

JULY, 1973

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

THE UNITED STATES AND AFRICA

PADMORE, THE "FATHER" OF
NEO-PAN-AFRICANISM

Henry Winston

U.S. IMPERIALISM IN SOUTHERN
AFRICA

Hyman Lumer

THE AFRICAN LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Harold Rogers

THE LIBERATION MOVEMENT BETWEEN
WORLD WARS

Lily Golden

ISRAEL'S SETBACKS IN AFRICA

Tawfik Zayyad

WOUNDED KNEE AND THE INDIAN FUTURE

John Pittman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Henry Winston</i> Padmore, the "Father" of Neo-Pan-Africanism	1
<i>Hyman Lumer</i> U.S. Imperialism in Southern Africa	20
<i>Harold Rogers</i> The African Liberation Movement	35
<i>Lily Golden</i> The Liberation Movement Between World Wars	47
<i>Tawfik Zayyad</i> Israel's Setbacks in Africa	55
<i>John Pittman</i> Wounded Knee and the Indian Future	66
IDEAS IN OUR TIME	
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i> U.S. Imperialism and Racism: A History	75
BOOK REVIEWS	
<i>Tony Monteiro</i> James Forman's Pseudo-Marxism	86

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26 Street, New York, N. Y. 10010, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$6.00 a year; \$3.00 for six months; for foreign and Canada, \$7.00 a year. Single copies 60 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N.Y.

Padmore, the "Father"
of Neo-Pan-Africanism*

For W. E. B. Du Bois, Pan-Africanism was at all times an anti-racist, anti-imperialist concept. But the Pan-Africanism of Innis, Baraka, Forman, Boggs, Carmichael and others, while invoking the name of Du Bois, takes its inspiration from George Padmore, C. L. R. James and Marcus Garvey.

For a brief interval—during the period of his work with the Communist International—Padmore's activity harmonized with Du Bois' anti-imperialist, internationalist conception of Pan-Africanism. It was only in this three or four year interval, ending in 1934, that Padmore appeared to genuinely share Du Bois' views. After that, while he found it expedient to pay lip service to this great genius of the 20th century liberation struggles, Padmore—whose closest friend, C. L. R. James, always openly opposed Du Bois—was in fact going in a direction opposite from Du Bois.

Unlike Padmore, Du Bois never departed from the conviction that anti-imperialist struggle demanded unity with the Soviet Union and all oppressed and exploited classes and peoples of every race on earth. Socialism in the multi-national, multi-colored Soviet Union coincided with his own deepest convictions and strivings toward Black liberation, both in the U.S. and in Africa. It was characteristic of Du Bois that, returning from his first visit to the USSR in November 1926, he proudly affirmed: "I have been in Russia something less than two months . . . I stand in astonishment and wonder at the revelation of Russia that has come to me. I may be partially deceived and half-informed. But if what I have seen with my eyes and heard with my ears in Russia is Bolshevism, I am a Bolshevik." As Padmore was moving away from an anti-imperialist conception of Pan-Africanism, Du Bois was moving to its support ever more consistently.

From 1934 until his death, Padmore's views derived not from Du Bois, but from Garvey and James. In this connection, it is important to recall that while Du Bois hailed the October Revolution from the

* The following is the second chapter of the recently published book, *Strategy for a Black Agenda: A Critique of New Theories of Liberation in the United States and Africa* (International Publishers, New York, 1973).

It is reprinted with the permission of the publishers.

beginning, James denied both the possibility and the necessity of solidarity between the oppressed of Africa and the land of socialism. James' concept of Pan-Africanism never in any way coincided with Du Bois'. And Padmore's divergence from Du Bois developed as he came closer to James' anti-Soviet, bourgeois-nationalist ideology.

Especially because of their anti-Communist, anti-Soviet opposition to Du Bois' Pan-Africanism, the policies of Padmore and James objectively led them into accommodation to the imperialist oppressors of the African peoples who have always given top strategical priority to the aim of isolating the oppressed nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America from their anti-imperialist allies on a world scale. Above all, the target of U.S. imperialism is to isolate the oppressed peoples and workers of all countries from the Soviet Union and the growing influence of its example. For these reasons, the Padmore-James revision of Du Bois' Pan-Africanism, now widely promoted in the U.S., has become a serious menace to the unity of the struggle against the monopolists within the U.S. and to the post-independence struggles against neo-colonialism in Africa.

The observation has been made that corporate monopoly combines the techniques of Detroit with those of Madison Avenue in promoting its ideological offensive against the people's struggles. One can see how this operates as the new anti-Marxist ideological fashions come rolling off the ideological assembly lines like the latest model cars. And, like new cars, these anti-Marxist concepts have a high rate of obsolescence, especially since they must be road-tested on the rugged terrain of the class and national struggles of the oppressed.

To help make up for this rapid obsolescence, the monopolists sometimes revive "old" models, repainted and fitted with the latest ideological trimmings. The old model is then presented as a newly discovered classic. This is what is being done, for instance, with the reputation of George Padmore on the appearance of a new edition of his book, *Pan-Africanism or Communism?*, first published in 1956 in England.

On the basis of this book, which attempts to merge Pan-Africanism with anti-Communism, the corporate controlled mass media now acclaim Padmore as the great genius and theoretician of Pan-Africanism. These are the same corporate masters who brutally persecuted Paul Robeson and W. E. B. Du Bois because they consistently pointed out that anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism, along with racism, were weapons of oppression.

In his introduction to his book, Padmore revealed that his ideology, though expressed in the lofty language of Pan-Africanism and "African socialism," treats the imperialist powers who carved up Africa as

gently as Booker T. Washington treated the oppressors of his people in the United States. (It is interesting to note that in arranging for the publication of his book in Africa, where anti-Communism finds a less receptive political climate, Padmore changed the title simply to *Pan-Africanism*, and also discarded his own foreword to the original English edition.) Padmore wrote:

Africans are quite willing to accept advice and support which is offered in a spirit of true equality, and would prefer to remain on terms of friendship with the West. But they want to make it under their own steam. If, however, they are obstructed they may in their frustration turn to Communism as the only alternative means of achieving their aims. The future pattern of Africa, therefore, will, in this context, be in large measure determined by the attitudes of the Western nations. (*Pan-Africanism or Communism?*, Dobson Books Ltd., London, 1956, pp. 17-18.)

It would be difficult to accuse anyone of bias in coming to a harsh judgment of Padmore's ideology, an ideology which allows him to proclaim to the world his willingness to accept support from Western imperialism provided, "it is offered in a spirit of true equality." This talk of "true equality" between imperialist oppressor and the oppressed is no less a fantasy than the idea of equality between slave and master on the plantation! Padmore continues:

Our criticism of British colonial policy is not what it professes to stand for—"self government within the Commonwealth"—but the failure to make good this promise unless actually forced to do so by the colonial peoples. It has always been a case of "too little and too late." The result is that the dependent peoples, who would otherwise be Britain's friends and allies, become her implacable enemies. What British colonial policy needs to do today is to make open recognition of awakening African self-awareness, and instill its own acts with boldness and imagination. Deeds and not vague promises are what is wanted. (*Ibid.*, p. 20.)

The views Padmore expressed about the colonialists were based on a lack of scientific understanding of imperialism. For him, as for Karl Kautsky—an ex-Marxist who betrayed the anti-imperialist struggles before and during World War I—imperialism was not an inherent stage in the development of capitalism, but a "policy" that corporate capital could turn on or off at will. Padmore, too, on the basis of anti-Marxist illusions, betrayed the peoples' struggles with appeals to the "good will" of the imperialists, exhorting them to change their "policies."

And today's neo-Pan-Africanists have simply translated Padmore's abject, illstory pleading—as an alternative to struggle—into "militant" rhetoric in the hope of making it palatable to radicalized youth.

Lenin Challenged Illusions

In his great classic, *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Lenin challenged the illusions of Kautsky's adherents in words that apply most aptly to Padmore and to the neo-Pan-Africanists now active in the United States. He wrote:

Where, except in the imagination of sentimental reformists, are there any trusts capable of concerning themselves with the condition of the masses instead of the conquest of colonies? (*Collected Works*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1964, Vol. 22, p. 261.)

And further:

Kautsky's obscuring of the deepest contradictions of imperialism, which inevitably boils down to painting imperialism in bright colors, leaves its traces in this writer's criticism of the political features of imperialism. Imperialism is the epoch of finance capital and of monopolies, which introduce everywhere the striving for domination, not for freedom. Whatever the political system the result of these tendencies is everywhere reaction and an extreme intensification of antagonisms in this field. Particularly intensified becomes the yoke of national oppression and the striving for annexations, *i.e.*, the violation of independence. (*Ibid.*, p. 297.)

When Padmore pleaded with British imperialism to "instill its own acts with boldness and imagination," he simply anticipated Roy Innis by 16 years. Innis calls for a "Marshall Plan" to help free Africa at a time when U.S. imperialism is trying to expand its penetration of Africa—and if need be, yes, with a "Marshall Plan." Not of course, for Africa's economic development, but to maintain NATO and South African and Portuguese military and economic domination and brutal aggression against the African liberation movements.

If any doubt still remains that the Pan-Africanism taking its inspiration from Padmore is alien to that of Du Bois, then consider Padmore's own appeal to the U.S. monopolists for "Marshall aid" to Africa:

In this connection of aid to Africa, if America, the "foremost champion and defender of the free world" is really worried about Communism taking root in Africa and wants to prevent such a calamity from taking place, I can offer insurance against it. This

insurance will not only forestall Communism, but endear the people of the great North American Republic forever to the Africans. Instead of underwriting the discredited regimes, especially in North, Central and South Africa with military aid, let American statesmen make a bold gesture to the Africans in the spirit of the anti-Colonialist tradition of 1776.

The gesture should take the form of a Marshall Aid program for Africa. (*Op. cit.*, p. 375.)

Obviously, this exposes the real reasons for Padmore's break with the Communist International; there was no place then, as there is no place now, in the Communist and Workers Parties for those with illusions about imperialism, those who deny that the issue in Africa is between imperialism and the oppressed peoples.

While rejecting Marshall Plan type "aid," Communists make it clear that they do not take a nihilistic attitude to aid and trade between former colonial or dependent countries and the imperialist powers. But they oppose "aid" or trade which continues a relationship of unrestricted plunder of the under-developed nations. Neo-colonial terms of trade, investment and "aid" bring super-profits to imperialism. And it should not be overlooked that the "aid" imperialism advances always comes out of its super-profits with the aim of perpetuating monopoly's domination over these countries.

The socialist countries do not, as the imperialists claim, seek exclusive economic relations with the emerging nations. On the contrary, they strive for a unified front of all the world's anti-imperialist forces to support the newly independent countries against the economic or military aggression of neo-colonialism.

Within this context, the socialist countries, and especially the Soviet Union, have inaugurated—for the first time in history—equitable terms of trade and credit for the developing countries. With such material aid and equitable economic relations, extended by the socialist countries as an integral part of the solidarity of the world's anti-imperialist forces, the former colonies now have the perspective of dealing with the imperialists from positions of increasing strength.

