

National Liberation Today

(Report delivered to the Executive Committee of
the Communist Party on November 10th, 1963)

R. Palme Dutt

I. Aim of Report

The aim of this Report is to cover three main subjects:

- (1) New features of the national liberation movement, changes from the old forms of the colonial question, and consequent new questions arising.
- (2) Britain's role in relation to the newly independent countries and the new forms of the national liberation struggle.
- (3) Current controversies, arising from the discussion in the international communist movement, with regard to the relationship of the national liberation struggle to the world situation, the socialist camp and the international working class, and the struggle for peace.

II. New Features of National Liberation—the Remaining Areas of Colonial Domination

The old form of the colonial question for our Party developed in the period when imperialism controlled five-sixths of the world, and the majority of mankind was under colonial or semi-colonial rule. This period lasted until the Second World War. Our Party, at the centre of the British Empire, the largest world colonial Empire, has from the outset consistently sought to fulfil its responsibility of direct and active alliance with the peoples struggling for freedom from colonial rule. We can be proud of the record of our Party in this battle. The role of comrades like George Allison, Percy Glading and Ben Bradley in India, George Hardy in China, our close contacts with the movement in Ireland or in South Africa, are testimony of this. Our party is the only political party in Britain which has a consistent record of fighting against colonialism. At a time when the second Labour Government was putting 60,000 Indians in prison for the crime of demanding national independence, our comrade Ben Bradley was undergoing four years imprisonment alongside Indian working class leaders in India.

Today the majority of the former colonial peoples have won their political independence. In the last twenty years fifty countries have won

political independence. For them the tasks of the national liberation struggle have now become to complete and consolidate their political independence, end the remaining holds of imperialism, win economic independence, and carry through economic and social reconstruction.

But direct colonial rule remains in parts of Asia, Africa and the Caribbean, involving still millions under British rule. In these areas the struggle against colonialism is intense, and is often met with severe resistance, as these are the toughest remaining centres of direct colonialism. Hence our tasks of practical alliance with the liberation struggle of these peoples under British colonial rule reaches still to great heights.

The main areas involved and our policy in relation to them are set out in the Executive Committee statement: *Finish with Colonialism*.

- (a) **Southern Rhodesia**
- (b) **South Africa** (which is still a sphere mainly of British capital, although formally outside the Commonwealth) and the **High Commission Territories**
- (c) **Aden and the Gulf**
- (d) **Malaysia** (which is a creation of British imperialism maintained by British armed forces to dominate South-East Asia)
- (e) **British Guiana and the Caribbean**. (In relation to Guiana Sandys' outrageous decision at the November Conference, offering no date for independence, and manipulating the electoral system to promote racial division, is a sell-out to the United States)
- (f) **Northern Ireland** (which is in fact legally and constitutionally under the domination of British imperialism)

The United Nations resolution of 1960 for immediate self-determination for all colonial peoples has sharpened the issue. The U.N. Committee of twenty-four for the fulfilment of this resolution has performed a valuable function. This policy has been carried by the co-operation of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries with the Afro-Asian countries against the resistance of British, French and U.S. imperialists. This new majority in the United Nations is of profound international significance. The recent

(1)

statement in the Chinese Communist Party document on neo-colonialism pouring scorn on this raising of the colonial question in the UNO as equivalent to an appeal to imperialism completely fails to see the international significance of this new majority, representing the alliance of the Socialist and Afro-Asian countries, with the handful of imperialist states exposed as a reactionary minority.

The special problem raised of the very small colonial territories should be seen in this context. The old objection that they are too small to be capable of independent existence is no longer valid in the new conditions. Immediate independence should be accompanied with immediate membership of the United Nations to ensure their full international rights against aggression. Any schemes of federation should be undertaken voluntarily only after self-determination, and not imposed by the ruling imperialist power.

The Labour Party in principle recognises the right of self-determination, but in practice this recognition is always hedged round with qualifications as in the case of territories regarded as too small to be viable. Further, in practice the Labour Party supports the armed actions of British imperialism, as in the recent statement of Gordon Walker of September 18th pledging full support to the Tory Government in any action necessary for the protection of "British interests and property" in relation to the question of Malaysia and Indonesia. Similarly Harold Wilson, at Hamburg in September, declared that Labour's strategic policy in contrast to the Tory emphasis on a fictitious nuclear independence, would be concentrating on "conventional" armaments, to be "strong East of Suez".

