentsia. Any observer of African policies will easily see the contradictions which pose this new generation of officers against the African officers who emerged from colonial armies and colonial wars. No doubt, a certain role is played by problems of promotion and personal ambition. The same can be said about the attitude of some young intellectuals opposed to the present leading groups. But the national problem plays a role of equal importance. The younger officers, though graduates of big military schools of the former metropolitan countries, are less ready to tolerate foreign tutelage within the framework of neo-colonialism. They are more sensitive to socio-economic problems. But they lack political culture, and sometimes they even oppose it, regarding the politicisation of the army from the narrow viewpoint of the need for caste unity. Clearly, patriotic-minded officers figure prominently in the struggle against imperialism. Although their salaries are as big as those of the politico-administrative bureaucracy, they can be relied upon in the struggle against neo-colonialism. The return of the caste spirit, which is potentially present in any profession-

al army, is always possible. It can complicate and even check the national-democratic movement. Therefore great attention should be paid to the intellectual officers in the new African armies.

In conclusion, it would not be out of place to recall that Marx stressed that the permanency of the hegemony of one class directly depends on its ability to unite with the intellectuals and above all with the most outstanding of them:

"The more a class is capable of admitting into its fold the most remarkable persons from the class over which it dominates, the more solid and dangerous its domination."

Imperialism and the bureaucratic strata are seeking to broaden their base. A policy has been carefully elaborated aimed at diverting the intellectuals from the patriotic path and the path of socialism. Therefore a task of primary importance is to unite still more with the intellectuals in the interests of the national-democratic revolution.

Just as at the first stage of the struggle for independence, the intelligentsia will play an irreplaceable role in the struggle for accelerated development. Many intellectuals have already come out against neo-colonialism: the honest patriotism which has led many intellectuals to the positions of scientific socialism stems from their social origin and is often a reaction to the ideological perversion systematically undertaken by colonialism. More and more they integrate themselves with the people in order to comprehend their problems better, to defend their cause more effectively.

THE AGRARIAN QUESTION IN AFRICA

ADEL GHONEIM

The agrarian question occupies a prominent position on the agenda of contemporary African revolutions advancing to liberation and socialism. This is natural in a continent in which the peasants constitute the political army of revolution and the main forces of production. They are the oppressed majority which suffered for a long time both from imperialism and feudal exploitation. The new African national revolutions are essentially peasant revolutions.

The agrarian problem is one of the main questions of the strategy of comprehensive economic development in Africa where agriculture is the main source of national wealth.

The features of the agrarian problem differ from country to country according to the varied economic, social and political conditions. Property relations also vary as do the class structure, the psychological and ideological patterns and the density of population. That is why the solutions are of a rich variety.

However varied the objective and subjective circumstances may be, in the last analysis the general laws of social revolution govern the strategy of the agrarian revolution, mainly the democratic and socialist transformation of agriculture.

The core of the agrarian question posed by the contemporary African situation is the liberation of the peasants from all aspects of feudal and capitalist exploitation, the liberation of the forces of production from semi-feudal and semi-capitalist relationships.

This means a complete revolution in the pattern of agricul-

tural production, in regard to landownership and the very forces of production. It means a transition from agriculture based on underdeveloped small-scale production to a developed socialist agriculture based on production co-operatives capable of utilising the latest scientific inventions and techniques.

The agrarian revolution in African societies characterised by a developed structure (for example Egypt) suggests two successive stages:

- A democratic stage aimed at liquidating semi-feudal production relationships represented in the system of renting landed property. This can be effected through the implementation of a radical agrarian reform transferring the land to those who till it.

- A socialist stage aimed at liquidating capitalist exploitation in the countryside and preventing the development of capitalist agriculture. This can be done by transforming the individual peasants into co-operative peasants.

The democratic stage of the agrarian revolution is the necessary prelude to socialist transformation, and socialist transformation is the inevitable outcome of the democratic stage.

The interdependence of the two stages is shown by the numerous and highly diversified transitional patterns of agricultural co-operatives. They begin with simple co-operation where the peasant retains his private ownership of land and some of the means of production, while the co-operative owns others, such as tractors, fertilisers, machinery and agricultural institutions. During this stage the economic surplus (the co-operative income) is distributed among members according to the units of work and ownership. In this stage the cooperatives acquire a semi-socialist character. But in the more advanced stage they achieve complete co-operative ownership of all the means of production, including land and the co-operative income is distributed only according to work, hence they become full-fledged socialist enterprises.

Socialist transformation has to be effected gradually in a way that coincides with the growth of the forces of production and parallels the expansion and development of the material and modern scientific methods. Socialist farms cannot be established on the basis of individual labour using primitive techniques and implements.

This transition must necessarily be carried through in a democratic way, not through compulsion but by way of convic-

tion. Here arises the importance of political, organisational and ideological work among the peasants. Economic incentives must be provided which benefit the peasantry. A sound system of material and moral incentives must be achieved.

The situation is different when it comes to African countries with an underdeveloped class structure and almost complete absence of private landownership such as prevails in West African countries. Such countries envisage an immediate tackling of the problem of socialist transition in agriculture. They do not need radical agrarian reform so much as the establishment of an active co-operative movement designed to carry out socialist transition in the countryside.

In this thesis we shall tackle two main patterns of the agrarian problems in Africa: that of the West African countries and that of the Egyptian experience.

West African Countries—Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Senegal and the Cameroons

When imperialism invaded West Africa, the societies there were passing into the higher stage of tribal communism, characterised by the disintegration of tribal democracy and the establishment of feudal relationships, hereditary tribal leaderships and monarchical systems.

Imperialism exerted a far-reaching influence on the course of economic and social development in West Africa. The foundations of the closed natural economy based in communal landownership began to collapse as a result of the introduction of export crops such as cocoa (today constituting 60 per cent of these countries' exports) and coffee beans. This collapse has also resulted from the inter-connections between the economies of these countries and the world capitalist market (the cocoa markets in London, Liverpool, Hamburg and New York) dominated by the giant monopolies. Financial relationships in West Africa began to expand. The seeds of capitalism, individualism and tendencies to private ownership grew. Hundreds of thousands of cocoa and coffee farms were established. Primitive communism disintegrated and the collective spirit declined. Various types of transference of landownership made their appearance. Apart from the type of landownership the essential fact was the expansion of private farming, the method of small-commodity production.

Landed Property in West Africa

Because of the transition from communal to private ownership, property relationships in West Africa are characterised by extreme complexity and diversity.

1. *Absolute Private Ownership*

This new phenomenon develops in respect to land and buildings particularly in cities and suburbs and across roads and rivers, where land has become the object of speculation and housing expansion is taking place.

2. *The Remnants of Communal Ownership*

This is centred in pastures and forests unsuitable for economic exploitation. The land provides the people with the requirements of timber for fuel and housing. Today communal ownership is a declining phenomenon in West Africa.

3. *Transitional Relationships of Ownership*

Between the two extremes mentioned above various aspects of transitional forms of ownership have developed on a wide scale. This is the case particularly in the vast regions of cocoa farms where elements of private ownership exist side by side with collective elements. Land transactions become the subject of legal transactions and the rights of inheritance. On the other hand, property relationships still preserve certain elements of tribal communism. Every member of the group has the right to cultivate these lands. The one whose turn is next has to wait for his predecessor to reap his crop and then to allow a period for the land to lie fallow. Foreigners are not allowed to cultivate the land without formal approval from the group, and the group does not allow them to cultivate permanent crops such as cocoa and coffee because that would give their owner some claim to property. Foreigners are not even allowed to cultivate temporary crops without making a payment to the chief of the tribe. However, there is a general tendency towards the consolidation of private ownership, notwithstanding the complications of the property system in West Africa.

Class Structure in the Countryside

With the transition of primitive communal societies into their higher stage, tribal leaders made their appearance as well as the feudal landlords who constituted the social support of imperialist rule in West Africa. With the growth of

capitalism and the spread of private enterprise a petty-bourgeois class of small peasants developed. A bourgeoisie appeared. The classless society was divided into different social classes with conflicting interests, and class struggle began.

Feudal Landlords

This class is composed of tribal chiefs living on the exploitation of peasants. The system of land rents is the dominant feature of feudal exploitation in West African countries, apart from tributes and taxes levied on peasants, forced labour on the lands of the landlords and tributes in kind and in money. This class also gains an additional income by exploiting workers and peasants in commercial transactions. It goes in for speculation and moneylending and profits from criminal activities and fraudulent undertakings.

Feudalism is concentrated in North Nigeria, North and West Cameroon. It existed among the Ashanti tribes of Ghana, but the implementation of agrarian and administrative reforms and the elimination of the hereditary tribal chieftainship system in 1958 led to the liquidation of feudalism in Ghana.