In struggling to realize this perspective, these countries will have begun the process of moving away from the days of subjugation—subjugation which was not relieved but *reinforced* by "aid" from the oppressor.

In all parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America, it is increasingly apparent that the existence of the socialist countries makes it increasingly difficult for imperialism to impose its dictates, whether militarily or economically, upon the peoples of the earth.

Time is running out on imperialism's long unchallenged control

over the terms by which it appropriates resources and products of the nations of the world. And one example of the new perspective opened up to the formerly oppressed peoples can be seen in Africa, the Mid-East and Latin America where the oil producing countries are at long last beginning to have a say in fixing the price of oil in the capitalist world market place. And this anti-imperialist "price-fixing," in addition to bringing billions in income to these formerly impoverished countries, has an even more important asset—it helps strengthen their independence and development and leads to sharper struggles for social advance within the revolutionary process.

Capitalism, which has for centuries plundered the wealth of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, must be compelled to do more than alter its terms of trade and credit. The monopolists must also be forced to use part of their superprofits for reparation to these countries—first and foremost to the Indochinese peoples, to assist their recovery from the most barbaric aggression in all history, and to the African peoples who suffered the centuries-long genocide of the slave trade and colonial oppression.

Trade, credits and aid must be based on recognition of the right of peaceful co-existence for each country of Asia, Africa and Latin America regardless of the social system each may choose. *This Leninist concept of the right of coexistence for different social systems goes to the heart of the question of self-determination.* Those neo-Pan-Africanists who call for anti-Communist "Marshall aid" to Africa make a mockery of the principle of self-determination as viewed by Du Bois and Lenin.

Calling for "aid" to African countries, while simultaneously echoing the neo-colonialists' anti-Communism and advocating a divisive skin strategy, weakens the world revolutionary process. In practice it means denying the right of coexistence of African countries, opening the door to the renewed economic, political and military pressures of neo-colonialism.

This, in turn, actually results in the denial of the elementary right of self-determination, of independent political existence. It also means denial of the right to choose a non-capitalist instead of a capitalist path—thus leading to submission to neo-colonialist terms of trade as well as "aid." To paraphrase Lenin in another situation, anti-Communist, neo-Pan-Africanist appeals for "aid" would, if answered, support Africa the way a rope supports a hanging man.

This is exactly what happened to Ghana when anti-Communist nationalists, echoing Padmore, plotted with U.S. and British imperialism against Nkrumah and isolated the country from the socialist nations and the world anti-imperialist forces. In denying Ghana's

right to choose a different social system, did not this result in tightening the noose against Ghana and tighten neo-colonial domination over the Ghanaian economy and people?

In calling for U.S. "Marshall aid" to Africa, Padmore's aim was not one of struggle to oust imperialism. His perspective was for imperialism to remain on the African continent—and he helped it to stay there by implying that it had already gone, was no longer a threat. He said:

In the coming struggle for Africa, the issue, as I have already inferred, will be between Pan-Africanism and Communism. Imperialism is a discredited system, completely rejected by Africans. (*Ibid.*, p. 21.)

Can any rational person believe, as Padmore suggests, that because imperialism has been rejected by Africans, it is already a dead dodo?

There is still another question that must be asked of today's neo-Pan-Africanists: Is there any contradiction between Padmore's anti-Communist ideology and the actions, for example, of Mobutu, accomplice of the Belgian bankers in the murder of Patrice Lumumba, or of General Thieu, partner of U.S. genocide in Vietnam, both of whom also, like Padmore, claim that the issue is between Communism and the people?

"Bending to the Will" of the Racists

In one of his mildest criticisms of Booker T. Washington, Du Bois wrote of his "bending to the will" of the racists. (*Dusk of Dawn*, Shoken Books, New York, 1940, p. 196.) Earlier, in *The Souls of Black Folk*, Du Bois discussed a particular example of this form of abject submission:

To gain the sympathy and cooperation of the various elements comprising the white South was Mr. Washington's first task, and this, at the time Tuskegee was founded, seemed, for a black man, well-nigh impossible. And yet ten years later it was done in the words spoken at Atlanta: "In all things purely social we can be as separate as the five fingers, and yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress." This "Atlanta Compromise" is by all odds the most notable thing in Mr. Washington's career. The South interpreted it in different ways: the radicals received it as a complete surrender of the demand for civil and political equality; the conservatives, as a generously conceived working basis for mutual understanding. So both approved it, and to-day its author is cer-

tainly the most distinguished Southerner since Jefferson Davis. (*The Souls of Black Folk*, Washington Square Press, New York, 1970, p. 35, originally published in 1903.)

And when today's neo-Pan-Africanists follow in Padmore's footsteps, are they not also "bending to the will" of the racists? Is this not also "complete surrender"?

The policies of neo-Pan-Africanism are ardently welcomed by today's conservatives. The anti-Communist version of Pan-Africanism can be accurately described, in Du Bois' words, "as a generously conceived working basis for mutual understanding" with neo-colonialism, U.S. racism and imperialism.

At the time when the gains of the Civil War and Reconstruction were being lost, Booker T. Washington assured the oppressors that instead of resisting the revival of racism, Black people would remain "as separate as five fingers" from a united struggle against their main enemy.

Padmore's Opposition to Anti-Fascist Struggle

In 1934, the German and Italian fascist imperialists were joining with Japanese imperialism to prepare for war with British, French and U.S. imperialism for a new partition of Africa and for the destruction of the first socialist state. It was at this time, when the advances achieved in centuries of struggle were threatened, that Padmore launched his anti-Communist career in the name of Pan-Africanism—assuring the imperialist powers that Black people would remain as "separate as the five fingers" from the anti-fascist struggle, from the Soviet Union and all the world's anti-imperialist forces. Padmore did this at a time when those forces were struggling for collective resistance against the Axis assault on Ethiopia and the growing fascist threat in Europe. Padmore's opposition to the anti-fascist movements in Europe marked the beginning of his open betrayal of Du Bois' internationalist conception of Pan-Africanism.

Padmore turned Pan-Africanism away from anti-imperialism, and into a concept aimed at winning the "good will" of imperialism on the basis of "mutual" anti-Communist understanding. His betrayal was compounded because he did this at a time when it was still possible to defeat German and Italian fascism from within, to halt the fascist aggression in Ethiopia and prevent the Franco-Axis attack against the Spanish Republic, all of which would have immeasurably strengthened the anti-colonialist struggles in Africa and elsewhere by preventing the outbreak of World War II.

In the context of the post-independence struggles in Africa and

the post-civil rights stage of struggle in the U.S., those who are inspired by Padmore's views are in effect helping revive the submissive ideology of Booker T. Washington. In contrast to Du Bois' concept, neo-Pan-Africanism calls for Black separation from, and anti-Communist antipathy to, the socialist and all anti-imperialist forces—non-Black or Black—on a world scale and in the U.S.

Can anyone doubt that this is a doctrine courting "mutual understanding" with the monopolist oppressors? Is it possible to deny that such a doctrine amounts to a resurrection of Booker T. Washington's "separate as the five fingers" credo, that it is a strategy of division and defeat for the world's oppressed and exploited—and first of all for the Black oppressed in the U.S. and the peoples of Africa?

Padmore started out by appealing to the good will of British imperialism. Later, with his call for "Marshall aid" to Africa, he began to include U.S. imperialism, which had emerged from World War I with mostly increased power, while British, French, Belgian and Portuguese imperialism had become secondary and even subordinate in Africa.

The purpose of the U.S. Marshall Plan, as has been noted, was to preserve capitalism in Europe by forestalling the advance of socialism, and by building a world-wide anti-Soviet encirclement aimed at containing the Soviet Union's support of the rising liberation struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Through Marshall Plan "aid," the U.S. supported the Dutch in Indonesia, the French in their African and Asian possessions, the Belgians in the Congo, and the Portuguese, the British and South African imperialists in other parts of Africa.

Is it possible to believe that U.S. imperialism will in any foreseeable future help build the economy of African countries? The imperialist leopard *cannot* change its spots. U.S. imperialism even now is in a new phase of rivalry with former recipients of Marshall Plan "aid" and with Japanese imperialism for control of African resources. At the same time, these rivals without exception operate within a policy aimed at preventing political independence in Africa from being followed by economic independence.

"An Empty Slogan"

Certain sharp criticisms of Pan-Africanism come from a surprising source—Daniel Guerin, an anti-Communist French writer and close friend of Padmore's. After receiving one of the first copies of his book from Padmore, Guerin wrote his friend:

In my opinion you are too eulogistic towards the Commonwealth. And when you, very correctly, denounce the "bogus and

fraudulent device to maintain French domination" why do you forget the device of the fetishist British Queen, used in order to keep together the several parts of the Commonwealth? (Quoted in James R. Hooker, *Black Revolutionary: George Padmore's Path From Communism to Pan-Africanism*, Praeger, New York, 1967, p. 128.)

Guerin then went on to say:

You give the impression (because of too vague definitions) to contradict yourself when you write on p. 337 that communism is meeting with stubborn resistance from the adherents of pan-Africanism and when you somewhere else write that many of the young Negro intellectuals in Britain held "Marxist views" (p. 147) and that both Garveyism and pan-Africanism "resemble Marxism" (p. 329). Then you *do homage* to communism when you observe that many of the present day students come from artisan families and peasant communities and are, therefore, more responsive to communist propaganda than those connected with the chieftain caste, etc. (p. 329). This means that there is a class struggle and that the communists are on the good side of the fence, the side of the poor. But, if so, why do you *seem to be delighted* when you say that most of these students on returning home revert to bourgeois nationalist, reactionary at fifty (p. 330). . . . Finally, my dear George, I am a little worried about a pan-Africanism which would be an empty slogan without much more contents than anti-communism . . . (*Ibid.*, pp. 128-129. Emphasis in the original.)

There is indeed a class struggle in Africa, and now, as they were then, Communists are on the "good side of the fence"—against colonialism in all its forms. And in writing of young African radicals who, he said, later became bourgeois nationalists, Padmore was unintentionally autobiographical.

As a youth, Padmore seemed to accept Marxism and anti-imperialist Pan-Africanism. But when in his fifties he came to Ghana at the invitation of Nkrumah, he arrived not with the Pan-Africanism of Du Bois, but as a bourgeois nationalist. Between 1957 and his death in 1959, Padmore tried to influence Nkrumah away from policies reflecting DuBois' thinking—that is, an orientation based consistently on a scientific socialist direction internally, and on unity with the world socialist, anti-imperialist forces headed by the Soviet Union internationally.

