

# LIBERATION

A Journal of Democratic Discussion

No. 24, April, 1957

THE NATAL SOCIETY  
COPYRIGHT SECTION

One Shilling

## THE TECHNIQUE OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

### ROCKEFELLER'S LETTER TO EISENHOWER

— FULL TEXT —

	Page
Editorial: Sunshine and Shadow .....	1
The Reichstag Fire, II, by L. Bernstein .....	7
The Transkei Tragedy, IV, by G. A. Mbeki .....	11
My Dear Mr. President .....	15

# LIBERATION

*A Journal of Democratic Discussion*

---

---

No. 24, April, 1957

One Shilling

---

---

EDITORIAL

## SUNSHINE AND SHADOW

**"The African in every territory of this vast continent has been awakened and the struggle for freedom will go on. Our task is not done and our safety is not assured until the last vestiges of colonialism have been swept from Africa."**

**— KWAME NKRUMAH.**

**A**LL Africa is celebrating the birth of Ghana.

The Union Jack, the symbol of oppression, gives way to the black-starred tricolour banner of Free Ghana; Kwame Nkrumah and his comrades, but a few years ago behind prison bars, take over the Government as elected representatives of the people, amidst the universal congratulations of the leaders of America, India, Russia, China, and every other country — even the Union of South Africa. Bonfires are lit in Accra and people dance through the streets with joy.

We echo that joy. In Kenya and Uganda they sing; in French colonies that border Ghana and in the Congo their hearts dance; in Portugal's slave colonies, in Ndola and Salisbury and Johannesburg and Durban and Port Elizabeth, the people rejoice. Ghana's victory today is a promise of ours tomorrow. It marks the beginning of the end for imperialism and white domination from the Sahara to Cape Town.

Ghana's winning of political independence is a triumph for the determination and sacrifice of the Ghana people in many long years of struggle. But it is also a mark of the declining power of British imperialism, which like its French counterpart finds itself unable to retain by violence the vast territories conquered by violence in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when capitalism was at the peak of its power and strength. The last ten years have been absolutely crucial in the long drawn out struggle between European imperialism and the colonial peoples. And, on the whole, imperialism has suffered a crushing defeat from which it can never recover.

The emancipation of China was the first of a long series of retreats by the imperialists. Britain has lost Ireland, India ("the brightest jewel in the British crown"), Burma, Ceylon, the Sudan and a host of key positions in the Middle East. Ghana has gone; Nigeria is going; Malaya (after eight years of bitter fighting) is all but lost; Kenya and Uganda cannot much longer be held off. The Empire is vanishing; it has all but disappeared; and the so-called "Commonwealth" which is supposed to replace it is becoming more and more a myth.

France has lost Syria and Lebanon, Indo-China, Tunis, Morocco; she is battling bloodily but vainly to hold Algeria; her departure from her vast territories in Central and West Africa is but a matter of time.

Holland has lost her main colony: Indonesia.

America has had to concede political independence to the Philippines and was chased out of North Korea; in South Korea and Japan and Taiwan she is clinging desperately to her ill-gotten gains, but it is becoming more and more troublesome and expensive to do so. Even the sprawling Yankee empire in South America where dollar diplomacy has largely replaced machine guns as the weapon of conquest, is becoming increasingly restive as the people rise to settle accounts with the corrupt politicians who sold their independence.

Portugal is already faced with serious trouble in Goa, and she need not deceive herself that her vast slave-empire in Africa will long remain immune from the world contagion of freedom and independence; the same applies to Belgium whose tight hold over the Congo will prove to be illusory and short-lived.

## GAMBLERS' THROW

The reckless Anglo-French invasion of Egypt a few months ago was the last, desperate gamblers' throw of the imperialists. It was intended to restore the lost fortunes and prestige of the aging monsters who had so long held so much of the world in subjection by terror and violence. It seemed the colonial darkies no longer feared the monster; they wouldn't pay blackmail to it any more; they said its teeth were blunt. "All right", said Eden and Mollet, with jackal Ben Gurion yapping at their heels, "We'll show them." Nasser and his Egyptians, they thought, would die with fright at their mere approach; they would advance triumphantly to Cairo, instal Farouk or someone like that; regain the Canal; and put the fear of God into all the rebellious Arabs, Cypriots, Asians and Africans who were giving them such a lot of trouble.

Instead of this optimistic picture being realised, the mad adventure ended in the most ignominious failure in the history of British and French imperialism. It may seem early to count the cost; but in the last analysis London and Paris will find that they staked the whole of their overseas territories and possessions in Egypt last November — and lost them.

Gone is the picture of benevolent Britain kindly granting independence to colonial peoples as soon as — in the opinion of Downing Street — they



are sufficiently "advanced" to receive it. The whole world has realised that only violence holds the empire together; that the imperialists are impotent to resist a powerful challenge; that any people which is united and bold enough to claim its freedom may have it for the taking.

## HOPEFUL SUCCESSOR

The big business-men who run the U.S.A., who have a keen nose for possible profits in any corner of the world, have been quick to sense that Egypt spelt the end of British and French imperialism in the Middle East and elsewhere. And seeing these vast and wealthy domains about to be lost by their former owners they have been quick to claim for themselves the right of heirs and successors. That is the real meaning and import of the so-called "Eisenhower doctrine" propounded with so much pomp and hypocrisy at the beginning of this year. "Here is a 'power vacuum'," they say. "We must step in and fill it."