Capitalist Landlords

This stratum of landlords cultivates the land by capitalist methods depending on the exploitation of wage labour. The capitalist landlords include foreign settlers who acquired the best African lands by force and own extensive farms, the comprador class of bureaucratic capitalists and the national bourgeoisie.

The Clergy

The heads of various sects and religions occupy a prominent place in the ranks of the landlords, living on the feudal and capitalistic exploitation of workers and peasants. As a whole they are inimical to the national-liberation movement.

The Rich Peasantry (the Rural Bourgeoisie)

These own relatively large farms on which they work. They depend on exploiting wage labour, have liquid capital at their disposal and carry on profitable commercial transactions.

Specialising in export crops, the rural bourgeoisie has grown remarkably since the Second World War. This is particularly noticeable in the Ivory Coast where this class occupies the strongholds of economic and political power. René Dumont observes that the rural bourgeoisie is responsible for the back-

wardness of agriculture and the stagnant economy of the Ivory Coast. In West Africa and indeed in most African countries the rural bourgeoisie concentrates particularly on unproductive and parasitical activities such as commerce and money-lending.

Middle Landowners

These work for their own interests and cultivate land which they either own or rent. They depend mainly on their own efforts. They usually have little capital and do not employ wage labour if they can help it. In West Africa the middle landowners are a broad class numerically strong.

The Poor Peasants

Members of this class cultivate negligible areas of land insufficient to make a living. Therefore they are compelled to sell their labour power as seasonal workers. The ranks of this class grows rapidly in regions of overpopulation, and it has long lived by cultivating export crops.

The strata of small and poor peasantry is growing in West and North Cameroon, where feudal production relationships prevail. It is also growing in Senegal where agricultural technique is most primitive and undeveloped.

Agricultural Workers

These own nothing but their labour power and work as seasonal labourers on the farms of the big landlords and the rural bourgeoisie. Some West African countries such as Ghana and the Ivory Coast suffer from a shortage of agricultural labour, especially in the harvest season. But in Nigeria there is a large surplus of manpower, concealed unemployment is widespread and there is a good deal of emigration to other areas, especially to West Cameroon.

The shortage of agricultural labour in Black Africa is generally attributed to historical reasons, the most important being the slave trade. There has also been a wholesale drift of the peasantry to the big cities. The population of Accra alone rose by 80 per cent from 1938 to 1948.

The poor peasantry and the agricultural workers are the pillar of the socialist transformation in African agriculture.

The following table produced by the Food and Agricultural Organisation in 1956 shows the structure of the peasantry in West Africa and the special significance of the middle landowners in relation to the population.

Rural classes in West Africa	Average of ownership per capita (in hectares)	Percentage of rural population
1. Landed proprietors and rich peasantry	More than 10	10%
2. Middle landowners	2-10	60%
3. Poor peasantry	Less than 2	30%

Disintegration in Agricultural Production

What contributes most to the backwardness of agriculture in Africa and especially in West Africa is the subdivision of farms into small and uneconomical units and the prevalence of small-commodity production.

In Ghana, for example, we find that the cocoa farms, producing the country's main crop, are distributed according to size as follows:

Farm area (in hectares)	Percentage of total farms
Less than $\frac{1}{2}$	21%
$\frac{1}{2}$ - 2	39%
2-4	37%
4-10	3%

This shows that 97% of farms have a surface area of less than four hectares and 60% of them less than two hectares.

This subdivision greatly reduces the productivity of labour and causes outrageous exhaustion of the material and human forces of production. The situation is aggravated by the scarcity of farm labour in many African countries. The prevalence of small-commodity production is the core of the agrarian problem in Africa, particularly in the West.

The main contradiction in African agriculture is that arising between the narrow frame of small private production, on the one hand, and the social character of modern forces of production [modern technology and scientific agriculture].

Small-scale private farming is a stumbling block in the way of the industrialisation of African countries, especially those which suffer a shortage of manpower. As long as small com-

modity production prevails in the countryside it is impossible to free manpower for industry.

The Co-operative Movement and the Development of Agriculture in West Africa

This means that the problems of agriculture require a socialist solution. There must be a transition from private agriculture based on small-scale production to modern mechanised socialist agriculture. The instrument of this transition is the development of various types of agricultural co-operative, starting with simple co-operation in the field of marketing and credit and developing into the most advanced forms of production co-operative farms. Agricultural co-operation provides the means of creating a modern agriculture and countryside in Africa, and raising the material and cultural standards of millions of African peasants.

The historical experience of the socialist countries has proved that production co-operatives are the best forms of rural economic organisation. They enable the spontaneous growth of capitalism to be controlled.

Marketing cooperatives have attained a remarkable success in many African countries. Their activities and their number have increased greatly in the last few years. The expansion of the co-operative marketing of crops means the abolition of middlemen and limits the exploitation of the peasants by traders. It provides the peasants with a share of their labour surplus which previously the rural traders used to appropriate as trade profits.

Credit co-operative societies are still few in number, and lack of funds limits their activities. The movement to form such societies faces severe resistance from trading networks and monopolies, middlemen and moneylenders.

The highest form of co-operation in agriculture is that of production co-operatives, which do not stop at processing and marketing but directly undertake the administration and organisation of agricultural production. They provide a framework for stable relations of production and distribution on socialist lines. Gradually, distribution according to work replaces distribution according to mere ownership. Such co-operatives are still in their early stages and face many technical and economic difficulties such as the shortage of technical, scientific, administrative and political personnel as well as a shortage of agricultural machinery.

The African co-operative movement is facing the task of controlling the growth of capitalism in the countryside and preventing the rise of a rural bourgeoisie seeking to use the co-operatives for capitalistic development.

In Guinea and Mali the establishment of production co-operatives was accompanied by measures to prevent the appearance of a rural bourgeoisie. In 1959 the government of Guinea passed a law making all sales and rents of farm land subject to state approval. This law enabled the state to control changes in ownership and prevent concentration of the land in the hands of the few.

The most important way to ensure real equality among members of production cooperatives is through the distribution of their income according to the amount and quality of work contributed. In 1960 the government of Guinea issued regulations on this question, setting forth three stages of development of the co-operative movement, in relation to the local circumstances and the development of the enthusiasm and consciousness of the peasants.

In the first stage, collective farms are formed but they are not very extensive and primitive agricultural methods are used.

In the second stage, collective farms are extended and merged into big production units. The state provides agricultural machines on a rental system. Cattle breeding is given special attention at this stage. Thirty per cent of the income is deducted to finance a co-operative fund and to strengthen the financial position and the material basis of the collective farm.

In the third stage the co-operatives become socialist farms in the true sense of the word and all the village land is farmed collectively.

In Senegal the agricultural co-operatives are closely connected with and supervised by the state, which supplies them with technical and material aid. Special attention and priority is given to marketing co-operatives comprising 1,200 societies.

In the Ivory Coast the position of the co-operative movement is very different. The co-operatives, numbering 700 societies with 30,000 members, are dominated by feudal and bourgeois elements. They include and unite landowners and capitalist farmers. Concerned with marketing and raising credit, they mainly serve the rural bourgeoisie.

The Egyptian Experience

Prior to the revolution landownership in Egypt was highly concentrated. Big landowners with more than fifty feddans constituted only five per cent of the total number of landowners but owned 34% of the total arable land. The small landowners comprising 90% of the total number owned only 33% of the farm land. The landless fellaheen (peasants) numbered five million.

The parcelling out of land into smaller properties went on apace. Holdings of less than five feddans increased from 21.8% to 35.5% of the total farm land. At the same time the average landownership went down from 1.45 to 0.9 feddans.

The position was made worse because of intensive exploitation in the countryside through high rents and the *metayage* system.

This parcelling out of land was responsible for an estimated 30% fall in agricultural productivity. The disintegration of landownership is related to two other factors.

First, the weakness of capitalist development—because the supremacy of semi-feudalism handicapped the growth of capitalist farm production, impeded the process of concentration of the means of production and limited capital accumulation.

Secondly, the parasitic nature of banking and commercial capital, dominated by imperialist concerns, drained an important part of the profits of producers and robbed them of their properties. They foreclosed on loans made at usurious rates of interest and held forced auctions of farm products to recover their debts.

A system of semi-feudal production predominated in agriculture, characterised by the rent and *metayage* system. This was a stage of the transition of feudal agriculture (based on internal self-sufficiency and division of labour) to capitalist methods based on production for the market, profits and exploitation of hired labour. Before the revolution, rented lands constituted sixty per cent of the arable land, farmed by four million tenant peasants. Big landlords used to take the fruits of the peasants' work in the form of a money-rent or a share of the crop, usually cotton. The rents of land properties and farmlands before the revolution reached fantastic levels, due to land monopoly and feverish speculation. The rent for one feddan rose to £E50. In 1952 rents swallowed up 48 per cent of total agricultural income.