Padmore's activities brought him into increasing conflict with Nkrumah's Marxist and generally Left supporters, and finally with

Nkrumah himself. After Padmore visited Israel, this strain became worse. James Hooker, who shares Padmore's ideology, commented on Padmore's attitudes toward Israel as follows:

Though he never wrote about his view of the Israeli question, certain things suggest that Padmore favored the Jewish side of the dispute. . . . Certainly Ghanaian-Israeli relations were best and Ghanaian-Egyptian relations were worst during Padmore's stint at Flagstaff House. . . . In any case, there is no doubt that Padmore was unpopular in Egypt. . . . He did what he could, and very effectively, too, to hamper the Egyptians at the first meeting of the All-African Peoples' Organization, AAPO, (Accra, December, 1958) by reducing their proposed delegation's strength from a hundred to five (*Ibid.*, p. 135.)

But Padmore's increasingly open betrayal of the true spirit of Pan-Africanism was not limited to cutting down Egyptian participation in this conference. He also succeeded in preventing Du Bois' attendance at it. John Hooker relates that according to Dr. Edwin Munger, who reported this conference for the American Universities' Field Staff,

. . . Padmore was worried about the probable attendance of Du Bois, whose communist message undoubtedly would be received with deference, such was the old man's prestige among young Africans. *There is no reason to doubt the correctness of Professor Munger's report, but it does reveal a third stage in Padmore's relationship with Du Bois.* (*Ibid.*, pp. 136-137. Emphasis added.)

Hooker also relates that Smith Hempstone, then of the Institute of Current World Affairs, interviewed Padmore in Accra in 1958, and he quotes Hempstone as follows:

He seemed sincere in his views, but rather out of touch with the new generation of African nationalists, with the exception of Nkrumah himself, of course, to whom he was very close. I have a feeling that Nkrumah's reliance on Padmore as an ideologue contributed to the Ghanaian leader's failure to gain real control of the Pan-Africanist movement. By this I mean that if Nkrumah himself had taken the trouble to ascertain the thinking of other African leaders on the subject of Pan-Africanism, rather than relying on Padmore's interpretation of what the shape of Pan-Africanism should be, Nkrumah might have more stature than he has today. (*Ibid.*, p. 137.)

Though oversimplified and distorted in interpretation, there is some truth in these observations. However, Nkrumah's great leadership, and its potential for Africa's future, was not based on reliance on Padmore—though some of his errors were indeed related to Padmore's influence.

But the outstanding qualities that brought Nkrumah to the pinnacle of African leadership transcended the influence of Padmore's ideology. Coinciding with his invitation to Du Bois to come to Ghana, Nkrumah began to move more decisively to overcome the effects of bourgeois nationalism and anti-Communism within his Convention People's Party. However, by this time it was too late to overcome what Padmore had done to undermine the Left and stimulate the mobilization of reactionary nationalism in concert with international capital to overthrow the Nkrumah government.

The Cost of Padmore's Anti-Sovietism

Padmore's overriding compulsion to link anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism with Pan-Africanism helped create the ideological atmosphere within which Nkrumah's enemies mobilized their forces. This strengthened the bourgeois forces in Nkrumah's CPP, enabling them to orient economic policies on capitalists and rich peasants as against public sectors of the economy. As a result, the country was increasingly at the mercy of the credit, "aid" and take policies of neo-colonialism.

While Nkrumah sought to turn Ghana toward a more consistent non-capitalist path and a more consistent recognition that true Pan-Africanism had to rely first of all on the socialist countries as the bulwark of anti-imperialism on every continent, the traditional elite in and out of the Convention People's Party was using Padmore's anti-Communism to challenge Nkrumah's leadership.

Commenting on some of the factors that led to Nkrumah's overthrow, two academic writers state:

We maintain that Nkrumah lost his opportunity partly because, despite his ideological commitment to socialism, he did not have a vanguard party on which he could rely if he wished to nationalize the economy. . . . He could have chosen a "conservative path" of development . . . or he could have opted for the "radical path." . . . As the first independent African state and one of the few with real immediate development potential, Ghana was in a position to bargain for socialist cooperation, especially from the Soviet Union, which might possibly have put Ghana in a position similar to that of Cuba. Cuba, with a population about the size of Ghana's has

received a price from the Soviet Union for its primary export, sugar, which provides a basis for economic development. In 1968 Cuba received \$365 million over the world price from the Soviet Union for sugar. (Barbara Callaway and Emily Card in *The State of the Nations*, Michael F. Lochie, ed., University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1971, p. 92.)

One cannot help recalling that in 1966, the year Nkrumah was overthrown, there was a disastrous drop in the price of cocoa—manipulated by the same imperialists who engineered the coup against Nkrumah and whose "good will" Padmore preferred to the solidarity and support of the Soviet Union.

The story of the contrast between the role of cocoa in disrupting social and political advances in Ghana with the role of sugar in Cuba's development is a fundamental expression of the consequences of neo-Pan-Africanism as compared to the international Pan-Africanism of Du Bois.

On July 26, 1972, on Cuba's National Day, what Fidel Castro had to say about the Soviet Union is as valid for Africa as it is for Cuba, and for the anti-imperialist struggles all over the world:

. . . in the future humanity will fully appreciate what the Soviet people have done for it. Our country is one of the many relevant examples.

What perhaps irks the imperialists and their stooges the most is the fact that this country of ours, situated on the very doorstep of the United States in the Caribbean which the Yankees once considered their private preserve, was able to cancel out the past, to carry out the revolution, to defend itself and hold its own. They will not forgive the Cuban revolution for this. They will not forgive the USSR for the support it has given us not in order to take possession of Cuba's mines, to seize Cuban soil, or to exploit our people, not to implant vice, prostitution, gambling, poverty, not to grab, not to appropriate the fruits of our labor, not to conquer the country, not to exploit anyone. The Soviet Union supported us in conformity with revolutionary and internationalist principles.

And, continued Castro,

The Soviet state does not own a single mine, not a single factory outside the frontiers of the USSR. Everything it has, everything it owns, every credit it extends, the aid it gives, all this derives from its own natural wealth, from the labor and sweat of its people.

The imperialists and capitalists at times grant loans. But on what terms? At exorbitant interest rates! . . . And even if a capitalist country does extend long term credits, in 10 years' time

you have to pay back twice as much, more through non-equivalent exchange, buying at high prices and selling at low, whether it is a matter of coffee, cocoa, sugar, minerals, or anything else. And the money the capitalists lend is money they have squeezed out of other peoples.

The economic relations between Cuba and the Soviet Union have always been the most unselfish and most revolutionary possible between two countries. . . .

What would have happened had there been no socialist camp, had not the Soviet Union existed? The least that would have happened is that we would all have been wiped out. The least!

We say that in the world today where imperialism exists and remains powerful leaving behind a legacy of poor and undeveloped countries, it is impossible to carry out revolution, to win independence without socialism and international solidarity. This is our credo.

The Cuban experience demonstrates that those who fight for liberation against imperialism do not have to bargain with the Soviet Union for its support and solidarity.

And, it may be added, Castro's credo expressed the internationalism that is the basis of Du Bois' Pan-Africanism— which, I believe, is one of the basic reasons fighters for Black liberation in the U.S. will reject the anti-Communist variants of Pan-Africanism. They will understand that anti-Communism linked to Pan-Africanism is an ideology as alien to the needs of Black liberation in the U.S. as it is to achieving African liberation. Every fighter for Black liberation will appreciate these closing remarks of Castro's:

I would like to ask this of the quasi-intellectuals, pseudo-revolutionaries, schemers and vilifiers: how many million lives would the Cuban revolution have cost had it not had the support of the socialist camp, especially the Soviet Union?

But for the influence of Padmore's anti-Communist perversions of Pan-Africanism, Ghana would now probably have been advancing towards socialism—an inspiration to all Africa as Cuba is to all Latin America.

Du Bois' anti-imperialist Pan-Africanism embodies the Leninist concept of anti-imperialism—which applies to each country, each oppressed people and exploited class, in accordance with that country's specific historical conditions. It is a concept of internationalism which rejects the idea that a continent can become free through an anti-Communist color strategy that would separate liberation struggles from the socialist and anti-imperialist forces on a world scale. It rejects out of hand the idea that the people of Africa, Latin America

or any other continent can end oppression and exploitation by going-it-alone on a color or nationality basis. That is the meaning of Castro's message, and that is why it harmonizes with the legacy left us by Du Bois.

Class Struggle and the Du Bois Legacy

To carry out this legacy in the United States calls for challenging the "quasi-intellectuals and pseudo-revolutionaries" who would have us abandon the struggle by denying the class basis of racism. Fighting racism, expecting liberation, is inconceivable without a strategy directed against the class source of racism. The same principle, taking into account the differences in their conditions and peoples, applies to each country on the African continent.

If one recognizes that most of the countries of Africa are dominated by imperialism, then one must also recognize that the content of the anti-imperialist struggle must reflect the specific class relations in each African country. If one says that no classes exist in Africa, as the rationale for claiming that Marxism does not apply to Africa, then one is saying that imperialism does not exist in Africa.

It is quite true that the development of both the bourgeoisie and the working class in Africa has been restricted by external domination. The struggle for the interests of the working class—which correspond with national independence and self-determination—and the tendency of the national bourgeoisie to compromise with neo-colonialism are at the center of the politics, the class struggle, in every African country. If one recognizes that imperialism must operate on the basis of the general laws of capitalism, then one cannot deny the fundamental fact of the existence of classes and class struggle in Africa, even though what is involved in most instances is a more or less emergent national bourgeoisie and proletariat.

When Nkrumah came to recognize the class struggle as basic to the struggle on the African continent, he began to express his unequivocal rejection of Padmore's ideology—the myth of anti-Communist "African socialism." In one of his latter works, Nkrumah stated:

The African Revolution is an integral part of the world socialist revolution, and just as the class struggle is basic to world revolutionary process, so also is it fundamental to the struggle of the workers and peasants of Africa. (*Class Struggle in Africa*, International Publishers, New York, 1970, p. 10.)

And again emphasizing the ideological distance he had put between himself and Padmore, Nkrumah wrote:

Myths such as African socialism and pragmatic socialism, implying the existence of a brand or brands of socialism applicable to Africa alone, have been propagated. . . . One of these distortions has been the suggestion that class structures which exist in other parts of the world do not exist in Africa.

Nothing is further from the truth. A fierce class struggle has been raging in Africa. The evidence is all around us. In essence it is, as in the rest of the world, a struggle between the oppressors and the oppressed. (*Ibid.*, p. 10.)

The future course of each African country will be shaped by the outcome of the class struggle. In this struggle, the national bourgeoisie tends to play an anti-imperialist role inconsistently, vacillatingly, and after independence tries to restrict the revolution by controlling economic developments in the image of its own selfish class interests, aimed at orienting the economy along capitalist lines. In the context of neo-colonialism, this would threaten independence and risk subjection to international capital and the further impoverishment and exploitation of the masses.

Some argue that the Marxist concept of class struggle is inapplicable to Africa since both the bourgeoisie and the working class are underdeveloped as compared with advanced industrial countries. However, the nascent bourgeoisie in these countries, striving toward national independence, is also subject to the general laws of capitalism, and therefore tends to rely on international capital against its own people.