III. New Features of National Liberation—the Newly Independent States

The majority of former colonial peoples have now won the establishment and recognition of their countries as independent sovereign states. When Lenin wrote his thesis on the national and colonial question in 1920, the colonies, semi-colonies and Dominions and dependencies accounted for 77.2 per cent of the territory and 69.2 per cent of the population of the world. In 1963 only 7.7 per cent of the world's area and 1.7 per cent of its population remain under the direct domination of colonial rule.

But, while their recognition as independent sovereign states has been established, in the majority of cases their full political independence from imperialism has still to be completed and consolidated. The battle for economic independence is only opening. In some cases, e.g.

Suez and the Congo, the most violent offensive and even armed assault of imperialism has taken place after the establishment of independence. In all cases the big imperialist monopolies seek to maintain their hold and exploitation.

In the report on neo-colonialism at the Executive Committee in September 1961 we examined the key features of this new strategy of imperialism to maintain a hold on the newly independent states. Some of the forms of this strategy were characterised, for instance, maintaining hold:

(a) by direct political means at the time of establishing independence i.e. through partition, as in Ireland, India, Palestine; imposing constitutions which play on division, as in the case of Cyprus or attempted in Kenya; establishing federal regimes based on the most reactionary strata as in Malaysia or the Gulf sheikdoms in the South Arabian Federation;

(b) strategic holds through drawing the countries into imperialist military blocs, as in the case of Pakistan, or the establishment of bases as in Cyprus, Aden, and Malaysia.

Against all these forms of political and strategic domination or indirect influence by imperialism, the peoples of the newly independent countries have conducted an increasingly successful struggle. Bases have been forced to be withdrawn in Eire, the United Arab Republic, Iraq and Ceylon. The majority of the newly independent Afro-Asian states follow the general international line of "non-alignment", i.e. refusal to be drawn into the imperialist military blocs (although in the case of India, this has been weakened by the Anglo-American imperialist utilisation of the border question to establish considerable penetration by military missions.)

ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE

The most important new question developing in the national liberation struggle of the newly independent countries is the struggle for economic independence, which is bound up with economic and social reconstruction at home. Economic exploitation by imperialism has actually been intensified in the recent period also in relation to the newly independent states. It is pointed out on all sides that the richer industrial imperialist nations have been growing richer in the modern period and that the poor, i.e. colonial or ex-colonial, nations have been growing poorer. What is not pointed out is that this is *precisely the effect of intensified colonial exploitation.* One measure of this is shown by the increase in prices of industrial goods which these countries have to buy, and fall in the prices of the primary products, food and raw materials which they sell.

(5) a State in which the people are ensured broad democratic rights and freedoms (freedom of speech, press, assembly, demonstrations, establishment of political parties and social organisations), and the opportunity to work for the enactment of an agrarian reform and other democratic and social changes, and for participation in shaping Government policy."

These principles of our approach could be worked out concretely in relation to the very varying types of situation in such countries as India, the United Arab Republic, Iraq and Ghana. An adequate analysis of the many complex problems involved in these situations would require a separate study in each case.

IV. Britain and the Newly Independent Countries

The myth of the "end of colonialism" as already accomplished is today the official line of Toryism and right-wing Labour. Rita Hinden writes *Empire And After*; Strachey writes *End of Empire*; Barratt Brown writes *After Imperialism*.

Economic facts prove the opposite. Colonialism is dying, but is by no means yet dead. Colonialism is still the main basis of British capitalism. An analysis of the biggest British monopolies shows that among the top twenty the biggest profits are derived from overseas exploitation.