The rent system hinders the growth of the forces of production and results in stagnation and underdevelopment. It must lead to the fragmentation of the forces of production, for each of the millions of fellaheen only cultivates a small fraction of the land he rents, depending on how much he owns of the primitive means of production. It is impossible to use modern machinery within this framework. It is difficult in such conditions to employ a rational cycle of farm production, so the land deteriorates and loses its fertility.

This system meant that the rents taken by the big landlords swallowed the bulk of the fellaheens' production. The big landowners did not re-invest their profits in the land but went in for luxurious consumption and speculation, especially in buildings. Industry also suffered, because instead of investing the vast amounts which they transferred from the countryside to the cities in industries, they put up palaces and blocks of luxury flats.

The July Revolution and the Land

The Egyptian revolution met the agrarian problem by confiscating the lands of the Royal family and the cancellation of the Wakf system of feudalism. This provided 1,800,000 feddans for the fellaheen.

The agrarian reform aimed at the systematic restriction of landownership. Rent was limited and maximum individual landownership fixed at 100 feddans. The National Charter adopted in 1962 stipulated that by 1970 family ownership too should not exceed 100 feddans. The maximum rent of farm land is fixed at seven times the taxes levied on land. This averages at about £E25 per feddan.

The Revolution paid special attention to co-operatives and played the principal role in building them up. The co-operatives in the agricultural reform sector differ from others in their structure and role. They are made up of small peasants, farming two to five feddans. There are no acute class distinctions among them and generally these co-operatives do not employ wage labour. They are moving from simple credit or marketing co-operatives to becoming production co-operatives.

Agricultural co-operatives outside the agrarian reform sector, however, include big landowners and agricultural capitalists as well as small and poor farmers. Through collaboration with the rural bourgeoisie the big landowners were able to domi-

nate these co-operatives. But in 1961 the government decreed that four-fifths of the seats on the boards of directors of co-operatives must be held by small farmers with less than five feddans. Outside the agrarian reform areas the activities of the co-operatives are limited to obtaining credit and to co-operative marketing.

Co-operative marketing is mainly of such export products as cotton, rice and onions. By applying this policy successfully the revolution was able to defeat the commercial capitalists. The state now has complete domination over the main export products which are primary sources for the national accumulation required for economic development.

The conventional capitalist private enterprise proved bankrupt in the solution of the problem of the fragmentation of agricultural production and ownership. The state intervened to solve this problem in two stages:

During the first stage (1961-64) the organisation and unification of the crop rotation system was successfully achieved. Small and scattered farms were replaced by big farms.

The second stage, that of agricultural organisation, began in 1964. The public sector began to intervene in agriculture and in relations of production on the land, with the aim of re-shaping the private sector on a new socialist basis. These depended on advanced techniques, on using scientific possibilities and methods of organisation and administration. The public sector co-operated with the small farmer in many ways, applying the line of the National Charter:

"Agricultural co-operation is much more than simple credit to which it was confined till recently.

"It starts by the process of pooling agricultural exploitation, which proved to be very successful. It goes parallel with the financial process which protects the farmer and liberates him from usurers and middlemen who take the largest part of the fruit of his labour. Co-operation also enables the farmer to use the most modern machines and scientific means to raise production. It helps the farmer in marketing, which enables him to obtain the highest returns for his continuous labour and toil."*

Reclamation of Desert and Waste Lands

The cultivated area in the UAR represents only four per cent of its surface area. That is why the horizontal expansion

* *The Charter*, English version published by Information Dept., Cairo, p. 63.

of agriculture is a vital necessity. The lands reclaimed since the Revolution (1952) amount to approximately 700,000 feddans. The High Dam project is expected to provide a further two million feddans. These new lands constitute the nucleus of the public sector in agriculture—state farms. An example already exists in Tahrir Province.

The land reform regulations have dealt successive heavy blows to feudalism and land monopoly. The rent system cracked and its sphere of influence has shrank. For the first time a state-co-operative sector has been established in the land reform areas, covering 970,435 feddans or 16 per cent of the total cultivated land.

The Rural Bourgeoisie

There is also, however, a negative aspect. The last few years have witnessed the growth and expansion of an agrarian bourgeoisie, cultivating the land that they own either through rent (on farms from 10 to 50 feddans) or by capitalist exploitation of wage labour. Prominent indications of the growth of the agrarian bourgeoisie are:

a) Those owning from 20 to 50 feddans increased from 22,000 in 1952 to 29,000 in 1964. Their share during that period increased from 654,000 feddans to 812,000 feddans, or from 10.9 per cent to 13.3 per cent of the total cultivated land.

b) The area under vegetable and fruit growing (mainly capitalist agriculture) nearly doubled during the period 1952-1964, increasing from 94,000 to 171,000 feddans; livestock farms have also expanded.

c) Incomes from agriculture, including rent, profit and interests increased from £E307 million in 1960 to £E360.9 million in 1965—an increase of £E53 million or 17.5 per cent.

The increase realised in property returns during this period was gained by the agrarian capitalists in the form of profits. The size of land rent was stabilised during that period and limited according to the law. The agricultural bank provides a system of cheap credit, thus limiting returns to financial capital.

The growth and expansion of the rural bourgeoisie is due to a number of important factors:

- The progressive restriction of landownership and rents has led the big landlords to move over from feudal patterns

of rent and *metayage* to capitalist methods of production: Many big landlords have shifted from the ranks of the feudalists to those of the capitalists and, on the other hand, many of the former tenants have been transformed into agricultural labourers.

- The First Land Reform Bill allowed the big landlords to sell land in excess of legal minimum thus increasing their money capital; 145,000 feddans, most of which were owned by the rural bourgeoisie, were sold to peasants owning less than 10 feddans.

- The law on restriction of rents has led to a decrease in the rents paid to landowners by 50 per cent. This big reduction has benefited the rural bourgeoisie and given them a chance to increase their capital investments in farming.

- Prior to 1961 the rural bourgeoisie, working hand in hand with the big landlords, were able to dominate the agricultural co-operatives and to use them for extending capitalist exploitation on the farms at the expense of the majority of the peasants. The 1961 law reserving four-fifths of the seats on the boards of the co-operatives was aimed at counteracting this tendency. However, in the absence of a vanguard political party in the countryside the rural bourgeoisie and the big landlords were able to frustrate this revolutionary gain and make it purely formal. They succeeded in placing their agents in the seats reserved for small peasants.

The capitalist parasites in agriculture took advantage of the state's agricultural credit system. Unpaid debts by capitalist farmers (those with more than 25 feddans) amounted to £E 60 million (i.e., 75 per cent) of the amount owed to the Bank of Co-operative and Agricultural Credit, although they constituted only 2.51 per cent of the debtors. This means simply that the agrarian capitalists are transforming public capital into private capital. They are using public funds for developing agrarian capitalism. The government, through the crop marketing co-operatives, has retaliated by the compulsory deduction of dues from the proceeds of the crops which are marketed co-operatively.

Parasitic capitalist exploitation in agriculture is also manifested by the fabulous profits obtained by the rural capitalists from renting their agricultural implements (especially tractors, and irrigation equipment) to small farmers at very high prices. They charge 200 piastres for ploughing one feddan, though the cost is only 130 piastres. In this way they make use of

their monopolistic position, for they own 12,672 tractors, 80 per cent of the total. But the agricultural co-operatives own only 1080 tractors, 8 per cent of the total. A similar situation applies with regard to irrigation equipment.

This increase in the social and economic strength of rural capitalism has led to the expansion of its political domination at the expense of the peasant masses. Today, apparently in the absence of the vanguard party in the countryside, the rural bourgeoisie has taken over most of the leading positions in various mass organisations and enterprises, including local committees of the Arab Socialist Union, co-operative societies and village councils. It has penetrated into trade union organisations in the countryside.

Things reached such a dangerous stage that it was necessary last July to set up the Committee for Liquidation of Feudalism, headed by the First Vice-President of the Republic. The function of the Committee is not only to eliminate the class of big landowners who have evaded the laws of the agrarian reform, but also to eliminate the power of the reactionary forces that penetrated into the Socialist Union and into the administrative apparatus in the countryside.

The Committee is putting an end to the feudalist terrorism in the countryside. A conference was held on September 8, this year, comprising members of the Agricultural Development Commission of the National Assembly, the peasant members of the Executive bureaus of governorates and towns, experts on agriculture, irrigation and co-operation and representatives of farm labourers.

The conference adopted a number of important progressive recommendations, such as the cancellation of the *metayage* system and the representation of peasants on the boards of Agricultural Banks in the governorates. The conference recommended that the status of agricultural labourers and seasonal workers be defined, to stop labour contractors infiltrating into the agricultural trade union organisations.