Of course, the Americans have come to realise that they cannot just reconquer the former British and French domains the way they were conquered in the first place, with bullets and cannon. They learnt that in Korea. New techniques are needed, they feel; what soldiers can't conquer, perhaps, dollars can buy. Exactly how this is to be done is explained with great detail and thoroughness by Mr. Nelson Rockefeller in this issue of *Liberation*: we shall allow his letter to Eisenhower to speak for itself.

Of course, the Americans have had and will have a certain amount of early success in this plan of bloodless conquest and dollar domination; indeed they have already penetrated deeply into the economy of our own country where, doubtless, they are pursuing the same aims with the same techniques.

But in the long run, they must fail. The colonial peoples have bought their independence at too dear a price in suffering and sacrifice to sell it for a mess of pottage. They have no desire to exchange overlords from Europe for masters from America. And they will not be so simple or short-sighted as not to see the cunning tricks which Mr. Rockefeller prescribes for them. Bait the hook as temptingly as he likes, they will not bite. The fish will not take the bait, when he can see the hook. In vain the fowler spreads his net in the sight of the bird.

No. The hopeful successors to the older empire stake their claims in vain. The day of the empires is past. And the sturdy sons and daughters of Africa and Asia arise to claim their birthright of freedom.

## "FLAT-EARTHERS"

As the sun rises in the morning, it does not cast its rays everywhere at the same time. When it is dawn in Peking, it is still dark and people are slumbering further to the West. We know that, as the earth rotates about its axis, the morning will come everywhere.

Yet, in this dawning of mankind's liberty which is taking place in our lifetime, there are still people who seem to believe that the sun of freedom, though it shines brightly elsewhere, will never arise over their part of the world. Like the men of olden days, who thought the earth was flat, they imagine they live in some sort of political, cultural, moral and economic island, apart from and unconnected with the universe.

Such people are to be found in the Government of the Union of South Africa. Everywhere, amidst songs and rejoicing, the peoples are casting away the chains of slavery, racialism, colour-bar, baasskap, segregation, indignity, prejudice, ignorance, exploitation, inequality and man's inhumanity to man.

But in our country, we seem not to have heard of this glad casting away of chains. We have a factory in Cape Town which is busy day after day manufacturing new chains. That factory is Parliament.

Already the people are groaning under the burden of all the heavy chains this factory has made in past years. Pass Laws, and passes for women. Land laws for Africans and Indians. Group Areas. Suppression of Communism. Bantu Education. Bantu Authorities. Native Labour. Industrial Conciliation. Coloured Franchise. Need we go on? There are many more such, and every one wrings a cry from the heart of every democrat.

And now they are busy making more.

Native Laws Amendment Bill: aimed at smashing African political and trade union organisations and destroying the spirit of human brotherhood in church, cultural, political and ordinary social relationships.

Separate Universities Bill: aimed at smashing real University education, not only for Non-Europeans but also for the all-White Universities too — doomed to be cut down to the level of what a Strijdom considers suitable training-institutes to turn out good-enough lawyers, doctors, engineers and teachers.

Police Bill — to make the policeman the boss in the police state.

Another Budget for the rich.

Increase of Poll Tax for Africans.

And plots and schemes to gag the Press, declare the Congresses illegal, banish people's leaders on a mass scale . . . .

## WHAT PARLIAMENT IGNORES

That's how it goes in Parliament, with the official United Party "opposition" dead scared to utter a word of serious criticism in case the Nats. call them "Kafferboeties" in next year's election (which they will do any-



way) or perhaps in case Swart names them too. And the whole task of opposition in the Assembly falls on the gallant trio of Labour M.P.'s.

While Parliament has been debating all these hateful Nazi measures introduced by the Ministers, it has practically ignored all the great issues of our times being hammered out in the streets and in the world beyond the four walls of the House of Assembly.

They listened to Mr. Schoeman's silly and spiteful little Bill to prevent any new bus company taking over a boycotted route. But they did not pause to think what it meant that a hundred thousand people were foot-slogging up to twenty miles a day over a penny increase. Couldn't they sense the desperate poverty behind the boycotts? The burning anger?

Do they know what Mr. Swart's police are doing to the African people in the townships, week after week? Thousands of people thrown into pick-up vans, into prisons, into farm jails, for trivial meaningless infringements of permits and pass laws — do the M.P.'s know about that? Do they care?

Do they know or care about the furious resentment and indignation of the people at the arrest of their best known and most-loved leaders — as shown in the extraordinary scenes outside the Drill Hall in December in January?

Do they realise that a mighty movement of workers' organisation is spreading throughout the country to demand £1 a day minimum wage?

Parliament does not discuss these matters. It goes grimly ahead, churning out ever more gruesome and horrid laws to burden the people. It does not discuss Suez or Ghana, or any of the other stirring events of our fast-moving world. Other Parliaments, in other countries, are talking about war and peace and the dread menace of the atom unchained that hangs over our generation like a pestilent cloud. But the Cape Town Assembly of little men goes on spluttering at the English newspapers and surrendering more and more unlimited powers into the hands of Police Minister Swart and the Great White Father Verwoerd.

## DEMOCRACY IN DECAY?

"Democracy in South Africa is in an advanced stage of decay," wrote Alex. Hepple, the forthright leader of the Labour Party, recently. He was, of course, writing about Parliament, where he has to spend so much of his time. Indeed, it is a sorry spectacle of decay.

But we must not forget that the House of Assembly (nor the Senate) is not "democracy in South Africa." It never was.