On the other hand, the interests of the nascent working class can only be advanced within a consistently anti-imperialist strategy—one that seeks, for example, to enlist allies on the African continent, while at the same time rejecting a narrow strategy that would limit allies to those with a similar skin color.

The necessity of such a strategy becomes clear to those fighting for the interests of the working class in Africa, who in so many instances have seen their own national bourgeoisie—whose skin color is no different from their own—betraying newly-won independence to imperialists of another color. This is why it becomes more apparent to them that they must reject an anti-Communist skin strategy which conflicts with their anti-imperialist interests.

And that is why the Pan-Africanism of Du Bois, unlike Padmore's, is essential to the African struggle for economic as well as political independence—why those who base themselves on the emerging working class in Africa increasingly see the need for applying those Pan-African principles that harmonize with and extend solidarity to the socialist countries and all anti-imperialist forces.

Tragedy and Irony

There is both tragedy and irony in the fact that Padmore's anti-Communist, anti-Marxist policies were continued after his death by one of Nkrumah's bitterest enemies, Dr. Kofi A. Busia, when the coup that overthrew Nkrumah made Busia Ghana's new Prime Minister. (Busia was later removed from power by still another coup.)

In the struggle against Nkrumah, Busia—like Padmore—stressed "African socialism" instead of scientific socialism. The vague generalities of "African socialism" served as the rationale for expanding the struggle against Marxist and other Left-oriented Ghanaians who favored cooperation with the world socialist and anti-imperialist forces. With the support of the imperialist powers, Busia mobilized the class forces that sought to bring Ghana within the orbit of neocolonialism.

According to Busia, "African socialism" aims:

at the equitable distribution of wealth, and at social justice and freedom. . . . The literature on African socialism contains criticism of Communism because its methods destroy equality and freedom in the name of the "dictatorship of the proletariat." (*Africa In Search Of Democracy*, Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1967, pp. 85-86.)

For us in the United States, it is important to note that Baraka's "Ujamaa"—"economic cooperation" and "self sufficiency"—is a close replica of Busia's "African socialism." Although Busia and Baraka manipulate the symbols of African tradition when they speak of "equitable distribution" or "communalism," the content of their language is that of capitalism.

Even the U.S. monopolists claim they are for "equitable distribution." But when auto or steel workers strike for higher wages, the bosses do everything in their power to defeat them. "Equitable distribution" is impossible as long as the capitalist class controls the means of production, thereby exercising the dictatorship of capital over the working class and the people in general.

In his opposition to Communism and "the dictatorship" of the working class, Busia reveals that he preferred that Ghana take a capitalist instead of a non-capitalist path, relying on the dictates of international capital instead of the support of the socialist countries where the working class controls the means of production.

For Busia, "Ujamaa" is "African socialism" based on "familyhood." (*Ibid.*, p. 78.) This, too, is akin to Baraka's ideology—an ideology of class collaboration which encourages Black workers and masses

to accept the political direction and economic domination of their "own" national bourgeoisie which objectively means accommodation to the monopoly ruling class. For Baraka, class divisions among Blacks do not exist; instead there is one big "family." This not only leads to collaboration with the Black exploiters of Black people; more important, it is an ideology leading to collaboration with the racist monopoly oppressors.

In the references he makes in his book to Kenya, Busia most clearly confirms that he speaks in the language of "African socialism" in order to camouflage capitalism. "Equally opposed to capitalism is African socialism as espoused by the Kenya Government," states Busia, which he approvingly follows with a quote from a Kenyan state Paper: "[Kenya's] socialism differs from capitalism because it prevents the exercise of disproportionate political influence by economic power groups." (*Ibid.*, p. 78.)

Do not these remarks simply reveal that the Kenyan state supports the development of capitalism—that its emerging capitalist class is using state power to prevent the exercise of political influence by the working masses?

One can identify the class character of Busia's politics from his background as well as from the orientation of his "African socialism." He came from the Ashanti professional elite which administered Ghana for the British and he continued to stay within the state apparatus under Nkrumah. The Ashanti professionals were linked with the Ashanti traditional elite who controlled most of Ghana's cocoa production, and Busia became the leader of the political opposition which first established its base among these cocoa growers. This was the base from which the political opposition put Padmore's anti-Communist neo-Pan-Africanism into action against Nkrumah.

In his book *Africa and the Politics of Unity*, Emanuel Wallerstein, a U.S. bourgeois writer, admits that as

. . . more and more African nations became independent, those states considered to be neo-colonial by the revolutionary core used liberally the concept of African socialism both to strengthen themselves internally against radical opposition movements and to abjure international policies which would involve systematic rejection of the West and its replacement by new links with the Communist world. As this occurred, the revolutionary core became more and more chary of the concept of African socialism. In time the concept was repudiated, and then denounced. (Random House, New York, 1970, p. 231.)

Wallerstein goes on to quote Mobido Keita, who gave the follow-

ing warning in 1962 when he was President of Mali:

Let us not be deceived by word-magic. Most of the other African states speak of African socialism . . . if we don't watch out, the word socialism will be emptied of its content, and the most capitalist systems and the most reactionary bourgeois can hide themselves behind the slogan of socialism. (*Ibid.*, p. 232.)

Then Wallerstein states:

It was in Ghana, once again, that the ideological position was elaborated in great detail. This can be found in Nkrumah's book *Consciencism* and throughout the various issues of *The Spark* and *L'Entincelle*. On the one hand, African socialism was denounced categorically. The historic mission of "African socialism" is to combat and, if possible, defeat scientific socialism firstly by introducing elements alien to socialist thought, and secondly by denying some of the foundations of socialist ideology. (*Ibid.*, p. 233.)

Such criticism, appearing in Nkrumah's writings in 1964, exposed the essence of Padmore's ideology. Unfortunately, Nkrumah's evolution away from Padmore's concepts did not develop its full thrust quickly enough to offset counter-revolution in Ghana.

And now that Padmore's neo-Pan-Africanism has been resurrected in the United States, it would be appropriate to keep in mind Mobido Keita's warning of 1962: "Let us not be deceived by word-magic." Today's word-magicians include Baraka, who now ironically speaks in the name of Nkrumah; and Stokely Carmichael, self-styled protege of Nkrumah, who has been sounding more like Nkrumah's enemy, Busia. One and all, the advocates of neo-Pan-Africanism—from the "militants" to the proponents of "Black capitalism" have turned the anti-imperialist, liberating Pan-Africanism of Du Bois into its opposite.

U.S. Imperialism in Southern Africa

In recent years, U.S. imperialism has greatly stepped up its drive for economic penetration of Africa. A primary motivation for this is the growing need of U.S. monopolies for increasingly scarce strategic raw materials—materials in which the African continent is extremely rich. Africa is a major source of uranium ore, diamonds, chrome, manganese, bauxite and many rare metals. It is also attractive as a lucrative market for U.S. exports and a sphere of investment at very high rates of profit (average returns are estimated at about 30 per cent).

Prior to World War II, U.S. interests in Africa were small. Less than five per cent of Africa's trade was with the United States, and U.S. investments were confined to Liberian rubber plantations and a small share of South African and Rhodesian mining ventures. U.S. corporations first began to gain a foothold during the war, in connection with the production of war materials. But it was only after the war that the drive to "muscle in" on British and Western European rivals began in earnest. The Marshall Plan and later Point IV aid became major instruments for bringing U.S. corporations into the picture.

Then, however, came the great upsurge of the national liberation movement, with the establishment of the political independence of one African country after another. During this period U.S. imperialism stepped up its offensive and became the main bulwark of colonialism and neo-colonialism in Africa, as elsewhere. At first it did so under the guise of being "anti-colonialist," a pose which was embodied in the early sixties in the "new frontiers" policy of President J. F. Kennedy. But this disguised neo-colonialist policy failed to stem the national liberation tide and it was discarded and replaced by a policy of naked aggression and counter-revolution.

The new policy found its first major expression in the brutal U.S. armed intervention against the liberation forces in the Congo (now Zaire) in November 1964, shortly after the Presidential elections. This was soon followed by the Johnson Administration's escalation of the war in Vietnam and the sending of U.S. armed forces into the Dominican Republic. These policies have been continued and further developed by the Nixon Administration, which has openly associated itself with the most reactionary forces on the African continent.

U.S. Penetration

Throughout the postwar years U.S. trade and investment have been vigorously pursued and have grown rapidly, especially since 1960. Direct private investments in Africa (excluding South Africa) have grown from 639 million in 1960 to \$2.87 billion in 1971. Direct investments in South Africa have grown from \$286 million in 1960 to \$964 million in 1971. Investments in Africa as a whole have increased from 2.8 per cent of total direct foreign investments in 1960 to nearly 4.5 per cent in 1971. At the same time they yield close to ten per cent of all profit on direct foreign investments. To these direct investments may be added considerable sums in indirect investments, of which we shall have more to say later. Trade has also risen greatly. Merchandise exports to Africa grew from \$793 million in 1960 to \$1.69 billion in 1971, and imports from \$534 million to \$1.24 billion.

These developments have been accompanied by a mushrooming of missions to Africa, with tours by Nixon, Eisenhower, David Rockefeller and others, by the creation of the post of Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, by the multiplication of research institutes on Africa in the United States, and by the vastly expanded activities of the U.S. Information Service and the Carnegie, Ford, Rockefeller and other private foundations in Africa. They have been accompanied also by growing involvement of the Pentagon and the CIA in Africa, not only in Zaire but in the counter-revolutionary coup in Ghana and in other instances. In addition, the U.S. military presence is embodied in the presence of the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean, in the possession of a major seaport and an air base in Liberia, and in the existence of military bases on strategically situated islands off the African coast.

Despite the very considerable gains of U.S. imperialism in its drive to displace its imperialist rivals in Africa, the bulk of foreign investments remain in British and French hands, and British investments continue to outstrip all others. Nevertheless it is U.S. imperialism which plays the role of chief support of colonialism and neo-colonialism in this part of the world as it does elsewhere. And in pursuit of its aims it has in recent years increasingly concentrated its operations—economic, political and military—in the remaining bulwark of colonialism, the white-ruled states of southern Africa. These it seeks to utilize as a base for an offensive against the liberated countries of Sub-Saharan Africa, designed to undermine and reverse the process of national liberation.

Toward this end the Nixon Administration is today building its

ties with the fascist and colonialist ruling circles in southern Africa. According to *New York Times* correspondent Terence Smith (April 2, 1972), it is "quietly pursuing a policy of deliberately expanded contacts and communication with the white governments of southern Africa." And it is doing so especially with regard to the apartheid ruling clique of the Republic of South Africa, which is the cornerstone of this unholy edifice.

U.S. Investments in South Africa

As the figures presented above indicate, U.S. direct investments in South Africa have more than tripled since 1959 and are today at about the billion dollar mark, constituting one-fourth of total U.S. direct investments in Africa. However, these are greatly overshadowed by British investments. A report by the UN Unit on Apartheid states: "In 1966 the United Kingdom owned 57 per cent of the foreign investments in that country. The United States owned 13 per cent of the total. France, Switzerland and West Germany each owned between 3 and 5 per cent." (*Industrialization, Foreign Capital and Forced Labour in South Africa*, United Nations, New York, 1970, p. 58.) These are the last figures available from official South African sources. But by 1970 the U.S. share had apparently increased to about 15 per cent while the British share has declined correspondingly. Currently the U.S. share is estimated at 16 per cent. Britain is also the chief trading partner of South Africa, accounting for one-third of its exports and one-fourth of its imports.