Finally, it recommended that the first steps be taken to set up peoples' councils and that the liquidation of illiteracy should be regarded as a national problem requiring the greatest concentration of effort.

These are the general trends of the development of the agrarian problem in Egypt.

TRUE NATURE OF IMPERIALIST "AID"

MICHAEL HARMEL

It is high time that a more thorough and profound investigation was made into the whole question of imperialist investments and so-called aid in Africa and other areas politely referred to as "developing" areas—a euphemism for the fact that they are areas of extreme poverty. This poverty is, of course, the result of a recent past (in some cases, of a still continuing present) during which their peoples suffered the ravages of colonialism.

Such rare studies as exist on the question of imperialist investments are almost exclusively from the point of view of the investor. And it hardly needs saying that their studies are of no great value to the African and other peoples seeking to understand the nature of imperialist investment and "aid".

Nowadays almost every transaction involving the transfer of capital, goods or personnel from the developed capitalist states to the poor countries is described under the general heading of "aid". Whether the transaction consists of certain grants, often thinly disguised bribes, or old-fashioned private investments, or even military equipment actually destined for use against the "recipients", it is all lumped together as "aid". Thus a picture is gradually, insidiously and persistently built up of "rich" countries as "donors" who generously, benevolently and out of the goodness of their hearts are disposing of vast amounts of "aid" to the "poor countries" which are strangely unappreciative and, even more strangely, do not seem to be getting any richer, but are even falling backward in their living standards, both relatively to the rich countries,

and even in many cases, in absolute terms of average income per head.

The "flow of assistance to less developed countries" from the group of capitalist countries associated with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), comprising the U.S., Canada, Turkey, Japan and all the West European capitalist countries, is estimated in an official publication of this organisation at the sum of 8,655 million U.S. dollars for the year 1964. But the text makes it clear that "the totals are made up of many forms and types of assistance. Grants and loans are added together, as are capital goods, consumer goods and technical assistance".

It should be said that this method of presenting statistics savours more of advertising techniques and propaganda than of serious economic analysis. It is true that, especially in recent years, and under the stimulus of genuine, disinterested and fraternal help given by socialist countries to help overcome the heritage of colonialism, some real and valuable aid has been given by some Western governments. Though, one should add, even here it has frequently been offered under conditions, written or unwritten, which are unacceptable to any country which values its independence. We recall, for example, the action of the West German Government on the occasion of the decision by Tanzania to authorise the opening of a consulate in Dar-es-Salaam by the German Democratic Republic. The Bonn Government thereupon unilaterally broke a Five-Year Training and Aid Agreement with Tanzania. Tanzania, on its part, cancelled all its other aid agreements with Bonn. As explained by President Julius Nyerere: "The choice before Tanzania was then clear: we could either accept dictation from West Germany and continue to receive economic aid until the next time we proposed to do something they did not like, or we could maintain our policies and lose the aid immediately. In effect, therefore, we had to choose whether to become a puppet state of Germany in return for any charity she cared to give us."

Capitalist governments have not changed their nature—they will not easily be found giving "something for nothing". The newly-independent African countries may desperately need capital for development projects; but the purpose of development is to safeguard and consolidate independence; if the granting of capital is at the price of independence then its purpose is defeated from the outset. Thus, even the cession

of outright grants is not the simple and straightforward transaction it may appear to be. The "rich" donor (grown rich, let us remember, by the very process of imperialist exploitation and downright looting which has made the recipient "poor") is by no means actuated by purely benevolent and altruistic motives. Bullying, blackmail, intrigue, interference and corruption are often the ugly accompaniment of what is paraded as charity.

Another form of "aid" is loans, whether "soft" (long-term, low-interest) or "hard" (short-term, high-interest), on a government-to-government basis. Again we must question the semantic basis of calling this type of transaction "aid". Usually the loans are "tied"; they are meant for the purchase of specific equipment from the country which makes the loan. If Government money is lent, it amounts to the taxpayer in the capitalist country financing the private manufacturers and middlemen who supply the equipment or services concerned. In his book *International Aid*, the Oxford economist, I. M. D. Little, makes the shrewd observation that: "It is misleading to lump these (loans) [and some other kinds of "aid"] together when assessing either the costs to donors and lenders or the benefits to recipients. *Moneylenders may benefit their clients, but we do not think of them as giving aid.*"

It must also be observed with respect to the granting and receiving of state-to-state loans:

(a) that very often loans are "sold" by high-pressure imperialist salesmen not very scrupulous in their methods for the purpose of buying goods and equipment of no real value in development, and

(b) that many African countries are finding an increasing proportion of their already low revenues going towards "servicing" previous loans—that is, to paying them back, plus interest. With states as with individuals, it is not sound practice to find oneself in the clutches of the moneylenders.

According to the *London Times* (September 26, 1966), the rate of accumulation of new debts has fallen to a 10 per cent increase a year compared with 15 per cent in 1964, "but the burden of debt repayments is costing the poorer countries 9 per cent of their export earnings".

According to a UN Report, seven African countries (Rhodesia, Malawi, Sudan, Ghana, Nigeria, Morocco and Tunisia) alone spent 143 million dollars in 1963 (as against 31 million in 1956) in repaying loans.

Thus, one finds that unless the utmost caution is exercised in analysing exactly what kind of "aid" is being given by the capitalist countries, we shall be merely contributing towards creating the absurd and distorted picture they are trying to draw—of kind, wealthy "donors", on the one hand, and poor, ungrateful "receivers", on the other. To take an extreme example: At enormous cost to the American taxpayer, all kinds of bombs and missiles, chemical and biological weapons, are manufactured in America, transported in American ships, loaded into American aircraft and dropped by US military personnel on Vietnam villages to kill women and children and to destroy the hard-won economic achievements of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. And this ghastly project, with grotesque and unbelievable audacity, is labelled "aid for Vietnam" and paraded before the world as part of the "programme for assistance to developing countries".

A particularly blatant misuse of this overworked expression "aid" is its application to the field of private investment in Africa and other areas rich in raw materials but poor in living standards. The monopoly firms which invest their capital in our countries have no intention of "aiding" anyone except themselves. They seek only their own profit and enrichment.

They are not in the least interested in how many starving, illiterate people, prey to avoidable diseases, there may be in an African country. They are interested in:

1. The presence in large quantities of valuable raw materials which can be removed and taken abroad for sale. This accounts for the preponderance of imperialist investments in African countries with large deposits of oil, gold, diamonds, copper, etc.

2. The existence of what they call "political stability". This means in practice regimes which are sympathetic to the needs of foreign investors, give them priority in the supply of power, transport, water, etc., see that labour is cheap, docile and abundant, guarantee against militant trade union or radical political opposition. The "ideal" regime from the point of view of the imperialist investor is the old-fashioned colonial administration. But as that is no longer possible they would like to have a regime which conforms as closely as possible to the pattern set in colonial times, with the difference only that Africans are found to fulfil the functions of the previous imperialist administration. Unfortunately, such Africans are to be found among the social strata which have adopted the out-

look of the West European and North American bourgeoisie—selfish individualism and “get-rich-quick” at all costs. It is from such strata that personnel is recruited for the neo-colonialist regimes of which, unfortunately, several examples are to be found in Africa.

Of course, one cannot deny that, subjected to proper control and provided that it does not play a dominant part in the economy, foreign investment, from whatever source, can play a positive role in the development of independent economies. But neither should one forget that the export of capital by the finance-capital monopolies is at the very heart and essence of modern imperialism.

In his classic work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, written fifty years ago, but still the most penetrating characterisation of imperialism, Lenin drew attention to just this aspect, when he wrote:

“Imperialism is capitalism in that stage of development in which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital has established itself; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance; in which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun; in which the division of all territories of the globe among the biggest capitalist powers has been completed.”

Of course, that was before October 1917, when the process of wresting a large part of the earth's territory out of the sphere of imperialism and capitalism began—a process which is continuing at ever-increasing speed. But otherwise there is nothing in Lenin's definition which needs to be changed.

African governments which are prepared to modify their internal and external policies in order to “attract” imperialist investment may have the highest motives, but in fact they are placing their independence in the gravest jeopardy.

It is true that imperialist investment does provide the appearance of change and development. Mines and oil wells and other enterprises are provided, an infra-structure of railways and communications may be developed and be of lasting value. But we must never lose sight of the underlying reality—the purpose of the export of such capital to our countries is not to put wealth into Africa but to extract wealth from Africa for the benefit of foreigners. Any marginal and incidental advantages (and often these are illusory rather than real) for African countries are subordinate to the purpose of the investments.