If instead we turn our attention to the townships, farms, reserves and factories of our country, where the people are stirring and discussing and thinking and organising, as never before, we shall find that democracy in South Africa is very much alive and kicking!

The students are out in the streets with placards against academic segregation.

The bishops and clergy are out on the public platforms against group areas and church segregation, collecting funds for the Treason Trial accused.

The women are organising up and down the land, in every town and village, pledging resistance to passes.

The workers are flocking into the trade unions to demand £1 a day and an immediate increase in pay.

People arrested for passes and permits are refusing to plead guilty and defending themselves.

“Asinamali!” “Stand by Our Leaders!” “Azikhwelwa!” “Mayibuye!”  
“The People Shall Govern!” “No Taxation Without Representation!”  
The air is filled with stirring battle-cries.

People are talking everywhere, about Nkrumah and Nasser; about the Freedom Charter; about the boycotts; about rotten wages; about not buying goods made by firms bossed by well-known Nationalists . . . .

No decay here! Here's the vigorous, young democracy that's driven its strong roots deep into our land, that will not be denied, that is blossoming, beginning to bear the precious fruit of liberty!

## **WE NEED YOUR HELP**

LIBERATION is your journal. It cannot carry on without your help. We ask you to:

1. Write for LIBERATION.
2. Subscribe to LIBERATION.  
(See back cover)
3. Send us a donation to our Printing Fund.

# THE REICHSTAG FIRE

By L. BERNSTEIN

- THE SECOND OF THREE ARTICLES ON A CRITICAL EPISODE IN MODERN TIMES

*“This is a God-given signal! If this fire, as I believe, turns out to be the handiwork of Communists, then there is nothing that shall stop us now crushing out this murder pest with an iron fist. You are witnessing the beginning of a great new epoch in German history. This fire is the beginning.”*

Adolf Hitler. Statement to Sefton Delmer of the London Daily Express on the night of the Reichstag fire: February 27, 1933.

Every great moment of change in history has its date, however long may be the story of strife and turmoil that leads up to change. For Germany, imperialist Germany, that date was February 27, 1933, the night the Reichstag burned to the ground. The Germany which went to bed that night a sick and stricken democratic republic awoke next day to an iron-fisted dictatorship. If one is to put a date to the Nazi dictatorship, then the Reichstag fire is its beginning.

Such events are never accidental. The Reichstag fire was planned, as the Boston Tea Party and the November 7th uprising were planned. Nor was it planned to appear as accident. It was planned to proclaim itself deliberate arson. Flames broke out at seven or more places in the building simultaneously. Torches and tar were scattered about for all to see. And one of the firebugs remained on the premises to be arrested, leaving his jacket at the scene of the starting of the fire and carrying a membership card of the Dutch Communist Party in his pocket. This man was Marinus van der Lubbe. And this too was planned.

And there was much more to the Reichstag fire that was planned beforehand. Clumsily planned, because, perhaps, it was never intended to bring the firebugs to trial before an open court. Because, perhaps, it was intended only that the mailed fist of Nazism should come down — as it did on the very night of the fire — on all the enemies of Hitler's New Order, on communists and Social Democrats and trade unionists and pacifists; and that the quiet of the concentration camp should close over the whole affair.



But the plan miscarried. The eyes of the world were on Germany in those days of change. Press correspondents poked fingers through the flimsy concoctions of the Hitler State Information Office. Terror had not yet bitten deep enough to prevent honest Germans speaking out the bits of truth they knew. Perhaps it was intended that Van der Lubbe should be shuffled off, quietly, having played out his part to the full. But the intention could not be fulfilled; for the word began to go around the world that the Nazis themselves had fired the Reichstag.

There was solid ground for the rumour. On March 2nd, for instance, the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* published a message from the official Preussische Pressedienst:

*"In certain foreign newspapers the slanderous assertion, emanating from German Marxist circles, is being circulated that the fire in the Reichstag building was organised not by Communists but from the National Socialist side. . . . Among other things it is asserted that the Dutch Communist who was arrested is in reality an agent provocateur, and was induced to carry out the act of incendiarism by leading National Socialists . . . . These slanderous arguments are of course devoid of any basis."*

The rumours were based on many things.

Mass arrests had begun by midnight on the night of the fire, which only started by 9 o'clock; and by February 28 in Berlin alone, 1,500 people had been arrested by warrants made out, signed and with photographs of the arrested person attached. Clearly these warrants had been prepared before the fire. On February 27 the whole of the storm troop forces in Berlin were confined to their barracks, and kept there all day awaiting further orders. At the height of an election campaign, Goering, Goebbels and Hitler were all in Berlin, none of them speaking at meetings on that night, although all were speaking at meetings almost daily before and after. The Reichstag officials and staff were released from duty earlier than usual on that day by Goering's orders. Herr Gemp, chief fire brigade director of Berlin, had complained that Goering had expressly forbidden him to circulate a general call to all fire-stations for aid in fighting the fire, and the storm troops had been summoned and reached the fire before the fire brigade. On March 1 an official Government statement said that ". . . other criminals may have been able to escape through the underground passage . . . which connects the Reichstag building itself with the building of the President of the Reichstag". And the President of the Reichstag, Hermann Goering, was also Minister of Police, and head of the storm-troop organisations.