The *Financial Times* (7.9.63) Table of the twenty companies showing the biggest profits in 1962 gives the following picture:

	Net Profit £ million
Shell Transport & Trading	81.8
British Petroleum	68.1
Imperial Chemical Industries	38.4
British American Tobacco	31.2
Unilever	23.5
Woolworth	15.8
Imperial Tobacco	15.7
Distillers	15.4
Burmah Oil	13.6
Nchanga Consolidated Copper	12.2
Courtaulds	12.8
Great Universal Stores	12.2
Marks & Spencer	11.1
Guest Keen & Nettlefolds	10.8
Rhokana Corporation	10.7
Rhodesian Anglo-American	9.5
British South Africa	8.5
Coats, Patons & Baldwins	8.3
Tube Investments	7.9
International Publishing Corporation	6.5

It will be seen that the first two are oil giants. Nine out of the twenty (Shell, B.P., British American Tobacco, Imperial Tobacco, Burmah Oil,

Nchanga Copper, Rhokana Corporation, Rhodesian Mines, British South Africa), are direct colonial overseas exploiting monopolies and made a total of £221 mn. profits or over half the £414 mn. total profits of the top twenty monopolies. If to these we add Unilevers and I.C.I. whose operations are heavily based on overseas exploitation (Unilevers in West Africa through the United Africa Company, and about one third of I.C.I. and its subsidiaries), the total would be £283 million. On the other hand the total for British industry is £61.7 million, of which only two represent heavy industry, with profits of £18.7 million, four light industry (thread, rayon, distillers, printing and publishing) £43 million, and three distribution, £29 million. A remarkable picture of the economy of an imperialist metropolis.

Official statistical reports conceal the extent of overseas exploitation. Some indications may be drawn from the official Balance of Payments for 1962. In this the return of *Property Income from Abroad*, £1,182 million, is separated from the income of the big imperialist monopolies which have their headquarters in London, and are treated as British Companies making profits in Britain, although the main source of these profits comes from overseas exploitation, e.g. Royal Dutch Shell, British Petroleum, Unilevers, and many of the big banking and insurance companies. *Corporate Income Earned Abroad* by companies in Britain was shown as £1,083 million in 1962.

The problem of the balance of payments is not primarily a problem of paying for necessary imports of food and raw materials by the export of goods. In 1962 the deficit on the visible balance of trade was only £68 million. The big drain arises from the overseas military expenditure (£246 million), and the export of capital, which is mainly directed, not to assist the economic development of the receiving countries, but to intensify exploitation of them.

The extent to which the balance of payments of Britain is covered by overseas exploitation was shown in a report of the *Financial Times* (28.8.62) which stated that during the five years from 1957-61 inclusive "the change in the relationship of export prices to import prices" (i.e. the intensified colonial exploitation) "has seemingly contributed something like £600 million per annum to the strengthening of the U.K.'s payments position". This is equivalent to a total of £3,000 million in five years. In view of this it is not surprising that all the calculations of the directors of the economy and strategy of modern Britain are so heavily concentrated on maintaining and extending imperialist exploitation.

IMPERIALIST STRATEGY

British strategy is still a world imperialist strategy, with the main concentration, alongside the Nato anti-Soviet front, on the dominance of the Persian Gulf for Middle Eastern oil and of South East Asia for rubber, tin and oil. In South East Asia alone the current military costs are said to amount to £100 million a year.

All these costs of Britain's continuing imperialist policy are heavy burdens on the people of Britain. The profits are drawn by the big monopolies, while the burdens fall on the people. These costs are the main obstacle limiting economic reconstruction and social advance at home.

Hence the alliance of the British working class movement with the national liberation struggle of the peoples against British imperialism is not a question of charity or altruistic services to other peoples, but a vital interest of the British people for the people of Britain.

On the question of "aid". The hypocrisy of the official professions of "aid", either as at present practised or as promised by the Labour Party, has been exposed in the preceding analysis of intensified colonial exploitation. In fact the tribute drawn from the overseas peoples far exceeds the so-called "aid". The biggest aid would be to stop drawing the tribute.

COMMUNIST POLICY

Against this we set out our policy for real aid:

- ! help*
- (a) To restore to these countries their economic resources seized by imperialism.
 - (b) Loans and grants to help the new states embark on large-scale industrialisation, the modernising of their agriculture and the raising of their living standards.
 - (c) Long-term trading agreements, with steps to establish more equitable price relations between the prices of the raw materials and primary goods exported by the newly independent states and the manufactures and capital goods they import.

Such a policy would open a new perspective for the future development of British trade, industry and employment, in association with the advancement of social and economic reconstruction of the newly independent countries.

V. National Liberation and the Controversy in the International Communist Movement

A special controversy has been raised with regard to the role of the national liberation struggle in the present world situation by the recent statements of the Communist Party of China.