My own country, South Africa, is a striking example of the effects of unrestrained admission of imperialist capital on its own terms. South Africa was "made safe" for foreign capitalists by the Boer War of British imperialism seventy years ago. It became the pioneer example of neo-colonialism already at the beginning of this century when political power was transferred to the white minority. Since then more imperialist investment has poured into the South of our continent than into all the other countries and regions of Africa put together. British investment alone, on the basis of real, not book, values of shares, is estimated at over £1,500 million. Other foreign investments, U.S., French, West German, Japanese, etc., are rapidly increasing. In 1960 alone, during the massive "rescue operation" mounted by U.S. finance capital to prop up the economy of the apartheid regime, American investments (including loans from the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) were poured in to an extent exceeding \$200 million.

How was South Africa "benefited" by these investments? It can be said that we have a good transport system, modern railways, ports, roads. We have big and imposing cities, shops crowded with luxury goods, a vast and costly state apparatus unparalleled in Africa, developed agriculture and secondary industries.

But what a price has been paid for these "assets" which exist in our country but are the exclusive property of foreigners and the privileged white minority! Here are only some of the debit items:

1. 87 per cent of the country is in the hands of the alliance of indigenous whites and foreign imperialists. The 87 per cent includes all the industries, developed agriculture, cities, harbours, airports and other wealth—largely the creation, let us remember, of the labour, the sweat and the blood of our enslaved African majority.

2. The remaining overcrowded 13 per cent "reserved" for Africans is a vast rural slum, typical of "undeveloped" Africa, entirely incapable of supporting its population or developing its resources.

3. Politically, socially and economically the price of this one-sided development has been the establishing of a regime of unbridled terror and racialism, whose crimes and outrages against humanity are on a par with those of Hitler Germany.

4. The vast state machinery is basically a frightful engine of

oppression and aggression to subjugate the revolutionary masses and threaten the independence of the entire continent of Africa.

One could prolong this list of negative results of imperialist investment in Southern Africa indefinitely. Let those African leaders who are so keen to encourage foreign imperialist investment at any cost pay heed to the lessons of the South. It may cause them to think again.

It is precisely because the Republic of South Africa is an investor's paradise that the big imperialist powers are out, at such pains, to protect and save the evil Pretoria regime from the anger of the South African masses and their supporters in Africa and all over the world.

To deceive world opinion, and with loathsome hypocrisy, they pretend to condemn apartheid as morally indefensible. But in practice the imperialist powers obstruct every international attempt to make South Africa observe elementary human rights. They sabotage solemn decisions for sanctions, boycotts and isolation of this regime. They defy UN resolutions and maintain and extend their diplomatic and commercial relationships, their military links with South Africa. They protect Smith and his gangsters in Zimbabwe, they arm Salazar in Mozambique, Angola and "Portuguese" Guinea. They pack and manoeuvre the so-called International Court of Justice so as to condone the illegal annexation of the mandated territory of South West Africa.

More and more it is becoming clear that the regime of the Nazi hangman Vorster is in fact not an independent government at all. South Africa is in the pockets of the international finance-capitalist monopolies. In fact Vorster and his gang are their junior partners, their caretakers and their policemen.

Imperialist investors in African countries ask and receive a high rate of return on their investments. They expect to see their capital outlay back again in about four years. That means an annual rate of profit of 25 per cent or more.

We hear much about the "flow of investments" from the "donor countries" to the "recipients". But very little is said about the *reverse flow*—the flow of profits, dividends, interest payments and invisible exports from the "poor" countries back to the "rich" ones. The imperialists have been exporting capital to Africa for over fifty years. Many of their "investments" have been repaid many times over in the natural wealth and the creative labour of our working people. The

figures for so-called "aid" are well publicised, but the figures for the *reverse flow* are discreetly hidden away and hard to get. I suggest that this reverse flow is far bigger in volume than all the so-called aid put together.

I suggest that these figures will go a long way to explaining exactly *why we are "poor" and they are "rich"*.

The imperialists have been draining our countries for generations, and they are still doing so. We shall never overcome our backwardness and establish true independence and equality for our people until this drainage is stopped. That means, above all, that Africans must be masters in their own countries. Africa's wealth must be restored to its rightful owners, the African people.

AHS

THE ALLIANCE OF THE FORCES OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

The Egyptian Experience of the Form of the State in the Stage of Transition to Socialism

DR. FUAD MURSI

Every revolutionary situation divides society in two: the classes and social forces who are for the revolution and those who are against it.

The victory of the revolution as a whole depends on the ability of its leaders correctly to estimate the position, at each stage, of the various classes in society.

Who is for the revolution and who is against it? In whose hands does power reside, and to whose hands shall it be transferred? This is the decisive question.

The position of each social class is not determined by good or bad intentions, but by objective criteria which are subject to scientific analysis.

A class is defined primarily by its place in the system of social production, its relation to the means of production, its role in the social organisation of labour, and consequently by the extent of its share in the wealth of society and the means by which it acquires this wealth.

The attitude of a class towards the revolution depends on its role in the process of social production. Does it play a role that increases production quantitatively and qualitatively? Do its activities increase the material wealth of society? Does it seek for new productive forces? Does it go ahead with production, develop productive forces and the relations of social production? In brief, does it propel the wheel of history forward or hold it back?

The answers to these questions will show whether each specific class is for or against the revolution.

At the outset, the leaders of the revolution must define the position of each class so as to be able to establish an alliance of revolutionary classes in order to liquidate anti-revolutionary classes which no longer contribute to production, and have become a fetter on the forces and relations of production, the classes whose social role has ended. Such an alliance can overthrow the power of the old reactionary classes and establish the power of the new revolutionary classes.

Through such alliances every revolution established its new power. In France, the bourgeois revolution was accomplished through the broad alliance of revolutionary classes led by the rising bourgeoisie. In Tsarist Russia the proletarian revolution was accomplished through the alliance of revolutionary classes led by the proletariat.

The Alliance of the Working People

Similarly the alliance of the forces of the working people was established in Egypt.

The victory of the national revolution, especially in the Suez battle, immediately raised the issue of economic independence. The revolution had to go on. The national leaders in the top-most positions moved forward from a conventional nationalist position to one of aiming at long-range national and social transformation. In 1961 and thereafter they took executive measures to realise this aim.

The National Charter adopted in 1962 expressed this trend in the formulation "The Inevitability of the Socialist Solution". This glorious slogan was accompanied by the organisational slogan of "The Alliance of the Working People's Forces". This was not just a state constitutional formula. It was basically a fighting concept for the continuity of the revolution itself. The masses have placed their hopes in this concept by which the country is being peacefully transformed to socialism. In fact "The Alliance of the Working People's Forces" is the Egyptian formula for state power during the period of transition to socialism.

At this stage the leaders of our revolution declared that the alliance of feudalism and non-national capitalism should be overthrown and replaced by its legitimate heir, the alliance of the working people's forces.

The nature of the present stage of the revolution provides objective conditions for the rallying of a number of social forces from the revolutionary camp, comprising mainly the workers, peasants, soldiers and revolutionary intellectuals, together with the sections of the national capitalist class who accept the socialist way of development and who take part in developing production.

The camp of counter-revolution is composed of the forces of the old regime which arose on the basis of domination by the exploiting feudalist and capitalist classes. These forces include the feudalists, big capitalists and sections of the bureaucratic capitalists who isolated themselves from the revolution and opposed its objectives. These forces strive to retain their class privileges and reject the power of the working people. They are backed by colonialism and neo-colonialism, and by Arab reaction whether open or concealed.

The Historical Conditions in Which the New Power Appeared

History has placed each class where it is. It is the Egyptian revolutionary experience and the character of our society which has produced for us this new power and which governs our particular path to socialism. We should therefore consider the main features of our experience which has shaped the form of our revolution.

First, *the Suez battle* was the peak of national struggle which abolished imperialist domination and exposed feudalism. The big bourgeoisie had to choose whether to participate in Egyptian development or align itself with colonialism and feudalism. The Suez battle also demonstrated the character of the working people, their genuine patriotism and readiness to repel the invaders. The battle of Suez sharply defined the two camps—revolutionary and counter-revolutionary.

Secondly, *the struggle for economic development* made it imperative to advance the revolution to a higher level. A national revolution will be abortive if it is not transformed into a social revolution, responding to the demands of the classes which had long been deprived of social changes. Because these demands were neglected by the leaders of the 1919 revolution, that revolution stopped half-way. These leaders left the peasant question as it was before, carried on a fierce struggle against the workers and tried to corrupt the conscience of

the intellectuals. They even failed to develop a significant national bourgeoisie.

After the Suez battle, when the country faced an intense economic struggle, the big bourgeoisie was isolated and shown up for what it was: a class aligned with imperialism and feudalism, sabotaging development and hostile to economic independence.