The rumours were solidly founded. The accusing finger of world opinion swung round to point clearly at the Nazis as the criminals and firebugs of February 27th. Whether or not there was any original intention to bring a "Fire Trial" before the courts, the fierce spotlight of world attention made such a public trial inevitable if the Nazis were to justify themselves. But despite all the confident assertions that the fire was caused by Communists, there was only one man in custody definitely accused of the crime. That was Marinus van der Lubbe. There were others held in prison without charge.

## THE ACCUSED

There was Ernst Torgler, Chairman of the caucus of Communist members of the Reichstag, who had been arrested the day after the fire when, in the presence of his lawyer, he voluntarily entered police headquarters to rebut allegations that he had been involved in the fire. There were, also, three Bulgarian Communists, arrested in the general anti-Communist dragnet on March 3rd — Georgi Dimitrov, Tanev and Popov. During the weeks that followed the trial, hastily concocted tales were fabricated in Goering's ministries to "confirm" the guilt of the five men.

But the concocted tales served only to strengthen the suspicion that the Nazi Government had itself plotted and carried through the act of arson. Against Torgler it was alleged that he had been seen in the corridors of the Reichstag building with van der Lubbe at 8 p.m., an hour before the fire started; but it was also stated that he left the building only at 10 p.m., an hour after the fire started. No one in Goering's office asked the question immediately posed by the press: 'How did Torgler pass out through the police cordón, through the crowd of thousands which had assembled by 10 p.m. without any questions being asked?' Against Dimitrov it was alleged that he had been seen in Berlin with van der Lubbe a day before the fire; but the witness who swore to the allegation disappeared before he could be questioned further and confronted with proof that on that day Dimitrov was not in Berlin, but in Munich.

By March 27th, a full month after the fire, investigating Judge Vogt created a world sensation by announcing to the press that, at that date, the only charge sheet and summons so far prepared was against van der Lubbe. No one in Germany or abroad, could be brought to believe that this dull-witted and insignificant character could have carried through the crime alone. The pertinent question was raised: 'Are the criminals shielding behind the Nazi rulers?' On April 3rd, Judge Vogt, bowing to the storm of criticism, announced that ". . . warrants for protective arrest have been issued in respect of a few other suspected persons." And on June 2nd, came the startling announcement that van der Lubbe, Torgler, Dimitrov, Popov and Tanev were to be charged with "setting fire to the Reichstag and high treason." (My emphasis. L.B.) The high treason charge had come as an afterthought, a hasty, ill-conceived afterthought, by those whose frame-up was being unmasked as fast as it was planned.

By April 22nd, the intention became clearer. "The Supreme Court" said a statement issued by Judge Vogt, "proposes to combine the investigation in the many cases of high treason against members of the Communist Party into one single inquiry on a vast scale . . . The cases concerned are all those arising in connection with the change of Government in Germany . . . during the course of January and February. This will also include the proceedings connected with the act of incendiarism in the Reichstag." But a month later, this grand plan had been shot full of holes, and an announcement from the official parliamentary news bureau announced: "That the trial in connection with the act of incendiarism in the Reichstag will be associated with other cases against the Communist leaders in a great Communist trial, as is suggested, is not to be expected." Nothing more was ever heard of the "Treason Trial."



It is necessary to turn to the man van der Lubbe. At the age of sixteen he had joined the Young Communist League in Leyden (Holland), and resigned a few years later when his ambition to become leader of the Pioneer movement was thwarted. He rejoined the same year, and resigned again after a conflict with the leadership of the Y.C.L. Again he rejoined a year later, and in 1937 resigned again when the question of his expulsion was under discussion. In 1931 he visited Germany, and met a Dr. Bell, and through him the influential Nazi Captain Röhm. The anarchistic tendencies which had led to his breach with the Y.C.L. finally led him into prison, for breaking the windows at the office of an unemployment relief organisation, after his claim for increased allowances had been turned down. On his release from prison towards the end of 1932, he spoke at a number of meetings, vigorously attacking communism; some of these meetings were held by the Dutch fascist organisation. In January 1933 he left Holland for Germany.

### GEORGI DIMITROV

And it necessary to turn to the other figure, Georgi Dimitrov — the man who came to hold the centre of the stage at the Reichstag Fire Trial. At the time of the trial he was fifty years old. All his life he had been a revolutionary; at fifteen he had joined the workers revolutionary movement in Bulgaria, and at eighteen had become secretary of the country's oldest trade union, the Print Workers Union. At the age of twenty, in 1902, he joined the Marxist wing of the Social Democratic Party, and rose over the years to become a County Councillor, a member of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and General Secretary of the Central Committee of Bulgarian trade unions. There is no struggle of the working class of Bulgaria in the twentieth century with which the name of Georgi Dimitrov is not associated. Finally in 1923, Dimitrov headed an armed uprising — was forced to leave the country, being sentenced, in absentia, to 15 years imprisonment. But he continued his life as a professional revolutionary, as a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International and one of its foremost organisers against fascism.

(In his third and final article, Mr. Bernstein deals with Dimitrov's defence in the Reichstag fire trial. It will be published in the next issue of LIBERATION.)



In this, the fourth and concluding article in his series on the implications of the Bantu Authorities Act for the Transkei, Mr. Mbeki deals with the administration of Bantu Education and the composition of the local authorities, under the Native Affairs Department. It has been proposed by a reader that the whole series should be reprinted as a pamphlet. We would welcome reader's opinions about this suggestion.

# THE TRANSKEI TRAGEDY

A STUDY IN THE BANTU AUTHORITIES ACT.