The Chinese Communist Party thesis has set out the following:

(a) That the main contradiction in the present epoch is no longer between socialism and imperialism, but has today "shifted" (in their words) and is now between the national liberation movement and imperialism.

(b) That the three continents of Africa, Asia and Latin America represent the main arena of the world revolution today, and that the outcome in these three continents will be decisive for the world revolution:

"The various types of contradictions in the contemporary world are concentrated in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America; these are the most vulnerable areas under imperialist rule and the storm centres of world revolution dealing direct blows at imperialism.

"... In a sense therefore, the whole cause of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles of the people of these areas, who constitute an overwhelming majority of the world population. . . .

"The centre of world contradiction, of world political struggles, is not fixed but shifts with changes in the international struggles and the revolutionary situation." *Apologists of Neo-Colonialism—People's Daily and Red Flag*, October 22, 1963.

(c) That the aim of peaceful coexistence is regarded by the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other Communist Parties as implying the abandonment of the national liberation struggle; that the aim of preventing war is regarded as equivalent to condemnation of just national liberation wars; that the Soviet Union and European Communist Parties have betrayed the national liberation movements to imperialism; and that the oppressed nations are called on to submit to the imperialist oppressors until such time as total disarmament has been achieved throughout the world:

"The modern revisionists in fact side with the imperialists and colonialists and repudiate and oppose the national liberation movement in every possible way.

"The leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union have been trying by every means to make the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America abandon their revolutionary struggle.

"They often take an attitude of great-power chauvinism and national egoism in matters concerning aid to newly independent countries.

"The leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union hold the victories of the national-liberation revolution are not due primarily to the revolutionary struggles of the masses, and that the people cannot emancipate themselves but must wait for the natural collapse of imperialism through peaceful co-existence and peaceful competition.

"Khrushchov here sounds like a preacher.

'Downtrodden people of the world, you are blessed! If only you are patient, if only you wait until the imperialists lay down their arms, freedom will descend upon you.'

"What he really means by looking to the United Nations for help is looking to the imperialists for help.

"The wrong line of the leaders of the C.P.S.U. completely abandons the task of fighting imperialism and colonialism and opposes wars of national liberation."

Of these three propositions the first two, presenting what is known as the "Three Continent Theory" of the world revolution, are contrary to what we understand to be the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the 1960 Declaration of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties. The third, alleging betrayal of the national liberation struggle by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and Communist Parties is plainly and demonstrably contrary to all the facts and the evidence.

THE BASIC CONTRADICTION

The 1960 Declaration has made clear that the basic contradiction of our epoch is between socialism and imperialism. This definition was already made by Lenin, and is the continuance of the Marxist analysis of the basic contradiction of the last stage of class society between capitalism and the working class. All other contradictions are relative to this main contradiction. Lenin said that since the 1917 Revolution, which undermined the position of world imperialism, the national liberation movement has become part of the world socialist revolution. He declared:

"The revolutionary movement of the peoples of the East can now develop effectively, can reach a successful issue, only in direct association with the revolutionary struggle of our Soviet Republic against international imperialism" (*Lenin's Address to Second All-Russian Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East*).

There is no doubt that at the present moment the national liberation struggles in Africa, Asia and Latin America are a burning furnace of revolutionary struggle against imperialism, of vital importance for the further advance and victory of the world socialist revolution. This is not in dispute. But this advance of the national liberation struggle has only been made possible by the victories and the strength of the socialist camp and the consequent weakening of imperialism; and continued advance is dependent on close co-operation with the socialist camp and the international working class.

Chinese spokesmen claim that their Three-Con-

continent theory of Africa, Asia and Latin America as the main centres of the world revolution today does not exclude the other contradictions or the desirability of association with the world socialist camp. But in practice their simultaneous denunciation of the Soviet Union and most Communist Parties as betraying the national liberation movement is calculated precisely to create a wall of division and distrust between the national liberation movement and the Soviet Union and international working class—which is what the imperialists want.