Once the issue of independence had, in essence, been decided the fate of the revolution depended on the struggle for development and social change. The choice of the socialist way of development was inescapable. It was a historical inevitability.

Thirdly, the national bourgeoisie played a positive role in the national revolution. Imperialism had intensified the unevenness of economic development of capitalism. Therefore the capitalist class always strove to drive out imperialism and liquidate feudalism. Most of them, in the interests of the national revolution, were prepared to go a long way to strengthen independence and carry through reforms. They showed great revolutionary potentiality. A large section of the nationalist capitalist class have been prepared to accept socialism as a means for developing our economy and consolidating independence.

Fourthly, the workers' socialist and communist organisations were not able to become an effective revolutionary force. They lacked close ties with the masses, especially with the peasant majority. This led to a lack of mass political consciousness. Progressive Egyptians contributed a great deal in spreading socialist ideas and strengthening the democratic movement. They influenced important sections of the workers and intellectuals. But they were hampered by the concentration of the forces of imperialism on Egypt, an efficient state machine that was used for oppression and persecution by the reactionaries, and by the lack of well-established democratic traditions in our country.

The terrorism used by reactionary forces against the Communists and all progressive social movements limited their links with one another and greatly weakened all of them.

All these factors mentioned above determined the slogan of the alliance of the working people's forces as the most suitable formulation in Egyptian circumstances.

Revolutionary Power

To proclaim the establishment of a new power by means of a constitutional declaration is not enough. The old regime does not fall of its own accord. A revolutionary struggle must be waged by the masses to seize the strongholds of reaction and to gain control over capital and over the state. This struggle is still going on. The reactionary alliance is still in existence. The total conquest of power by the forces of the working people is essential for the accomplishment of the tasks of the period of transition to socialism.

The solid social base of the revolution is the people's domination of the means of production—the ownership of the main means of production represented by the public sector and the development of the co-operative movement in agriculture.

Politically, the widest masses must be united, organised and developed ideologically. The Arab Socialist Union and its political leadership provides the basis for the political and organisational expression of national unity.

The National Charter provides an ideological foundation. It applies scientific socialism to the particular needs of our people and their continuing revolution. This basis is enlarged by the revolutionary activities and ideological contributions of President Nasser and other leaders of the revolution.

Thus, the three bases of the alliance of the working people are social, organisational and ideological.

Like life itself, these three bases do not remain static, but are always developing in the unfolding revolution. The leaders, the mass movement and its unerring revolutionary sense, are continuously advancing.

Democracy and Dictatorship

The new power contains both aspects of a state, a democracy and a dictatorship. The dictatorial aspect is directed against the enemies, and the democratic aspects serve those who hold power, the working people. There is every freedom for the people, but no freedom for reactionary feudalism and capitalism.

The revolutionary forces cannot remain aloof from power. They must make full use of it against counter-revolution. For a long time state power has been used against the revolution

ary forces. Now it is a means to be used by these forces in the service of historical progress.

Dictatorship is power, unrestricted by law, and relying on the forces of the revolution. Of course, the aspects of dictatorship should not exceed the limits needed to accomplish the tasks of the transition period. Its use is limited to breaking down the resistance of the exploiters and to achieve reconstruction. Its three basic methods are:

First, the economic liquidation of the feudalists and capitalists by dispossessing them of their property, with or without compensation.

Secondly, the political liquidation of these classes, through depriving them of political rights and isolating them.

Thirdly, their social liquidation, banishing from the countryside the feudalists who resist progress, together with the leaders of their terrorist gangs.

Despite all these measures influential vestiges of the exploiting classes remain, supported by international capitalism. It must not be forgotten that capitalist values and customs have been entrenched for countless generations. The resistance of the exploiting elements is multiplied after their overthrow, and there is all the more need to use the full resources of state power against them.

For the working people, however, this dictatorship is a democracy. The new regime does not consist mainly in the use of power. It means above all the organisation of social labour at higher levels than capitalism can achieve.

The working people's democracy is a form of class alliance of the various classes defined above. For this broad section of social forces it is a comprehensive democracy.

The working people's democracy does not signify the end of class struggle. It is a development of that struggle in new forms, more advanced, more mature and more suitable for the aim of abolishing classes altogether.

Unity Within the Alliance

All the forces of the working people stand together against the forces of counter-revolution. They form a national unity expressed in the Arab Socialist Union, the primary organisational level of the alliance. The state, established by this alliance for national unity, advances the revolution, safeguards true democratic values and provides an arena for the

democratic resolution of class struggles among the working people's forces.

The state formed of these healthy forces within the nation is not that of one class, but of several revolutionary classes.

Which class plays the leading role? The answer to this question varies at different stages of our revolution. In the first stage the national bourgeoisie played the leading part. In the following stage, which is still continuing, the petty bourgeoisie and its ideologists among the revolutionary intellectuals, are in the lead. However, of all these classes the working class is destined by history to play the leading part in building socialist society. But it will not attain this leading position until the peasant masses and the revolutionary intellectuals recognise its fitness for leadership and are convinced that this is the sure guarantee for complete victory.

The unity of the toiling masses, the workers and peasants, is the basis of national unity and the guarantee of transition to socialism. These classes are the majority of the people. They have suffered exploitation for many years and are deeply interested in the revolution. The National Charter, based on the democratic experience of the revolution, has stipulated three important principles to establish this class unity:

- Reserving half the seats in representative assemblies for peasants and workers;
- Allowing workers to participate in the administration of enterprises in the public sector;
- The domination of co-operative societies by the rural poor.

There are two levels of unity, that of national unity among all revolutionary forces, and that of class unity between the workers and peasants.

This should be reflected by two levels of organisation. On the national level there is the Arab Socialist Union. On the level of class organisations there is the political organisation, which, it is suggested, might be called the Party.

This political organisation is not a Communist Party. Though guided by scientific socialism, the tested scientific doctrine, it does not adopt the philosophical principles of Marxism-Leninism. Its social base is much wider than the working class, although it recognises the special significance of the working class within its ranks.

We proceed from certain facts. Scientific socialism, the

science of socialism, is victorious on a world scale. Tested revolutionary leaders, headed by the militant Gamal Abdel Nasser are there to fulfil the people's aspirations for building socialism and accomplish achievements of a socialist character. Many socialists, including the Marxists, who do not have a separate organisation but rally around the leadership of President Nasser, are participating. Proceeding from these facts, the issue of uniting all socialist forces arises with all its political and organisational implications. We arrive at the following important conclusions:

- Considering the different ideological schools of the Egyptian Socialists, and the broad social forces on which the Party depends, the political organisation which is called for at this stage is not a Communist Party;
- In order to lay the foundations of unity amongst socialists, the Egyptian Communist Party has terminated its independent organisational existence;
- To unite the socialist forces the immediate task is to build a political party which will express their unity. This has become the critical task of the present political situation.

The Struggle Within the Alliance

The conquest of state power by the forces of the working people cannot in itself abolish existing social contradictions.

What has been accomplished is to overthrow the reactionary alliance and to clear the way for democratic interaction among the forces of the working people.

The present stage of the revolution is one of transition from capitalism to socialism. As in all transitory stages there are phenomena and their antitheses, sharp conflicts between the old and the new. Problems are inter-related, complex and unresolved.

Although the present transitional stage is peaceful, it witnesses the most acute class struggle we have ever known.

This applies not only to the struggle between the revolutionary and the counter-revolutionary forces, but also to the struggle within the ranks of the revolution itself, a non-antagonistic struggle between allied, friendly forces which at this stage do not seek to liquidate one another. The acuteness of the struggle is a reflection of the backwardness of the forces of socialism, of the forces of production.

Side by side with the landowners are the peasants. Side by side with the national capitalists are the workers. There are the managing personnel in the nationalised factories and department stores. There are the peasants in the co-operative societies and the various ranks of the civil service. The alliance of the working people is one which brings together a number of classes, united against counter-revolution, but differing among themselves. It is an alliance that involves social contradictions and class struggles which—as pointed out by the Charter—cannot be denied or ignored, but which should be resolved peacefully.

The alliance itself, as an expression of national unity, provides a framework within which such contradictions may be dealt with in a peaceful manner.

To do this there must be democratic interaction among the forces of the working people and the practice of criticism and self-criticism. There must be freedom of expression of revolutionary classes, and organised, objective dialogue between their leaders and representatives.

The basis for the peaceful resolution of contradictions is the common socialist objective of abolishing exploitation and classes. The cardinal condition for peaceful struggle is the continuation of the revolution: maintaining the revolutionary leadership of the state, liquidating vestiges of exploitation, advancing steadily towards the resolution of class differences by abolishing them. The existence of classes is no more than a passing stage in the history of mankind. They will disappear when productivity is sufficient to provide abundance for everyone.