By GOVAN MBEKI

## IV. THE LAST WORD

Even the Nationalists whose political philosophy is based on the violent application of their policy, reckon with the fact that compulsion in Government has no lasting results. It is for that reason that the officials of the Native Affairs Department took so much pains to persuade the Councillors at the special session of the Transkei Council to administer the Bantu Education Act. In spite of their unwillingness to accept the administration of so specialised a service as Education, the Councillors were not allowed to evade this responsibility.

Doubtful of the ability of the Bantu Authority to undertake the training of teachers, as this was a matter for experts, one Councillor asked: "I want to know how the territorial authority is expected to train teachers?"

In reply a Native Affairs official retorted: "Would the territorial authority not like to employ the experts who teach the teachers . . . and find the money and build the buildings and generally administer the Colleges?" To this the Councillor replied: "Yes." Elucidating the position further Mr. Pearce added: "I think all this means, Mr. Chairman, that if, in the future, the territorial authority should desire to assist the Bantu Education Division of the Department in some way or other in respect to teacher training, there is the power under which they could assist."

One more problem in respect of the administration of education before the Councillors had completely got themselves entangled irrevocably in the encircling tentacles of the Nationalist octopus had yet to be solved. Under the paragraph dealing with the functions of the Territorial Authority one such function is: "Higher Education: training of teachers". Asking for clarification of this point, a Councillor stated that under this item the control of Higher Education seemed to be restricted to the training of teachers. He suggested that there should be a "for example" inserted between "Higher Education" and "Training of Teachers". When the Chairman suggested inserting the word "including", Mr. Pearce immediately saw the advantage and while acknowledging the unconscious service rendered by this Councillor, agreed with the concurrence of his Committee to have the position clarified by the addition of the word "including" between the words "education" and "training". Thus this function which is to be carried out by the Territorial Bantu Authority would in effect mean the administration of Higher Education, including the training of teachers.

For the Nationalists the acceptance of this item as one of the functions of the Bantu Authority must be considered as one of the greatest achievements. Two principles in their battle to render the African servile have, by the passing of the item "Higher Education, including the training of teachers", been established. That the Bantu Authority should find money to "build the buildings" means acceptance of the Nationalist policy that the African should pay for the Verwoerd indoctrination. The Bantu Authority must impose and collect burdensome taxes in order to help the Nationalists realise their fantastic dream of enslaving 10 million Africans.

Secondly, not only are the Nationalists interested in controlling teacher-training as an immediate and important objective in their scheme, but they are also preparing to take over the complete control of the whole field of Higher Education, including University Education. To enforce the worst aspects of Apartheid even in the seats of higher learning, the Nationalists will always hide behind the Bantu Authority and claim that he wants these things for the development of his people.

When dissatisfaction grows amongst the people against the increasing taxes, against the rehabilitation scheme, against Slave Education, against the pass laws, it is the Bantu Authority who will appeal to the Nationalists to bring in armed police to crush the dissatisfaction. When some men and women become recognised as leaders in their communities, the Bantu Authority will appeal to the Nationalists to deport them as "agitators" and "communists". When delinquency increases as a result of bad economic conditions the Bantu Authorities will plead for the teaching of more scriptures to the children at school for they are becoming more sinful. As the scriptures fail to cure the evil the Bantu Authority will plead for the opening of work colonies. The African must carry out in practice his own suicide and history will never point an accusing finger at God's Chosen race as represented by the Nationalists.

## **SEEDS OF TRIBAL CONFLICT**

In the composition of the four types of authority are the seeds of tribal conflicts which would blur the people's vision and render them unable to see their real problems of landlessness, exploitation and recurrent famines. The Recess Committee recommends that there should be four types of authority to take the following form:



(1) A Community Authority which will have influence over a tribal group within a limited small area.

(2) District Authority corresponding to the district Councils and also functioning as school Boards.

This is evidently for administrative convenience, to cover the same area of jurisdiction at present prescribed for each Native Commissioner.

(3) Five Regional Authorities for each of the following areas (a) Eastern Pondoland (b) Western Pondoland (c) Tembuland (d) Transkei Proper consisting of the four Fingo districts (i.e. Butterworth, Idutywa, Nqamakwe and Tsomo) (e) East Griqualand.

(4) A Territorial Authority which is to replace the General Council.

The manner in which the Government wants to ensure that the balance of power in the Authorities is in their favour may be judged from the composition of the Community Authority which is allowed a minimum membership of 8 and a maximum of 14 in the following proportions:

(a) The Chief or Headman to nominate the whole of the minimum, i.e. 8

(b) One third of the difference between the minimum and the maximum to be nominated by the Native Commissioner, i.e. 2

(c) Two thirds of such difference to be nominated by the people in consultation with the Chief or Headman 4

—  
Total 14  
—

Here is an abandonment of all pretence of representative institutions. Power comes from above, from the Governor-General (the Supreme Chief) to Dr. Verwoerd to Native Commissioners to Chiefs (African) to Headmen. Showing the typical Nationalist mentality which seeks to give to words and phrases meanings that conform to their myth of the "superman", Mr. Young told the Councillors: "The Chiefs and Headmen are leaders by virtue of their birthright and traditional tribal law. If they are then leaders by birthright . . . there is no need to elect them to a position which they already hold." Consistent with this idea the personnel of the Regional and Territorial Authorities is almost entirely composed of chiefs and headmen. They are made to feel that they have a divine right to rule the people as at the same time they are made to believe that the Nationalist baas has a divine mission to rule the chief. As the Nationalists will, according to this plan, be able to tell the chiefs, not ask them, what to do, it is expected that the chiefs will in turn be able to tell the people, not ask them, what to do. What will happen at the end of the long line when the people are told "what to do" is something to which the Nationalists and the people have diametrically opposed answers. And if history has any lessons to teach about what happened to those who thought like the Nationalists — the Pharaohs, the Hitlers, the Mussolinis — then history is on the side of the people.