For British monopoly capital Africa is a major sphere of foreign investment. It accounts for 9-10 per cent of all British direct foreign investment and is outranked only by Australia and Canada. South Africa serves Britain as a base of operations for all of Africa. In contrast, U.S. direct investments in South Africa are only slightly more than one per cent of total direct foreign investments.

It would be wrong, however, to judge the stake of U.S. monopoly capital in South Africa solely by these criteria. It is, in fact, much greater than such comparisons indicate. Though smaller than British investments, the U.S. investments are more strategically placed and have much greater prospects for growth. And they dovetail most closely with the plans and aspirations of the fascist apartheid ruling clique in South Africa.

Unlike the British investments, which are concentrated in mining, U.S. investments are increasingly centered in manufacturing, whose share has risen from 34 per cent in 1959 to 51 per cent in 1971. Almost 20 per cent more is in petroleum refining. Moreover, writes

Ruth First in the UN quarterly *Objective: Justice*: "United States investment is concentrated in key sectors of the economy and United States corporations play a critical role in the sectors which are the prime contributors to heavy industrialization, long-range growth, technological development and military capability." ("Foreign Investment in Apartheid South Africa," April-May-June, 1973.)

The auto industry, which alone accounts for seven per cent of the gross domestic product, is dominated by U.S. firms. Ford, General Motors and Chrysler produce 60 per cent of the country's cars. Their operations have grown rapidly since 1962 when the South African government instituted a "local content" program. This followed on a severe economic crisis precipitated in large measure by internal struggles growing out of mounting African resistance to apartheid and culminating in the infamous Sharpeville Massacre. During this period a flight of foreign capital took place, reaching \$271 million in 1960. To minimize the danger of a recurrence and to reduce the vulnerability of the apartheid regime to external pressures, the government established the requirement of a progressively increasing locally manufactured content of finished automobiles, to reach 65 per cent by 1976. In addition, tariff concessions were offered as an inducement.

The U.S. auto companies were quick to respond. Eight new plants were built, greatly expanding productive facilities beyond mere assembly. By 1970, total investment reached \$262 million.

In addition to cars and trucks, General Motors produces earth-moving equipment and Frigidaire electrical products, the latter accounting for more than one-fourth of the country's total output. Tire production is also dominated by U.S. firms; the leading manufacturers are Firestone and Goodrich.

South Africa has virtually no oil resources of its own. Ninety per cent of its oil is imported and the remaining ten per cent is manufactured from coal by a state-owned corporation (SASOL), utilizing an expensive process. Three U.S. oil companies—Caltex, Mobil and Exxon—carry on more than half of the country's oil refining. In addition, as of 1970 U.S. oil companies held 19 oil prospecting concessions.

South Africa produces no computers, but the number in use has grown rapidly (from 205 in 1964 to some 500 in 1971). More than half of the South African computer market is held by IBM. Several other U.S. corporations are also involved, chiefly National Cash Register and Burroughs.

In the electrical industry substantial investments, in addition to those of General Motors, are held by General Electric and IT&T.

Westinghouse is also represented. Other U.S. manufacturing corporations with South African investments include Allis-Chalmers, American Motors, Dow Chemical, International Harvester, Procter & Gamble, Squibb and U.S. Steel, to list but a small sample.

These investments are almost entirely direct investments and the South African firms are generally wholly owned subsidiaries of the parent companies. They are an integral part of the expanding network of multinational corporations based in the United States. On the other hand, investment in mining, in which British capital predominates, has historically taken the form of purchase of stock in South African-based companies. Thus, of the seven top mining corporations only Consolidated Gold Fields of South Africa is registered abroad.

Here we find an intricate network of interests in which U.S., British and South African capital are intertwined. Within the space of this article we can only touch on them.* At the heart of this complex is the empire ruled by the South African financier Harry Oppenheimer, which controls some 150 corporations and whose kingpin is the \$2-billion Anglo-American Corporation. Closely associated with the Oppenheimer interests through Anglo-American is the financial empire headed by Charles W. Engelhard, Jr. of New Jersey. Engelhard is chairman of the half-billion dollar firm Minerals and Chemicals Corporation, which in 1957 joined Anglo-American to take over the big South African holding company Central Mining. Also involved in the mining complex are the U.S. companies Kennecott Copper, Newmont Mining and American Metal Climax, among others. In 1965 Newmont mining joined with the British Rio Tinto Corporation as major shareholders in the Palabora Mining Company Ltd., the biggest copper mining company in South Africa.

Of strategic importance in this setup is the Anglo-American Corporation, of which Pomeroy writes:

... While based in South Africa, it has ramifications throughout Africa below the equator. It is an ideal structure to assist American capital to penetrate most of Africa. Besides the Engelhard interests, a number of other major American corporations and financial institutions are connected with Anglo-American, including the Guggenheim interests (American Smelting and Refining

*For a more detailed account the reader is referred to William J. Pomeroy, *Apartheid Axis: The United States and South Africa*, International Publishers, New York, 1971. A detailed description of the ramifications and interrelationships of foreign investments in Africa as a whole is presented by Kwame Nkrumah in his book *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*, International Publishers, New York, 1966. The details presented here are taken largely from these sources.

Co.), U.S. Steel, American Metal Climax, Roan Selection Trust, Foote Mineral Co., First National City Bank of New York, and Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. (*Op. cit.*, pp. 44-45.)

U.S. banking and financial interests are also directly represented in South Africa, in particular by branches of the First National City Bank and the Chase Manhattan Bank. Altogether, there are more than 300 U.S. corporations and some 6,000 agencies operating in South Africa today, constituting a powerful base for U.S. imperialism.

U.S. Imperialism and Apartheid

The system of apartheid which prevails in South Africa today is a uniquely horrible social monstrosity. Under it a fascist white ruling class has imposed on the Black African majority (some 70 per cent of the total population of 21 million) the most extreme and inhuman racial oppression to be found anywhere. The Africans have been deprived of all rights as human beings. They have been reduced to unbelievable depths of poverty and have been subjected to a system of forced labor bordering on slavery. The imposition of this bestial system is described in the above-cited report of the UN Unit on Apartheid in these words:

The essence of the newly rationalized apartheid system is that it makes it impossible for Africans to be anything but cheap labor. This is done in two ways: Africans have been denied, first of all, the right of permanent residence in almost all areas but those designated by the government as African "homelands." Since these areas are very poor and overpopulated, many of their inhabitants have been forced to migrate to "white areas" in search of work. If they do not, they and their families may starve. In "white areas," Africans have no rights, no permanent status and no control over the terms and conditions of their employment. They are, in consequence, totally at the mercy of their employers and of the government. (*Op. cit.*, pp. 27-28.)

These "homelands" or "Bantustans" embrace only 13.7 per cent of the land and moreover are situated in the most barren and inhospitable areas. Yet they are today practically the only areas of legal, permanent residence for nearly 70 per cent of the population. And this system of segregation has been designed to force on that 70 per cent the most brutal, merciless exploitation. And to minimize their moving into "white areas" to find work, the South African government is encouraging foreign corporations to build plants near these border areas where they can find an abundance of the cheapest labor.

The gap between the incomes of whites and Africans is enormous. In 1969 the per capita income for whites, according to the official figures, was \$133 a month; for Africans it was a bare \$10. Although whites constitute only 19 per cent of the population, they receive 75 per cent of the country's total income. While unemployment among whites is virtually non-existent, among Africans it runs up to 25 per cent. There is a constant shortage of skilled labor, but Africans are prohibited by job preference laws and other means from holding such jobs. Instead, efforts are continually made to import white workers.

The great majority of African families suffer severe poverty and malnutrition. It is estimated that at least 75 per cent have incomes below the Poverty Datum Line—an income level sufficient to provide the average family only the barest necessities of life. At least 85 per cent have incomes below the Minimum Effective Level, a somewhat more realistic standard proposed by certain South African sociologists. To this must be added the almost total lack of medical facilities for Africans and the rudimentary character of educational facilities. In short, the vast majority of Africans live in the most abysmal poverty and misery.

Moreover, they are denied any means of fighting against their oppression. Trade union organization is outlawed. Strikes are punishable by severe fines and prison terms. Arbitrary arrest and imprisonment is widespread. And South Africa has the dubious distinction of accounting for more than half of the world's executions.

The system of apartheid includes also the racial oppression of Coloreds and Asians, who make up about 12 per cent of the population. True, their oppression is not as severe as that of the Black Africans, but they are none the less victims of apartheid. Though space does not permit a detailed discussion of their conditions of existence, they should by no means be overlooked.

For the maintenance of this barbaric system, the South African ruling class has relied heavily on the support and investments of foreign monopoly capital. In turn, apartheid has served as an inducement to foreign corporations in search of superprofits to invest in South Africa.

Since World War II the South African economy has undergone a remarkable transformation. During these years it has enjoyed one of the highest growth rates among capitalist countries. And from an "underdeveloped" country, engaged chiefly in agricultural and mineral production it has developed into a country with a modern industrial economy. Today manufacturing leads, yielding 21 per cent of the national product, while mining has fallen to

12 per cent. Living standards have risen greatly and are now second only to those of the United States—that is, for the white minority. Of course, white workers also suffer exploitation and their unions have conducted militant struggles for better wages and working conditions. But their real wages, unlike those of the African workers, have risen with economic growth and industrialization. And no effort has been spared to imbue them with a thoroughly racist and colonialist mentality. Indeed, this whole transformation has taken place, primarily through the medium of foreign investment, at the expense of the great majority of the population, whose conditions over the past twenty years have grown worse, not better.

In their public relations propaganda the U.S. corporations with investments in South Africa hypocritically claim to be opposed to apartheid. They insist that their investments, by promoting industrialization, improve the living standards of all workers, including the African workers, and thereby ultimately serve to undermine apartheid. They claim that they treat all workers alike except insofar as law and local custom compel them to discriminate. They claim to be "apolitical" and maintain that as foreign companies operating in South Africa they cannot mix in local politics—that is, oppose apartheid. And they piously point to their contributions to charitable institutions for Africans.

The truth is, however, that these corporations are in South Africa not in spite of apartheid but *because of it*. Apartheid serves their interests. The superexploitation of Africans and of Coloreds and Asians as well yields them 20 per cent profit on their investments as against 11 per cent on foreign investments generally. They are no more opposed to it than they are to the racial discrimination that they practice in the United States as a source of superprofits. The record shows that discrimination against Africans by these U.S. corporations is no less than that of South African employers and considerably exceeds even the legal demands of apartheid.* In this connection, it is noteworthy that the greatest expansion of foreign investment in South Africa, and especially of U.S. investment, took place *after* the UN condemnation of apartheid and imposition of sanctions against South Africa.