Should a class deviate from the socialist path, contradictions within the alliance of the working people could become hostile and this may lead to their settlement in a non-peaceful manner.

The transitional stage presumes mutual concessions by all revolutionary classes, especially the national capitalists. This stage imposes on them the need for great sacrifices to develop the national wealth and unleash productive forces so as to achieve socialist production relations. This is the only practical way to resolve class differences.

To use the working people's alliance as a means of self-advancement or to accentuate class differences, neglecting the development of the national wealth or preventing the establishment of socialist production relations in town and country

—all such tendencies intensify class struggle within the alliance.

No revolutionary class can be permitted to abandon its duty of making the necessary sacrifices for the revolutionary advances.

No class can be permitted to take advantage of the sacrifices made by other classes to ascend the class ladder, retaining its privileges or seeking to increase them.

No class or part of a class can be allowed to retain its leading position in the alliance if it abandons its revolutionary role in production or becomes a stumbling block to national development.

The situation within the alliance will not remain unchanged. The balance between classes will not remain stable while life continues to rush ahead. The rising level of class and political consciousness and the spread of new socialist values must inevitably lead to sharp class struggle, reflected in a shift in the balance of class forces.

The Development of Class Struggle

The first five-year plan saw the development of class struggle within the alliance. It took place at a difficult period in the stage of transformation to socialism.

The first nationalisations immediately after the Suez victory enabled planning to begin. But these nationalisations affected only the capital of the imperialists.

When the plan was drawn up in 1959-1960 it necessitated large-scale nationalisation from 1961 onwards, affecting big local capital and sometimes even medium-sized capital. Thus the first five-year plan, according to Ali Sabry, General Secretary of the A.S.U., was the bridge across which economic power passed into the hands of the working people.

Public ownership was established of the principal means of production in industry, finance and commerce. The movement towards modern industrialisation was begun though its basis was mainly light industry. The working class grew in size, quality and consciousness.

On the other hand, in the countryside there was widespread subdivision into small farms, which is not conducive to increased productivity. The question arises as to what should be done with the land that will be reclaimed in the course of the High Dam project. If it were to be distributed among

small peasant holders it would not help solve the problem of productivity in agriculture. That is why Hussenein Hetkal, Editor-in-Chief of *Al Ahram*, suggested that all new land should be cultivated as state farms.

During the first five-year plan the countryside became the centre of reactionary groupings of feudalists and big capitalists. They attempted to impose feudal and semi-feudal social relations, making the countryside the stronghold of counter-revolution. Taking advantage of the consolidation of reactionary forces hiding behind various state organs, armed bands of the Moslem Brotherhood arose.

The feudalists, big landowners and capitalists resisted and dodged the Agrarian Reform laws. They refused to hand over land exceeding the legal maximum, scattering their property in different provinces and faking sale contracts to their dependents and members of their families. They had their accomplices within the agrarian reform, taxation, and property registration administrations. They seized the land from the peasants without payment and forced them to work without wages during the sowing and harvest seasons. Small tenants were forced to sign blank contracts, stipulating neither the area leased nor the rents. Peasants were forced to sign blank bills and receipts.

The feudal masters installed their servants and agents as "owners" to dodge the Agrarian Reform Law, and used them to entrench their own position as feudalists. They hired armed Bedouin bands to terrorise villages. The fact was that reaction in the countryside was armed. Through the village headmen, the feudalists controlled the apparatus of local government and law enforcement. Because of coercion or because they were afraid of standing for election, peasants conceded their seats in the co-operatives and the Arab Socialist Union to the feudalists.

Thus the feudalists controlled the state organs as well as the political, economic and other organisations and institutions in the countryside. Their influence was extended far and wide.

Their power reached its height after they were dispossessed of their land through sequestration and received substantial compensation. Using semi-feudal production relations they proceeded to a capitalist way of life.

In Menoufia Province the Fiky family was subjected to sequestration in 1961. Yet by 1966 it had accumulated six times as

much as what it had in 1961. It abandoned feudal exploitation for capitalist exploitation. Live-stock and dairy farms, fruit and vegetable cultivation, the renting of land and the leasing of irrigation equipment and trucks were among its activities. Through their accomplices in the Agrarian Reform administration they were able to purchase fruit crops and cattle produced at low cost by the state, and to sell them at semi-monopoly prices, thus making fabulous profits.

Fearing a rise in wages as a result of the opening of a new state-owned flax factory, the feudalists burnt it down. When the armed plot instigated by the Moslem Brotherhood failed, the feudalists resorted to assassinations to liquidate peasant leaders. Reaction was rampant in the countryside.

At this stage the leaders of the revolution set up a committee, headed by Field Marshall Abdel-Hakim Amer, Executive member of the Arab Socialist Union, for liquidating the vestiges of feudalism. This became a new revolutionary organ of the state, with powers to confiscate the feudallists' property and banish them from the countryside, to prosecute subversive elements and dismiss them from state posts. With the support of the peasant mass movement this committee was able to carry out the biggest revolutionary movement the countryside had ever seen. A number of economic positions held by the reactionaries were liquidated, and traditional governing organs in the countryside were overthrown. Mass struggle by the peasants can overthrow old state organs and establish new ones, but when this is attempted without mass struggle the new organs do not easily become part of the life of the people.

The Development of National Capitalism

No doubt the national capitalist class is one of the forces of the working people. It won its prominent position because of its revolutionary ability in the struggle against imperialism and feudalism. After the Suez battle it took over the most important, economic and state positions, and dominated the public sector. It agreed to participate in socialist reconstruction, its members occupying leading posts in the ASU.

However, the experience of the five-year plan has revealed dangerous tendencies in the ranks of the national capitalist class. It has grown phenomenally and developed three distinct sections. There is a parasitic section that abstained from the

development of production and national wealth. There is a bureaucratic capitalist sector, holding top positions in the public sector and working in co-operation with the parasitic elements to transform the public sector into a source of financial accumulation for the private sector. Finally, there is the productive section of the capitalist class that is still occupied both in the cities and the rural areas with the development of production.

The facts speak for themselves.

In the third year of the plan the private sector accounted for 93.8 per cent the total income from agriculture, 58.4 per cent of that from industry, 79.1 per cent of that from trade, 87.5 of that from housing construction and 30.6 per cent of the income of educational and cultural services. 65.8 per cent of the national income was accounted for by the private sector.

In the same year the distribution of profits between the public and the private sectors was as follows:

<i>In millions of Egyptian pounds</i>			
Net Profits	Estimated	Actual	Difference
Public	178	166	-13
Private	388	441	+53
	567	607	+40

This means that 13 million pounds infiltrated to the private sector from the public sector, in addition to the expected profits of the public sector.

A number of facts illustrate the development of different sections within the national capitalist class.

Those engaged in wholesale trade, contracting, the transport of freight and big property owners were transformed into a parasitic capitalist class. From production these elements moved over to hoarding, smuggling and black market activity. They formed price rings in tendering for contracts in the public sector. Thus, building construction prices increased by about 12.5 per cent in the second year of the plan, 30 per cent in the third year, 47 per cent in the fourth year, and 50 per cent in the fifth year of the plan. It must be remembered that construction costs amount to 40-50 per cent of total investments under the plan.

The economic surplus actually increased, but most of it

was absorbed by public services and administration costs.

The administrative apparatus of the government and the public sector have become a burden on development and an obstacle to democratizing the state organs.

Rural capitalism has grown to a stage where it absorbs half the total income from agriculture. Returns from land were about £E100 million. The property of medium owners (holding 20 to 50 feddans) increased by 24 per cent of what it was before the revolution.

These facts confirm the conclusion drawn by Ali Sabry, Secretary-General of the A.S.U., in his analysis of the plan. The exploiting national capitalist class seeks to channel the product of revolutionary efforts to swell their own profits.

The Development of the Working People's Power

Therefore, it is still necessary to mobilise the alliance of the working people against the reactionary alliance and defeat it completely. Those sections of the national capitalist class that seek to appropriate the fruits of the revolution must be liquidated.

This alliance must be developed in a democratic way, raising the morale of the people and arming them with socialist consciousness.

We must avoid the erroneous theory that formerly prevailed in some socialist states. Calling for the intensification of class struggle as economic development went ahead, steps were taken to restrict democracy within the ranks of the people themselves, and socialist legality was abandoned.

Only democracy can make citizens equal in their country. Only through democracy can we guarantee that the class struggle will be resolved peacefully among the ranks of the people, can we peacefully wrest the new power from the grips of the old. Democracy is the instrument to liquidate reaction and peacefully complete the transition to socialism.

As President Nasser has pointed out, democracy is concerned with all aspects of life, beginning with production. Once democracy has been ensured in the sphere of production various forms and institutions of political democracy can be established. But without democracy in the field or the factory, political democracy will be set at naught.