## THE LAST WORD

"Under the Bantu Authorities Act and the regulations already published thereunder in respect of the appointment or the composition of tribal or community authorities, the people have no say in the appointment of the Community Authority . . . . If it were otherwise, Sir, the most vital principle of the Bantu Authorities System would have been thrown overboard



. . . It would make the whole system of Bantu Authorities a farce" . . . declared Mr. Pearce in answer to a Councillor who had complained that the composition of the Community Authority was heavily weighed in favour of what the Councillor described as "illiterate headmen."

The Bantu Authorities Act is a demonstration of the contempt of the Nationalist Party for the masses of common men, and for the African people. With blind faith in the magical powers of a handful of chiefs and their hangers-on, they hope to turn back the wheel of history and to see the African people revert to a state of tribal innocence, at war among themselves and an easy prey to exploitation and oppression. But Verwoerd and his men are due for a rude awakening from their dream. They know not with whom they are dealing: the children of mine and factory, with over a century of bitter lessons of the need for African unity, with minds open to the invigorating experiences of working people at home and abroad, who have hearkened to the inspiring call of the African National Congress.

The Verwoerd plan will not answer a single one of the great problems of the country — the poverty, landlessness, and frustration of aspirations of the people. In the last analysis the success of the plan depends upon its acceptance by the people themselves, and they will not accept any plan that does not answer these problems.

The Native Affairs Department should not be too quick to congratulate itself on its success in getting the members of the Bunga — through a mixture of threats, appeals to personal ambitions, and deception — to "accept" the Bantu Authorities Act. The Bunga had no mandate to speak, and it did not speak, on behalf of the people. The last word lies with the people, and they have not spoken yet.

# My Dear Mr. President

## ROCKEFELLER WRITES TO EISENHOWER

On February 15, 1957, the Berlin newspaper "Neues Deutschland" published the full text of a letter written in January, 1957 to President Eisenhower by Nelson A. Rockefeller, heir to the Standard Oil millions, and a key figure in the making of American foreign policy. The letter is so revealing in relation to the motives behind the "Eisenhower doctrine" and American plans in Africa and Asia, that "Liberation" has decided to reproduce it in this issue. Apart from our own sub-heads and emphases, the text is that in the possession of "Neues Deutschland", which stated in an editorial note that it came from a source of "undoubted reliability."

Dear Mr. President,

I am reluctant to revert to that lengthy and tiresome discussion which took place in Camp David in connection with my proposal regarding a bolder programme of aid to under-developed countries. However, recent political developments have shown that our discussion was not a sterile one and that the time has now come when I should state some points that have occurred to me which though they do not pretend to be original may all the same be of some help in approaching one of the most important problems of our foreign policy.

First of all I would like to express my deep satisfaction with the new Bill increasing the allocation for aid to underdeveloped countries. If I am not mistaken the Bill obtained your approval following Sir Anthony Eden's visit to Washington. The Bill was well timed, particularly in the light of Ambassador Cooper's recent reports emphasising the catastrophic drop in American prestige in India especially after Mr. Dulles' statement that Portugal should keep Goa.

I am sorry to have to point out that my arguments in favour of expanding our economic measures were misinterpreted. I have not, and never had, any fundamental differences with the Administration as regards the general line of our foreign policy. I appreciate as much as anybody does the importance of military alliances, but I believe that they call for an

approach different from that of the State Department so far. We should not shut our eyes to the fact that military alliances are becoming increasingly unpopuilar just now because of the active foreign policy offensive launched by the Russians.

We must face the fact that during the past two or three years the policy of building up military alliances has sustained serious setbacks. SEATO may serve as an example of this. The main Asian countries have refused to join it.

The fate of our most recent military project has been even worse. I refer to the Bagdad pact, considered by Dulles as an important success for American diplomacy — something claimed by the British as well.

True, on paper and on the maps the Bagdad pact looks well enough. It ties up four Middle East countries into a single military union, well disposed towards us. These countries are located directly on the southern perimeter of the Communist world and present valuable reserves of strategic raw materials and man power.

#### **GOOD FOR STANDARD OIL**

However, one of these four countries, Turkey, is already connected with our system of defence through NATO, and another, Pakistan, is a member of SEATO. At the same time, most of the Arabian countries have not joined the Pact, holding that the Pact is by its very nature contrary to their national interests.

The creation of these alliances in fact did not secure the ends desired by us either in South-East Asia or in the Middle East since we failed to include in the Pact or in the Organisation countries whose membership was vital for success. In saying this I do not mean to say that these organisations are of no use to us, that they should never have been created. It is not the pacts that I criticise, but the methods chosen for their establishment. I will not use the well known paraphrase: "What is good for Standard Oil is good for the USA", but all the same I cannot ignore the fact that neither the Bagdad pact nor SEATO guarantee us the use of the valuable resources of areas concerned. What is more, they do not guarantee even the security of those potentially vital bridgeheads.