The foreign monopolies, and in particular the U.S. monopolies, are in fact a bulwark of apartheid. The South African government

*The Corporate Information Center of the National Council of Churches has conducted a well-documented series of studies exposing the role of leading U.S. corporations in South Africa and has issued these in the form of a series of *Center Briefs* and other publications. These have served as the basis of a campaign to get U.S. corporations to withdraw from South Africa.

has pushed capital investment to the limit with the aim of achieving independence from outside pressure. South African capital has grown greatly and direct state investments have built up a body of state-owned corporations. With these the foreign corporations maintain the closest ties and cooperation. They are thus of inestimable value to the schemes of the architects of apartheid. On this point Ruth First writes in the article cited above:

Far from exerting leverage for changed policies, foreign funds are building South Africa's economy so that it will be better able to resist any challenges to apartheid from the international community. Furthermore, foreign capital is accepting a stake in the South African economy on terms laid down ever more stringently by the controllers of that economy. The intent of the South African government is clear: apart from the indispensable role played by foreign capital in crucial growth areas, the more closely the economy is linked with western economic interests, the simpler it will be for the government to command political support and sympathy in the countries of their origin.

In turn, this unholy partnership serves U.S. imperialism as the main base for its neocolonialist offensive in Africa.

Other Countries of Southern Africa

In addition to its South African holdings, U.S. monopoly capital also has substantial investments in Namibia, Zimbabwe (Rhodesia), Angola and Mozambique—countries which, together with South Africa, form the chief bastion of colonialism and neocolonialism on the African continent.

Namibia is a one-time German colony which was placed under South African administration in 1920. Though this status has long been terminated and although continued South African rule is totally illegal, the South African government refuses to release its hold. The country has a population of 750,000 of whom 96,000 are whites. Under the apartheid system which prevails there, as well as in South Africa, the latter exercise sole political power. The African population suffers the same inhuman conditions of existence as in South Africa, and African workers are subjected to a contract system which tears them away from their families for long periods and employs them under conditions of semi-slavery.

Foreign investment is mainly in mining, which is totally under foreign control. The largest mining company is Tsumeb Corporation Ltd., in which two U.S. firms, American Metal Climax (AMAX) and Newmont Mining Company, each own 29 per cent of the

shares. These two firms are also major stockholders in O'Okiep Copper Company of South Africa (Newmont 57.7 per cent, AMAX 17.7 per cent) which in turn owns 9.5 per cent of Tsumeb. Most of the remaining Tsumeb shares are owned by British and South African capital. Other major mining companies are SWA Corporation (British) and De Beers Consolidated Mines (South African). Other U.S. corporations with interests in Namibia include Bethlehem Steel, Getty Oil, Phelps Dodge, U.S. Steel and Chevron Oil.

Mining accounts for about half of Namibia's gross domestic product. In the hands of the foreign monopolies, Namibia's rich mineral resources are being rapidly exhausted for the sake of monopoly superprofits. Tsumeb expects its principal mine to continue operations for no more than 12-15 years. The life expectancy of many new mines is from 8 to 30 years. This pillage is at the time immensely profitable. Newmont estimates that its average annual return on its initial investment in Tsumeb comes to 372 per cent. AMAX reports an average return of 470 per cent a year. For Newmont, profits on total investment have averaged more than 30 per cent a year since 1963. Fully one-third of Namibia's gross domestic product is taken out of the country yearly in the form of repatriated profits. According to the 1972 *Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia*: "If the total net profits [of all companies in extractive industries] remained where they were produced—in the Territory—they would have amounted annually to \$100 per capita, several times more than the average Namibian family receives. Such amounts of capital would have enabled the Territory to develop industries which a century of South African economic domination has not made possible." (Vol. I, p. 10.)

In operating in Namibia under the conditions of South Africa's illegal rule, the foreign corporations give sanction to that rule. They do so in addition by paying taxes directly to South Africa, a practice which violates international law.

Here we have the rawest kind of colonialism. Here, indeed, is imperialist brigandage with a vengeance.

Zimbabwe has a population of 5 million Africans and 240,000 whites, plus 25,000 Coloreds and Asians. The white ruling clique, having usurped power, is taking the country down the fascist road of apartheid. U.S. investments here are almost 90 per cent in extractive industries, mainly the extraction of chrome ore, of which Zimbabwe has 67 per cent of the high-grade reserves. Almost all of the mining is in the hands of two U.S. companies, Union Carbide Corporation and Foote Mineral Company (in which Newmont Mining has a 32 per cent interest). A number of other U.S. com-

panies have subsidiaries in Zimbabwe. One of the largest is Ford Motors. IT&T is also represented through its subsidiary Supersonic Radio Manufacturing Company.

More than half of the output of chrome ore is exported to the United States and this export goes on today despite the sanctions against trade with Zimbabwe imposed by the UN. At the close of 1971 Congress authorized the lifting of the ban on ore shipments which had been imposed in 1968. In April 1972 a suit was filed by the Congressional Black Caucus and others to force the cessation of chrome imports; nevertheless they continue.

The Portuguese colonies of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau—the only remaining outright colonies in Africa—have a combined population of nearly 13 million, overwhelmingly African. The peoples of these countries are subjected by the fascist rulers of Portugal to the most brutal opposition and exploitation, against which armed liberation movements have arisen that have gained control over large sections of these territories. To combat these movements and to preserve its colonial rule, the Portuguese government has found it necessary to spend 45 per cent of its budget on arms and to maintain an army of 400,000 troops in Africa. And to meet these expenses it has sought the aid of the major imperialist powers, especially U.S. imperialism.

Up to 1965 Portugal maintained severe restrictions on foreign investment in the colonies. But in that year they were relaxed, partly to obtain foreign exchange for military expenditures and partly in return for direct military aid. With this, U.S. corporations have found their way into these areas in growing numbers. Currently more than 30 U.S. firms operate in them.

The largest of these is the Cabinda Gulf Oil Company in Angola, which began operations in 1966 on the basis of a major new oil discovery. By the end of 1970 some \$150 million had been invested and it was expected that total investment might exceed \$200 million. More recently Exxon has applied for exploration rights in Angola. It already has a concession in Guinea-Bissau, and there are six companies prospecting for oil in Mozambique.

The Angola Diamond Company, part of the Anglo-American complex, is largely U.S.-controlled. In addition, IBM has branch offices in Mozambique and Angola, and IT&T is the major supplier of telephone equipment in these countries. In short, U.S. monopoly capital is acquiring a significant base in the Portuguese-ruled territories. It is doing so on the basis of large-scale aid to the Portuguese war machine, in return for which the Portuguese colonialists undertake to "do all possible" to enable the U.S. companies to carry on

their operations.

The Portuguese rulers are also seeking to combat the liberation movement through the construction of the massive Cabora Bassa and Kunene River hydroelectric projects as part of a scheme to bring in a million white European settlers as a base for strengthening white rule. In this, they are heavily dependent on the participation of foreign capital. Pomeroy writes:

In July 1968 the contract to build the Cabora Bassa dam was awarded to ZAMCO, a consortium headed by Oppenheimer's Anglo-American Corp. Major banks of all the main western countries, as well as from South Africa, are participating in the financing of the project; these include the Bank of America in addition to the usual banks associated with the Oppenheimer interests (First National City Bank and Morgan Guaranty Trust). Subsidiary contracts have been farmed out to a spectrum of western corporations. For example, Ingersoll Rand, an American company working through a British subsidiary, is supplying the drilling equipment. (*Op. cit.*, p. 74.)

Thus are the interests of U.S. imperialism increasingly intertwined with those of the forces of apartheid and colonialism in southern Africa. Thus does it work to preserve and strengthen them, both as the guarantors of lucrative investments in this region and as a base for imperialist expansion in Africa as a whole.

The Imperialist Offensive

South Africa dominates the southern bloc of white-ruled states economically and militarily. It turns out nearly three-fourths of the total product in the area and is developing increasingly extensive trade and investment relationships with the other states. It also exerts considerable economic pressure on the nearby anti-apartheid state of Zambia which, because of its geographic location and past ties is dependent on Zimbabwe railroads and on ports in Angola, Mozambique and South Africa for its access to the sea.

At the same time, South Africa has been built into a military power with U.S. aid. It sends its troops into Zimbabwe to assist the white ruling clique in imposing its rule and it carries out military incursions into Zambia. It gives military support to the Portuguese colonialists. It is the imperialist gendarme of the region.

But South African capital, in league with the foreign monopolies based in South Africa, also strives for economic penetration of other parts of Africa. South Africa is heavily dependent on foreign trade, exporting nearly 30 per cent of its national product. And with grow-

ing industrial production accompanied by the limitations imposed on the internal market by the severe poverty of the great mass of the population, the pressures for external expansion grow. South Africa's rulers seek to compel other African states, particularly those with regimes favoring neo-colonialism, to come to terms with apartheid. It uses its economic resources to offer aid to such states, whose economies remain undeveloped and impoverished, on a basis of "cooperation"—that is, of acceptance of apartheid.

In thus striving to develop its own neocolonial base in Africa, the South African ruling class paves the way for the penetration of U.S. imperialism into other African countries. Operating in the name of champions of anti-Communism, it seeks to develop a growing base for imperialist reaction and counter-revolution. In all this, it should be noted, it is assisted by Israel's rulers, who maintain close ties with the South African government and who faithfully play their part in opening the door to U.S. imperialism in Africa.

Such is the basis of U.S. imperialism's offensive in Africa. Small wonder that it pursues with increasing vigor the building of the foundation for this offensive in southern Africa.

However, the camp of colonialism and neocolonialism is meeting with powerful and mounting resistance. In Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau the armed liberation forces are in control of large areas and have been given recognition and observer status by the UN General Assembly. In Namibia a growing guerrilla movement is following suit. Guerrilla forces are in operation on the territory of South Africa itself in conjunction with the mounting economic and political struggles within the country. And there is growing resistance in Zimbabwe. To these struggles may be added the strike of 15,000 workers in Namibia in December 1971 and January 1972, also the strike of 100,000 workers in South Africa in early 1973—heroic actions carried out under the most difficult of conditions. And there are many other such examples.

There is no doubt that the peoples of southern Africa will be victorious, that they will put an end to apartheid and colonial oppression and win their freedom. A major obstacle to victory, however, is the support given to their oppressors by U.S. imperialism. As we have seen, it is U.S. investments, U.S. support of apartheid, U.S. violations of sanctions and U.S. military aid which help these racist regimes to survive and bolster their ability to fight the liberation forces. To put a stop to this role is therefore a responsibility of prime importance for the people of the United States.

But it does not end there. A real danger exists that southern Africa may become another Vietnam. As the armed conflicts and

other struggles in the area increase, and as the liberation forces win new victories, the danger of direct U.S. military intervention also grows. And such involvement would create a most serious threat to world peace.