Democracy is the basis of the development of the public sector. The principle of workers' participation in administra-

tion is the embodiment of democracy in production. Popular supervision must be ensured from the start. The people must participate in drawing up and carrying out plans for production. The workers in each unit must be mobilised for the administration of production on a democratic basis.

Production councils bringing together the board of directors, the trade union committee and representatives of the A.S.U. is a sound and original idea. In addition, production conferences in the factories, public sector enterprises and co-operatives are necessary for the democratising of production.

The next requirement is political democracy. It is based on every possible freedom for the working people alone: freedom of expression, of organisation, of movement, of political action. In calling for democracy for the people we must define clearly what we mean by "the people". We mean the peasant—one living by his own labour and that of his family on a property not exceeding 5 feddans; the worker—he who owns nothing but his wages and is not working in the capacity of a manager; the national capitalist—one who engages in production, not the parasite or the bureaucrat.

Finally, there is local democracy. The National Charter introduced the genuinely democratic principle of devolving authority from the centre to the local authorities and from there to the people themselves. In the provinces and in the countryside half the seats on the local popular councils are reserved for workers and peasants. The simplest peasant in the most remote village may participate in local administration and self-government.

This is the way democracy develops. Democracy is not just a matter of setting up formal institutions. It is a continuous militant process that goes on all the time. The people rules itself as it learns in everyday life to solve its problems.

The consciousness of the people is the precondition for this process; without this, democracy is meaningless. In the same way class consciousness plays the decisive part in the process of socialist development.

The people's state does not emerge at one stroke. It is not realised according to a preconceived plan, nor does it develop according to preconceived specifications. It is rather formed through the revolutionary struggles of the masses of the people to liquidate the old way of life and to build a new and better society.

PLANNING AND SOURCES OF ACCUMULATION

SHOEIB M. EL-RIFI

A thorough analysis of our countries' experience over the past several years in the fields of planning, capital accumulation and economic growth confirms the view that a capitalist pattern of development cannot solve our problems.

We should now, however, go beyond this, to work out a precise and scientific theory of *non-capitalist development for African countries*; a theory that—avoiding generalisations and routine formulae—would be based on the analysis of concrete realities, and make use of all the data provided by modern economic and social science.

Such an undertaking would certainly be hard and complicated. For it to be carried out successfully will require tremendous effort, research and repeated consultations between African liberation movements which, much as they have in common, are working in different social and political conditions. But the elaboration of such a theory now seems to us to be a vital necessity for our everyday work and as an integral part of our ideological and political struggle, to improve our methods of struggle and make it more effective by casting a clearer light on the path to the future.

Causes of Failure in Planning

After independence, most African governments proclaimed that planning was the main method of development. But what has happened? A few countries, notably the UAR, launched out on a genuine process of planning, with all its social, eco-

conomic and political implications. Apart from these countries we find that in most cases there is no real planning of economic development at all. This is because:

1. No social, economic and institutional transformations actually took place. Apart from other failures, there were no decisive changes in social relations in agriculture, and foreign monopolies remained predominant in vital sectors of the economy.

2. State intervention lacked vigour. It was very often conceived as being supplementary to the private sector. It did not lead to the establishment of a sufficiently developed public sector, quantitatively and qualitatively capable of playing a major role in economic growth.

3. Planning was also obstructed by the development of a bureaucratic and commercial bourgeoisie, enriching itself through direct or indirect use of the state machinery, by bribery, "commissions", and the like. Naturally this stratum of society regards genuine planning as opposed to its interests and offers powerful resistance to it.

The example of Morocco shows that it is not sufficient to elaborate development schemes and even to set up a number of new instruments of investment and economic intervention, if the economic structure and former social relations are not modified at the same time.

After independence, the Five-Year Plan of 1960-1964 could have been the starting point of economic growth for the Moroccan economy, provided that the structural reforms, especially agrarian reform, regarded as indispensable in the plan itself, had been carried out, and that all, or a large proportion, of investment in the industrial sector had come from the State.

This first attempt at national economic development failed, mainly because the structural reforms provided for in the plan were not implemented and because State intervention lacked vigour. Also, to a large extent, illusions were harboured by the ruling social forces, who expected to see a large-scale influx of foreign investments comparable with that of the years 1946-1953, under the Protectorate. Consequently the steps to set up new technical and financial institutions to promote development were very limited. The attempt to mobilise unemployed labour—the "National Promotion" scheme was not very effective.

Compared with the Five-Year Plan of 1960-1964 the so-called

Three-Year Plan for 1965-1967 is a clear step backward, both in its general conception and in the means proposed to implement it.

The Nature of Genuine Planning

We may—always assuming that the *necessary social and political conditions* are present—proceed to define the elements of efficient planning of our economic development as follows:

1. The first essential is to bring about such social, economic and institutional transformations as profound agrarian reform, nationalisation of vital sectors of the economy, and the concentration in the hands of the state of the major part of the economic surplus.

2. The public sector must be extended to include the commanding heights of the economy, including big industry. This will enable the state to plan the overall direction of the economy, to apportion the gross national product between consumption, investment in various sectors, etc. It will make it possible to fix targets for the output of key products, to estimate the necessary investments and to find the means of financing them.

3. The private sector, which exists side by side with the dominant public sector during the transition period, must be compelled to conform with the overall plan. The state will also provide economic incentives for operators in the private sector, such as priorities in receiving credits and foreign exchange, and the participation of state capital in mixed companies. Contractual relations should be established by the state both with private enterprises and with collectives.

4. Part of the public investments could be left at the disposal of regional institutions endowed with economic management which should be given the possibility of using them, under certain conditions, independently of the basic objectives of the central plan, so as to ensure harmonious economic development on the entire national territory and to encourage initiative at regional and local levels.

5. The plan must become an instrument to mobilise all the creative energies of the people. Its aims must be expressed in terms that everyone can understand, and everyone must feel it his own concern to see these aims are achieved. This means a detailed procedure to see that the entire population

is consulted in framing the objectives of the plan, so that they not only contribute by suggestions, criticism and amendments, but are also committed to its fulfilment. This is of particular importance for success in mobilising the underemployed labour forces in the rural areas. Their general objectives could be defined in the central plan, but more detailed aims should be laid down in regional and local plans, with the consent of all concerned.

The Rate of Accumulation

In African countries still dominated by imperialism the sources of internal accumulation are either very weak and misused because of the existing social relations (as in agriculture), or monopolised by foreign capital, which drains the accumulation abroad.

Now, planning cannot succeed unless there are accumulated funds to finance investment, and development cannot continue and extend without a continuous process of accumulation.

Therefore the mobilisation of internal sources of accumulation is of central importance. The problem is twofold: how to begin the accumulation of funds, and how to ensure a continuous process of accumulation.

Where African countries are dominated by imperialism and by pre-capitalist or bureaucratic classes, much of the social product is lost to accumulation funds.

Part of the surplus in agriculture is grabbed by landlords or ruling classes of the pre-capitalist type, who hoard it or spend it in unproductive ways. Another part is appropriated by traders and moneylenders, and goes into buying land, extending trading capital, acquiring luxury goods, etc.

The part of the social surplus exported from the country by foreign firms is extremely substantial. And a further part is seized from public funds by the bureaucratic bourgeoisie and wasted.

Our researches in Morocco indicate that a sum amounting to as much as 30 per cent of the gross national product could be mobilised as the "starting point" of accumulation funds. Agrarian reform, profits and revenues of non-agricultural sectors, savings on the extravagant state apparatus, and increased employment of the rural population would together provide the necessary funds to start planned development.

But these possibilities could only be realised if there is an overall change in the social structure and relations, a new pattern of social and economic organisation, and a resolute advance along the path of non-capitalist development leading to socialism.

Further, the financing of industrialisation from internal sources can be planned in such a way as to ensure *the constant re-investment of profits*. This would give rise to a geometrical rate of progression of industrial growth.

This is because the highly productive techniques of modern industry enables costs to be reduced to a fraction of those of similar industries using old techniques, on whose costs current market prices are based. This creates the possibility of recovering the capital invested in a very short time.

Large capitalist units investing in underdeveloped countries expect to recover their capital in a few years out of their profits, thus releasing the original amount for re-investment.

The same rate of capital recovery could be achieved within the framework of a plan of national development, and the capital recovered directed to the creation of new industries. That is, of course, provided there are adequate measures to prevent the waste of resources and that there is coherent long-range planning.

Thus the economy would become self-supporting and self-generating, thanks to the setting in motion of a process of continuous internal accumulation.

There are tremendous possibilities of development before us—once we turn our backs on the capitalist road!



AHS

Price 8 Kčs