The failures in our post-war policy in Asia are the more glaring when seen against the background of the visit by the Russian communist leaders to India, Burma and Afghanistan and the readiness shown by the Soviets to undertake largescale economic co-operation in this region. These Russian moves which we have so far regrettably failed to counter in any effective way may have far-reaching economic and political consequences for the future of all the countries of Asia. Therefore if we are not only to consolidate existing military alliances and arrangements but also to create new ones — assuming such pacts are a convenient form for our relations with other countries — we must begin to act in conformity with the new situation that confronts us.



The discussion which culminated at Camp David and which resulted in my resignation concerned not so much the essence of our relations with under-developed countries at the present moment or, rather, was not concerned with the theoretical principles of our policy in the backward areas so much as with the means and ways and pursuing that policy. I refer to this dispute because some of my arguments apparently had a favourable effect and contributed to the approval by you of the Bill providing for the increase of aid to underdeveloped countries. It is in this connection that I have tried once again in this note to formulate my opinion on the changes that seem to me essential in our policy in Asia.

To put the problem in a nutshell — our policy must be both "global" i.e. embrace every part of the world and also "total" i.e. include political, psychological, economic, military and special methods integrated into one whole. In other words the task is to hitch all our horses in a single team. To illustrate my point of view better I want to attempt some analysis — even if it is a superficial one — of some aspects of our foreign policy as it has been conducted in Europe and Asia.

In Europe we started with economic aid. It is quite possible that without the Marshall Plan we would have found it more difficult to form NATO. What in fact happened in this case was that a co-ordinated foreign policy, using every kind of pressure, resulted in the creation of what we hoped was a solid military union. Even critics within NATO itself say that it suffers from undue emphasis on the military aspects at the expense of the economic factors which played such a big role in its formation.

In Asia our efforts were far less successful. The principal reason for this can, I believe, be clearly stated: the conception of force was too nakedly shown, too much stress was laid on the military side while we largely ignored the importance of preliminary economic preparations for the alliances we wished to make.

## FOUNDATION OF SAND

This underestimation of the vital economic aspects on the part of the State Department has led to the creation of SEATO and the Bagdad pact on a foundation of sand. And I would prefer to see the sand cemented. The American tradition has been that "the flag follows trade". In spite of this wise tradition all our energy was directed to building up the military side of SEATO. It is hardly plausible, however, that the members of SEATO would want to be involved in a war with communist China, with the US backing Chiang Kai-shek. Yet this apparently was the State Department's calculation.

I confess that I am gratified when I see that more and more people in the Administration are coming to the conclusion that ill-considered military steps sometimes weaken and even totally destroy the effect of economic measures the necessity for which you have come to see for yourself.

But the same military measures will often be found objectionable if the way to them is paved with economic aid.

You of course know, Sir, that in the vast underdeveloped regions of the world the most serious problem of all is the lack of capital, equipment, administrative personnel and technical specialists. We must always take this fact into account in all our planning. If we believe in military arrangements we should be prepared to pay for them.

However the 'payment' must be done in a different way from that followed hitherto. Thus, for example, although economic and technical aid to underdeveloped countries last year ran to more than \$1,000,000,000 in fact more than half of this sum was concentrated in three countries where military and political rather than economic considerations were the controlling factors. These countries were South Korea, Formosa and South Vietnam.

I am happy to see that the Administration has at last ceased to sit on the fence, as it were, of military alliances, impotently watching the growth of nationalism among Asian peoples who are simultaneously in receipt of American armaments and Russian technical aid. I am pleased to see that the Administration, even though under the influence of external factors, has at last paid due attention to the economic side of our military alliances, has recognised that economic policy is inseparable from military policy.

The most significant example in practice of what I mean, was the Iranian experiment with which, as you will remember, I was directly concerned. By the use of economic aid we succeeded in getting access to Iranian oil and we are now well established in the economy of that country. The strengthening of our economic position in Iran has enabled us to acquire control over her entire foreign policy and in particular to make her join the Bagdad pact. At the present time the Shah would not dare even to make any changes in his Cabinet without consulting our Ambassador.

To sum up, the considerations stated here have brought my friends and myself to the conclusion that our political programme must be based on the following fundamental considerations:

1. We must continue the measures designed to create and strengthen our military alliances. For these alliances, while potentially useful in warding off any communist aggression and in preventing nationalist outbreaks, consolidate our entire position in Asia and the Middle East. /

We should not ignore the vital fact that virtually all of our natural rubber, manganese, chromium and tin, as well as substantial proportions of our zinc, copper and oil and a third or more of the lead and aluminium we need comes from abroad, and, furthermore, that it is chiefly drawn from the underdeveloped areas of Africa and Asia, which are in the orbit of one or other of the military alliances built by the US. This is also true of a major part of our "superstrategic material" (uranium ore, in particular).

2. In order to strengthen and, if possible, to broaden these alliances we must draw up a programme of economic development extensive enough for us to have in Asia, Africa and other underdeveloped areas a political and



military influence as great or greater than that we obtained through the Marshal Plan in Europe. That is why the main flow of our economic allocations for underdeveloped countries should be channelled through bodies set up to serve our military alliances. This should serve to make the alliances themselves more attractive. If necessary, certain changes in the form of these alliances should be considered.