In the name of freedom for the peoples of southern Africa and in the name of peace, therefore, what is demanded in this country is a massive struggle to reverse U.S. policy in this region and to end the present role of U.S. monopoly capital there. To be sure, the widespread opposition to present policies which already exists compels the Nixon Administration to give lip service to UN sanctions and other actions, but this is only a cloak for their continued violation. This hypocrisy needs to be exposed and combatted.

On April 9-14 of this year an International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and Apartheid in Southern Africa took place in Oslo, Norway. The Conference adopted a 16-point program which includes the following proposals:

"Investments should be withdrawn, all new investment programs should be stopped; no loans or other assistance should be provided either to the white racist regime or to corporations operating in South Africa."

". . . trade unions should take special measures to prevent their members from migrating to South Africa."

"The international boycott of South African goods and campaigns against corporations which have links with South Africa should be intensified."*

These proposals, we believe, form the core of a program around which movements involving great masses of white people in this country can be built. Certain movements already exist; most notable is that of the National Council of Churches already referred to, based on a campaign to press corporations with investments in southern Africa to withdraw. In this the Council is joined by five of the country's major Protestant denominations—the Episcopal Church, the United Methodist Church, the United Church of Christ, the United Presbyterian Church and the American Baptist Convention. Large quantities of literature have been issued exposing leading U.S. corporations as bulwarks of apartheid and colonialism in southern Africa and demands for withdrawal have been projected in various forms including the introduction of proxy reso-

*These proposals are quoted in an article by John Pittman in the *Daily World*, one of a series of five articles on African liberation, running from June 12-16, 1973. The reader is referred to these as a valuable treatment of the international struggles against apartheid and colonialism, particularly on the part of the trade union movement.

lutions at stockholders' meetings.

The Congressional Black Caucus has also taken certain initiatives. We have already noted its suit to force cessation of chrome imports from Zimbabwe. At about the same time, Representative Charles C. Diggs introduced a bill in Congress calling for termination of government contracts with all U.S. corporations guilty of racist practices in southern Africa. The Caucus has also raised the demand that no allowance be made in corporate income tax returns for taxes paid by corporations operating in Namibia to the South African government.

Other instances of opposition can be cited. But these are scattered and limited. What is required is the development of mass movements of much wider scope and based on the generation of mass activities and pressures. Of key importance is the role of the trade union movement, which can carry tremendous weight in such struggles. The fight against U.S. involvement in racist oppression in southern Africa must also become a central concern of the peace movement. The Communist Party and the progressive forces generally are called on to take much more initiative toward the launching of such struggles and movements.

The struggle against racial oppression in southern Africa, it is essential to note, is intimately related to the struggle against racism and racial oppression in the United States. It is the same U.S. monopolies which are the root of both. Furthermore, the Nixon Administration's tightening of ties with the racist regimes of southern Africa is related to the deliberate escalation of racist ideology and practices in this country. Both fights are part of the struggle against imperialist exploitation and racial oppression on a world scale and one cannot succeed without being linked to the other.

In a world in which international economic interdependence is growing by leaps and bounds, South Africa's bestial system of apartheid cannot be insulated from external pressures. At home the fascist apartheid regime is sitting on a tinderbox and is able to maintain a surface calm only through ever more massive repression. With the withdrawal of U.S. aid and support its position would truly become untenable. The people of this country can play a decisive role in ending apartheid and colonial rule in southern Africa. And they will.

The African Liberation Movement

The national liberation movement in Africa is an inalienable component of the three revolutionary currents in the world. Having won political independence, the majority of African countries (41) have entered the second stage of the struggle for economic and social emancipation.

In general, the independent African states can be subdivided into two groups: countries that are pursuing a non-capitalist road of development or socialist orientation such as Tanzania, Egypt and Guinea, and countries that have embarked on a capitalist path of development such as the Ivory Coast, Kenya and Liberia. A third group of African countries are those countries which are struggling under the yoke of Portuguese colonialism, Rhodesian and South African fascism.

The significance of such a subdivision is that although in the main the majority of African states have a similar economic basis, they differ from one another in their superstructure. The peculiarity of the national liberation movement in Africa lies in the problems of the two stages of national liberation which are being solved simultaneously: the peoples of the colonies are waging a struggle for their national independence, while the peoples of politically sovereign states are working toward their economic and social liberation.

Since the first stage of the African revolution, which was basically achieved by most African countries in the early 1960's, U.S. imperialism in particular has had to maneuver to insure its hold on the African countries that won formal political independence. The imperialist powers resorted to new forms of neo-colonialism in the late 60's and the 70's. They increased their investments in Africa (excluding South Africa) by 350 per cent from 1960 to 1970. Israel, South Africa and Portugal are now the front men who represent the aims and interests of imperialism in Africa. Imperialism has developed a more extensive neo-colonialist superstructure by using the local national bourgeoisies in different African countries to suppress the democratic struggles of the African workers and peasantry. The movement of part of the labor intensive industrial process from capitalist countries to such countries as Kenya, Mozambique, Ivory Coast, etc., in order to acquire a cheap labor force is now an important part of imperialist schemes in Africa. Outright military support of the colonial regime of Portugal with the U.S.-Portuguese agree-

ment of \$436 million (the Azores Agreement) and the supply of NATO weaponry to South Africa and Rhodesia have marked a new stage in the aggression of imperialism in Africa.

Lenin and National Liberation

In spite of the increased imperialist aggression in Africa, the successful struggle for the abolition of colonialism and neo-colonialism by the national liberation movement and the fight for social and economic emancipation on the part of independent African states is fully possible through an understanding and application of the general principles developed by Lenin on national liberation and through an analysis of the experiences of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in their fight against imperialism. According to Lenin, the success of the national liberation movement in Africa is possible only on the foundation of an alliance with the forces of world socialism and the international working class movement. This is the first lesson we can draw from Lenin's teachings on the national-colonial question.

Second, the African national liberation revolution is undergoing two stages of development. The first stage, which includes the general democratic struggle of winning national independence, the creation of a national state apparatus, land reform, abolition of feudal relations and the ousting of foreign monopoly capital, is an important democratic task which cannot be overlooked. Lenin stressed this fact by saying, "the preponderance of precapitalist relationships is still the main determining feature in these countries, so there can be no question of a purely proletarian movement in them. There is practically no industrial proletariat in these countries." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 242-243.) Only on the basis of the successful solution of this first task does the objective possibility arise for the national liberation movement to develop to its second stage (through the intermediate steps of non-capitalist development) into a socialist revolution. Lenin emphasized that the transitional stage must not be viewed as a leap, because the experience of the national liberation movement shows that any attempts to skip the first stage of the revolution and artificially accelerate the revolutionary process leads to grave consequences for the progressive and democratic forces.

Third, the decisive internal prerequisite for the success of national liberation movements is the active participation of the masses. Lenin indicated that a national liberation war "waged by oppressed peoples, if it really succeeds in arousing the millions of working and exploited peoples, harbors such potentialities, such miracles, that the emancipation of the peoples of the East is now quite practicable. . . ."

(*Collected Works*, Vol. 30, pp. 153-154.)

The working class, peasantry and national bourgeoisie are driving forces of the national liberation movement. The working class, comprising a relatively small proportion of African peoples, acts as the initiator of the most determined and organized anti-imperialist actions. The dock workers' strike in 1959 by the mass of workers at Piuiguiti Quay in Guinea-Bissau led to the mobilization for armed struggle by PAIGC, the liberation movement in that country. The early workers' strikes in South Africa which led to the formation of the ANC in 1912 attested to the role that can be played by a small working class.

Fourth, Lenin taught that the principle of international unity of the anti-imperialist movements in all countries does not imply uniformity of the tactical forms of struggle, but demands a change of these forms, their adaptation to national and state distinctions. Lenin admonished the vanguard forces in each country "to seek out, investigate, predict and grasp that which is nationally specific and nationally distinctive, in the *concrete manner* in which each country should should tackle a *single* international task. . . ." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 92.)

Thus, the forms and methods of the national liberation movements are marked by diversity and depend on the concrete historical situations and the national distinctions of the particular developing country.

Lenin's principles on the national-colonial question are an important tool for us to critically view the African national liberation movements that have achieved political independence and those that are presently fighting direct colonial and white minority rule.

Armed Struggle Against Neo-Colonialism and Imperialism

Even though most African countries have achieved the first stage of the national revolution over 50 million people in Africa living in Guinea-Bissau, Angola, Mozambique, the Republic of South Africa, Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) and Namibia are living under direct colonialism and have not achieved any form of democratic rights. Lenin's theses on the national-colonial question take on greater importance with the diverse national liberation movements that are today engaged in political and armed struggle in these countries because of the nature of imperialism today and the character of these national liberation movements. The struggles of the oppressed peoples in these dominated countries are being led by the African National Congress (ANC) in South Africa, Mozambique Liberation Front (FRELIMO) in Mozambique, South West African People's Organiza-

tion (SWAPO) in Namibia, African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde (PAIGC) in Guinea-Bissau, and the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) and the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe).

The significance of some of these national liberation movements engaged in political and armed struggle today is based on a changing correlation of world forces since 1960 when most African countries won their independence. In 1973 the capitalist world is in a weaker position, politically and economically because of inter-imperialist contradictions and the recent defeat in Vietnam, while the socialist world is economically and politically stronger today. But imperialism is not dead yet.

U.S. imperialism, in particular has been increasing its aggressive and exploitative role in Africa since 1960. In order to increase its neo-colonialist hold on African countries, the U.S. is pursuing a policy of supporting militarily and economically its main bridgeheads into Africa, namely Portugal, Israel and the Republic of South Africa. This policy is aimed at retarding the first stage of the African liberation revolution and halting national liberation movements that are fighting colonialism and fascism today. In this three-pronged attack on Africa, South Africa is being supported as the main bridgehead into Africa and as the cornerstone of U.S. policy in Africa. The imperialist-created state of the Republic of South Africa (RSA), a mixture of a colony and an advanced capitalist state, is now the strongest economic and military power on the continent. One quarter of the \$3.5 billion of U.S. investments in Africa is in the RSA, channeled through over 300 U.S. corporations. The fascist state of the RSA, based on the social genocide policy of apartheid ("separate development") accounts for 22 per cent of the continent's gross output and 40 per cent of its industrial output. The RSA handles 20 per cent of Africa's exports and 18 per cent of its imports. (*International Affairs*, Moscow, No. 1, 1971, p. 40.) This racist block in the south, maintained and strengthened by the imperialist powers, has already become a small imperialist power by investing in other southern countries. By 1968 the RSA had investments in Southeast (Namibia), Lesotho, Botswana, Swaziland, Malawi, Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), Angola and Mozambique (the countries composing southern Africa) worth over 650 million rands (1 rand=\$1.4). Already the South African white ruling class has set up plans to establish a South African Common Market (SACOM) to include the countries mentioned above. Included in this imperialist scheme are the ruling classes of the Latin American countries of Brazil, Mexico, and Argentina, which will have equal trading rights in southern Africa

with the RSA. Under a banking agreement signed in 1969, the RSA was to give Brazil \$4 million worth of credit. An agreement with Bolivia provides for technical assistance in developing the SACOM mining industry; other sinister agreements of cooperation with Argentina, Venezuela, Colombia and Uruguay are in the making.