THREE-CONTINENT THEORY

Further, the Three-Continent theory is directly contrary to a class understanding of the world situation. For, since the national liberation movement is, as we have seen, led in the majority of countries by the national bourgeoisie, to regard the principal role in the world revolution as being played by the national liberation movement is to place the primary role in the world revolution in the hands of the bourgeoisie instead of in the hands of the international working class and its outcome the world socialist system. This is a complete contradiction of a Marxist-Leninist class approach.

The Three-Continent theory of separation of the national liberation struggle from the socialist camp and the international working class is directly contrary to the vital interests of the national liberation movement in these areas.

It is an illusion to imagine that the difference arises because the Chinese spokesmen in this controversy place more emphasis on the national liberation struggle and are more ardent champions of the national liberation struggle. This illusion, which the ceaseless repetition of general formulas might create among careless readers, is the exact opposite of the truth. For in reality, whatever the subjective intentions of the Chinese comrades to serve the cause of the national liberation struggle, the doctrines which they put forward, embodied in the Three-Continent theory, would be, if accepted, disastrous to the cause of the national liberation struggle.

Prior to 1917 all national liberation struggles were crushed by the superior power of imperialism. I well remember the world of the national liberation movement before 1917, when the leaders of the national movement in India and other countries visited my father in Cambridge, England, and when the Majlis or first association of Asian students, founded in 1907 in honour of the Persian Revolution (Jawaharlal Nehru, then a student, used to be a member, though not very active) met in a room in my father's house. The popular movement in Britain conducted agitation

against the atrocities of imperialism and colonial wars and oppression all over the world. There were ceaseless meetings of protest. Protest against suppression in Egypt, in India, in Persia, in the Congo. Protest followed protest. But before 1917 there were no victories to celebrate. Every meeting was a meeting of protest. Only subsequently to the victory of the socialist revolution in 1917, and still more after the joint victory over fascism in 1945 and the establishment of the world socialist camp, have the victories of national liberation followed.

Today even small countries such as Cuba, Guinea or Ghana are able to defy the overwhelming strength of the most formidable imperialist powers, thanks to the strength and support of the Soviet Union and the socialist camp. This was powerfully shown in the Caribbean crisis of 1962, as in the Suez War of 1956.

Imperialism seeks above all to disrupt this unity of the anti-imperialist camp, embracing the socialist countries, the international working class and the national liberation movement. For this purpose the imperialists spread every kind of propaganda to break this unity, and to urge the newly independent countries to "keep out of the cold war", "beware of the menace of communism" or the supposed expansionist aims of the Soviet Union, and to regard the Soviet Union as merely another great power alongside the imperialist great powers. If this propaganda of division were to succeed, the newly independent nations and national liberation movement would be at the mercy of imperialism.

GOSPEL OF SEPARATION

Similarly the most reactionary right wing nationalist elements in the newly independent countries preach the same gospel of separation from the socialist camp and international working class, from Marxism or Communism. They seek to distort the correct policy of "non-alignment", i.e., refusal to enter imperialist military blocs (there are no socialist-organised military blocs of newly independent countries) as if it meant equally opposition to socialism and imperialism. They preach the theory of the role of the newly independent countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America as a "Third Force" independent of either socialism or capitalism. This plays into the hands of imperialist disruption and neo-colonialism. This doctrine represents the interests of the right wing upper class elements of the national bourgeoisie who fear the advance of the workers and peasants and popular progressive democratic movement, and move in practice towards compromise with imperialism. They misuse the term

"socialism" to cover this doctrine of separation.

In the same way Right-Wing Social Democracy in the imperialist countries preaches the same gospel, proclaiming the Afro-Asian nations to represent a "Third Force" independent of socialism or imperialism, and thereby seek to smuggle through their real anti-communist, anti-Soviet aims.

In the most extreme form this theory takes on the character of racialism, and seeks to replace the real division between the interests of the imperialist oppressors and the national liberation movement and working masses by a false division supposedly based on colour, between white and coloured races. The camp of socialism, as represented by the Soviet Union and the European socialist countries are thus combined in a single category with the imperialist countries as "white". From a deeply oppressed African or American Negro just beginning to awaken to active struggle, this elementary confusion of national and class oppression with a supposed absolute alignment according to colour is understandable, to be met with full sympathy, and can be rapidly helped to advance to political clarity. But from the lips of a Communist any hint of such an outlook is unpardonable.