## **STEP UP THE PRICE**

In other words, wherever possible we should emphasise the economic aspects of our alliances. We should widely and wisely make use of economic aid to those countries which we intend to draw into alliances with us, but we should do it more flexibly and carefully than hitherto. In the past we have sometimes tied up the provision of economic aid with demands to join one or other of our alliances in such a crude manner that many potential allies were alienated. It is necessary for us to act carefully and patiently, and in the early stages confine ourselves to securing very modest political concessions in exchange for our economic aid (in some exceptional cases even without any concessions in return). The way will then be open to us, but at a later stage, to step up both our political price and our military demands.

You seemed to be ruled by these considerations when you agreed to offer economic aid to Egypt to help it with the construction of the Aswan Dam. If the Nasser Government accepts this aid a situation will be created in which Egypt will inevitably become bogged down in over-ambitious construction and will need our support for a long period of time. I think it logical to extend this type of co-operation to other countries. And in particular never to forget the theory of cumulative rather than immediate political demands on which it is based.

## **HOOKED FISH NEEDS NO BAIT**

3. In line with this I suggest that those countries to which US economic aid is to be extended, should be divided into three groups, different methods and forms of economic co-operation being applied to each of these groups.

First of all, we should pick out the countries with anti-communist governments friendly to us, which are already bound to the US through stable long-term military agreements. In this case governmental subsidies and credits may take the form mainly of military appropriations. The hooked fish needs no bait.

Here I agree with the State Department, that the allotment of extensive economic aid, say, to Turkey, might under certain circumstances bring results exactly the opposite of those intended, might, that is, strengthen its tendency to independence and to weakening its existing military alliances. Such countries may be given direct economic aid as well but we must give them only as much as is necessary in order to keep suitable governments concerned in power and to check any hostile opposition elements.

In this connection it will also be necessary to regulate private investment. The government should make use of and encourage private investors, seeing that many political objectives can be secured with their help. In the long run such private investments should allow us to eliminate or neutralise any disloyal opposition or resistance to our policy, and to put increased economic pressure on only local business interests which show uncertainty or hesitate to support us. At the same time economic support for those strata of the local business community which are ready to co-operate with the US should be increased, and the necessary conditions should be created for businessmen of this type to be put in key economic positions and accordingly for their political influence to be increased.

## **INTERNAL SUBVERSION**

The second group includes those countries which pursue or tend towards a neutralist policy. In this case the main emphasis in economic assistance as regards government subsidies and credits should be on creating conditions in which eventually the economic relations established by us would work for and make it natural for these countries to join military pacts and alliances inspired by us. The essence of this policy should be that the development of our economic relations with these countries would ultimately allow us to take over key positions in the native economy. In neutralist countries we should support any tendencies to seek our help in launching extensive economic plans which go beyond what is really practical (e.g. the case of Egypt, mentioned above). By this means we can hope to divert the foreign policy of these countries in a more desirable direction.

In encouraging private investment in these countries support should be given to those sections or individual persons who oppose the present regimes. We should thus lay the basis for the orientation of the policy of those countries in a more healthy direction.

The most important member of this second group is, of course, India..

The third group should include colonial countries still directly dependent on their mother-countries (e.g. Morocco, the Belgian Congo and Equatorial Africa etc.) Side by side with measures designed to encourage private investment for these countries, support should be given, in particular cases and within due limit, to native businessmen, who are struggling against their colonial status. In the first stage such aid might take the form of establishing joint enterprises. In supporting such elements we should proceed from the fact that if we do not support them we lose all hope of exercising a restraining influence on them until too late. If this happens the desire for independence may result in a nationalism so strong as to escape not only from the control of the old colonial powers but also from our own control.

## **"SINCERE AND DISINTERESTED"**

Extensive economic aid to all three groups of countries should always be presented as the expression of a sincere and disinterested desire on the part of the USA to help and co-operate with them. We cannot afford to econo-



mise in ramming home by every propaganda means available to us the disinterested nature of US policy as regards aid to underdeveloped countries. We do not economise on our anti-communist work.

Meanwhile our investors, our technical experts, and other specialists should make it their business to penetrate every branch of the national economy of backward countries, and to develop them with due respect for our own interests and encouraging the national ambitions of those native businessmen whose political loyalty is not in doubt.

It seems to me that provided all these recommendations are carried out the result should be not only to strengthen the international position of the US as a whole but would also considerably facilitate the fulfilment of any military tasks that may confront us in the future by strengthening existing military arrangements and breathing new life into them.

I would not have written this letter and I certainly would not have written at such length, if I had not been confident of your sympathy with the ideas expressed here, and if I did not hope that these ideas would help us in shaping our policy along sound lines.

Naturally, in this letter I have not been able to put down all my arguments in favour of switching the emphasis of our foreign policy. It is my deep hope however that you and also those responsible for drawing up the budget are now convinced of the need to take measures which will strengthen our position in Asia and perhaps more important, in the Middle East, and have decided to revise the priorities given to the different aspects of this central problem. As my friend put it, we cannot allow future historians to say that in the second decade after World War II freedom throughout the world died of a balanced US budget.

Yours sincerely,

Nelson A. Rockefeller.

## **SUBSCRIBE TO "LIBERATION"**

"LIBERATION" is published ten times a year. Send ten shillings for one year, or five shillings for six months to:

"LIBERATION",  
P.O. Box 10120,  
JOHANNESBURG

Fill in this form:

Name

.....

Address

.....

.....

To LIBERATION : Please send me "LIBERATION" for one year/six months. I enclose 10 shillings/five shillings (cross out that which does not apply).

Printed by Royal Printers, 12, Wolhuter Street, Westgate, Johannesburg and published by the proprietors, Liberation, P.O. Box 10120, Jhb.