Verbal propaganda of this type, as at the Moshi Afro-Asian Conference, has been carried much further than in the written documents. In the Afro-Asian Conference of Journalists the Chinese representatives demanded the exclusion of Soviet representatives as not Asiatic, although the Central Asian Republics of the Soviet Union were the first Asian nations to overthrow colonialism and win national freedom. A similar shameful approach has been shown in the plan for an Afro-Asian Trade Union Conference excluding Soviet representatives.

Sometimes this line of division to conceal the real division between imperialism and anti-imperialism is presented as a division between "have" and "have not" countries. In this way the Socialist Soviet Union, which has no imperialist interests, export of capital for investment or foreign exploitation, is lumped in a single category with the imperialist countries which exploit the colonial peoples and maintain their economy on the basis of this exploitation. This shameless presentation equally serves the interests of disrupting the anti-imperialist camp.

FALSE CHARGES

The charge against the Soviet Union of neglecting action on behalf of the national liberation struggle is a complete falsification of the facts. The main support of the national liberation

struggle in every case, both through the strength of armed power to counter-balance the power of imperialism, through the direct supply of arms where the national liberation struggle has had to take the armed form, and the supply of every kind of material and technical aid for economic reconstruction, has consistently come from the Soviet Union. Every national leader has borne witness to this:

"Without the existence of the Soviet Union the Socialist Revolution in Cuba would not have been possible" (Fidel Castro).

"The Soviet Union proved to be the only great power which from the very beginning supported the people of the Congo in their struggle" (Patrice Lumumba).

"Were it not for the existence of the Soviet Union, the movement for freedom from colonial oppression in Africa would have felt the full force of brutal suppression" (Kwame Nkrumah).

The whole experience of the modern period, Suez in 1956, Syria in 1957, Iraq in 1958, Indonesia in 1960, Cuba in 1962, has demonstrated the truth of this.

With regard to the role of our Communist Party in the national anti-imperialist struggle, we can say that we have never failed to give full support to every national anti-imperialist struggle, whether violent or non-violent, armed or unarmed without qualification. We can say this at the same time as we fully recognise the inadequacy of our efforts compared to the needs. When it was a question of the battle of the Kenya people, with Kenyatta at their head, denounced by the imperialists in terms of their description of Mau Mau, we alone of political parties, as Kenyatta well knows, gave full support to the struggle of the Kenya people. We stood by the armed struggle of the Malayan people. We support today the South African people's struggle, also when they find that, denied every democratic outlook, they are compelled to advance to armed struggle. It is a slander to describe our Communist Party as supporting imperialism or failing to support the national anti-imperialist fight.

The struggle for peace, disarmament and peaceful co-existence corresponds to the vital interests

of the national liberation movement. The 1960 Declaration has made clear that the aim of peaceful co-existence does not exclude just wars of national liberation. But it is precisely the war plans of imperialism which seek to entangle the newly independent countries in imperialist military blocs, and thereby nullify their independence. Similarly the first nuclear offensive of imperialism was conducted against an Asian country, and the nuclear tests of imperialism have always been conducted in Afro-Asian regions. The peoples of the newly independent countries like the colonial peoples struggling for freedom have the same common interests with the peoples of the socialist countries and in the capitalist countries to prevent a nuclear war and win the aims of peaceful co-existence and nuclear disarmament. Every step towards the fulfilment of these aims improves the conditions for the advance of the national liberation struggle.

UNITY AND SOLIDARITY

The unity of the world anti-imperialist movement, the socialist camp, the international working class and the national liberation movement is vital for the victory of the aims of peace and of world socialism.

We are confident that this unity will be fulfilled, and that the fulfilment of this unity will bring victory equally for the final end of colonialism and for our cause in Britain, for peace and socialism.

In this Report I have not dealt with the detail questions of our practical policy in the various spheres on this issue or in relation to the various countries, as this is set out in the Executive Committee policy statement *Finish with Colonialism*. But I would only say this in conclusion.

We are pledged as a party, and we need all of us to strive to achieve, by our activity and our response, the fullest solidarity with the national liberation struggle of all the peoples fighting to complete their independence from imperialism, as well as with the coloured citizens in our midst struggling against every form of discrimination and disability, in brotherhood and alliance for our common aims.

Victims!
M. G. P.
Cuba
1957