The key role of the RSA in the plans of U.S. imperialism for the recolonization of southern Africa is vital in light of the fact that it was only after the 1960 Sharpeville massacre and the achievement of political independence by the majority of African countries that U.S. imperialism increased its investment in the RSA by over 200 per cent from 1961 to 1970. This increased investment signaled the new role that the RSA would play in the plans of world imperialism. U.S. imperialism hopes to use the RSA as the main economic and military striking force against the southern African liberation movements and the progressive African countries; to further extend capitalism in Africa through RSA by supporting the RSA "dialogue" policy with other African countries; to keep the RSA within the economic domination of the big imperialist powers as a source of cheap labor and exploitable natural resources; and to use the RSA as a strategic military area for control by NATO of the southern Indian and Atlantic Oceans.

Even though the RSA and to some extent Rhodesia are key to suppression of the African national liberation movements and the further expansion of U.S. capital in southern Africa, Portugal and Israel as *gendarme*, imperialist-controlled nations also play an important role.

Portugal, one of the few European countries that has direct colonies in Africa, is able to maintain its feudal-military state and its colonies in Africa by direct U.S. military and economic aid. The Azores Agreement signed in 1971 between the U.S. and Portugal which gives \$436 million to Portugal represents 2/3 of that country's military budget. This is highly significant in light of the fact that between 1949 and 1961, the U.S. gave Portugal only \$370 million. The U.S. has since 1949 assigned Portugal the task of *gendarme* nation by supplying military equipment to it to help suppress the African liberation movements. It was in 1949 that the first 25-man U.S. advisory team (MAAG) arrived in Portugal. U.S. military advisors operate in the Portuguese territory of Angola. The United Nations in a report last year indicated that there were over 400 U.S. Green Berets in Angola and that Portugal has a military assistance program with the U.S. to train Portuguese officers in the U.S. Portugal's 400,000-man army in Africa includes 130,000 troops in Angola, 80,000 in Mozambique and 100,000 in Guinea-Bissau, a 10-fold increase

since 1960. Besides being a *gendarme* nation for U.S. imperialism in Africa, Portugal hopes to use Mozambique and Angola as major areas for the resettlement of millions of unemployed Europeans around the Cabora-Bassa Dam project in Tete Province of Mozambique and around the Cunene Dam project in Angola. The imperialists' plans to resettle workers from the metropolitan cities in Africa is a new scheme of recolonization for Africa. This scheme, which is financed by the Inter-American Governmental Committee of the U.S. to the tune of \$4.6 million yearly since 1965, resettled over 25,000 unemployed workers in Mozambique and the RSA mainly in the skilled labor category. Hence, the colonial territories of Portugal are part and parcel of the imperialist plans to recolonize parts of Africa and create a buffer zone against the countries north of the Zambezi River.

Israel, the other *gendarme* nation in the northern part of Africa, comprises the third country used by the U.S. imperialists for its bridgehead policy in Africa. The pro-imperialist Zionist state of Israel, which is well known for its aggression against the Arab countries, also has been assigned by the U.S. imperialists the role of providing "military and technical assistance" to African countries in an attempt to bring them into the imperialist orbit, to retard their social and economic progress and to split the African countries on a tribal basis. Israel's support of the Biafran secessionist movement in Nigeria and the Anya Anya secessionist movement in the southern part of the Sudan are examples of Israel's direct counter-revolutionary involvement in Africa. There is no better case of Israel's role in Africa than her military and economic support of the Amin coup in Uganda which overthrew the progressive government of Milton Obote in 1971. Probably Israel's most direct role in aiding the suppression of the African liberation movements now engaged in armed struggle is her relationship with the Republic of South Africa. Not only is Israel the RSA's *largest* trading partner in Africa, but also the Israeli laws against its Arab inhabitants and the RSA apartheid policies are similar in spirit if not in practice. (Harold Rogers, "Imperialism in Africa," *Black Scholar*, January 1972.) The new use of the RSA Portugal and Israel represents a more aggressive policy by the U.S. imperialists to maintain their hold on African countries, to weaken the gains Africans have made, and to retard the progress of the current African liberation movements.

The increase in capital investments in African countries facilitated the neo-colonialist attempts to saddle the young states' development with economic and military treaties designed to increase U.S. influence in African societies and split the national liberation move-

ments of MPLA, FRELIMO, SWAPO, PAIGC and ZAPU-ZANU. In the independent countries, "the imperialists" said Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU, in a report dedicated to the Lenin centenary, "strive to promote the ex-colonies' development on capitalist lines; it will be easier to plunder them in modern conditions by using more flexible and devious methods. That is the whole essence of neocolonialism."

To make the African countries extensions of capitalist powers is the main objective of the "partnership" policy which opens up African countries to neocolonialist schemes. This policy to oppose the countries that are pursuing the non-capitalist path of development is designed to split the African national revolution along lines that will retard African independence. This policy involves bringing the independent African countries into the capitalists' new international division of labor and, at the same time, creating a comprador bourgeoisie in some of the African countries.

The U.S. imperialists hope to split current national liberation movements that are increasingly becoming pro-Soviet and socialist in their orientation. They hope to achieve division within the national liberation movement, thereby retarding their program and development. In spite of these splitting tactics, FRELIMO and MPLA have overcome CIA obstructions and have already liberated 1/3 of their lands; PAIGC has liberated about 2/3 of their territory and will shortly proclaim their independence.

Counter-Revolutionaries and U.S. Imperialism

All of the different African liberation movements today claim to be fighting in the interest of their people and to see socialism as the answer to their economic and political liberation. Even though the armed struggle has become an important feature of their struggle (except for the ANC), there are ideological differences between the many African liberation movements that merit our attention. These ideological differences must be understood in light of the short history of the armed phase of the African liberation movements and the fact that the African liberation movements represent a broad force of many different strata and classes with different backgrounds. Workers, peasants and middle strata elements in African society play important roles in the African liberation movements. The imperialist strategy of trying to split the African liberation movements by encouraging tribalism, nationalism and opportunism is evident in all of the national liberation organizations that are fighting Portuguese colonialism and white minority rule. This tactic is evident in the case of the split between the ANC (African National Congress of South

Africa) founded in 1912 and the Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC) founded in 1959. Many of the PAC members were part of the ANC Youth League founded in the 1940's who from the early start of the ANCYL supported a position of trying to split the ANC on the basis of the ANC's position on the national question. The faction led by Potlaka Kitchener Laballo, Peter Molotsi and Mongaliso Robert Sobukwe tried to disrupt the national democratic character of the ANC by attacking the *Freedom Charter* of the ANC which outlined multi-racialism as one of the official policies.

Behind this counter-revolutionary plot to destroy the ANC was the U.S. As the ANC public document states, "at the end of 1958, a small band of disruptive adventurists that had for some time been active within the ranks of the ANC finally broke away. Early in 1959, after a lengthy meeting held in the luxurious premises of the library of the U.S. Information Service (USIS) in Johannesburg, they decided to form a revolutionary political organization which they called the Pan-Africanist Congress. Thus the dark schemes of American imperialist subversion of the successful development of the national liberation revolution against apartheid fascism were clearly exposed to the light of day." (*The Pan-Africanist Congress of South Africa—Whom Does It Serve?*, Morogovo, Tanzania, 1968.)

With U.S. backing, the PAC launched an all out attack on the ANC position of trying to unite all the democratic forces in the RSA including the South African Indian Congress, the South African Colored People's Organization and some militant white youth under the historic 1955 *Freedom Charter*. The "super-militant" PAC went a step further and started to organize their own nationwide anti-pass campaign in 1960 in opposition to the planned ANC March 31, 1960, anti-pass national stoppage of work campaign. The PAC, however, issued a call for the people to go and stand outside police stations on March 21. To confuse the people, the PAC issued the call in the name of the "Congress" (a generic title for the ANC among political and non-political circles in S.A.). Because of the hard work of preparing people for the ANC March 31 action, the South African people responded to the incorrect call by the PAC issued in the name of "Congress" and on March 21, people were massacred at Sharpeville and at Langa in Capetown. This disruptive action can only be blamed on the agents of U.S. imperialism and enemies of the African people.

In similar situations are the splinter movements of the *Comite revolucionario de Mozambique* (COREMO) in Mozambique; the South-west African National Union (SWANU) in Namibia; the *Governo Revolucionario de Angola no Exilo*/Frente Nacional de Libertacao

e Independencia de Guine Portuguesa (FLING) in Angola which like the PAC are all organizations having similar positions for forming new movements. All of these movements, the PAC, COREMA, SWANU, GRAE/FNLA and FLING were formed on the basis of petty bourgeois nationalism and in one way or another have attacked the Soviet Union and have supported the position of the Chinese government. This grouping of splinter organizations is a natural ally of the U.S. imperialists who have opened their ranks to counter-revolutionary activity. But even counter-revolutionary activity within these organizations has recently been met with opposition by the recent statements of MPLA and GRAE apparently aiming to form more cooperative relationships with each other, and the recent alliance between ZAPU and ZANU in Zimbabwe. These recent alliances indicates that the African liberation movements are trying to close their ranks against imperialism, but face some problems in doing so.

The persistence of these problems is favored, to a certain extent, by the conditions prevailing at the present stage of development of the national liberation movements, and indicates that the conditions in which the national liberation movements are engaging in armed and political struggle in Africa are uncommonly complicated and contradictory. On the one hand, the anti-imperialist and anti-colonial front is gaining strength while, on the other hand, the forces of colonialism and neocolonialism which largely rely on local reactionaries and pro-capitalist circles, are becoming more active. In spite of the armed national liberation movements, masses of African people in Rhodesia, Namibia and South Africa still have to be brought into the struggle for national liberation. The growing national liberation struggle in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) was reflected in the mass demonstrations of Africans during the visit of the Lord Pearce Mission. Not only did the Zimbabwe people reject the colonialist attempts at legalizing the pro-fascist regime of Ian Smith under the guise of "independence," but a new organization emerged in the course of the struggle against the British-Rhodesian deal—the African National Council—which represents the legally functioning anti-colonial movement.

In Namibia, 13,000 workers went on strike for increased pay and better social and working conditions. In the early part of this year, over 50,000 workers struck in Durban and other South African cities against South African and U.S. corporations. These new uprisings of the working class reflect the deep-seated militancy of the masses, and indicate that the national liberation movements in Africa are fighting on many different levels for both democratic and national rights.

The New Role of the African Liberation Movements and National Reconstruction

At the 24th CPSU Congress Leonid Brezhnev said, "... the struggle for national liberation in many countries has in practical terms begun to grow into a struggle against exploitation relations, both feudal and capitalist." These words fully apply to the African continent. This process is operating with the greatest consistency and scope in the countries with socialist orientations, namely, Algeria, Egypt, Guinea, the People's Republic of the Congo, Tanzania and Somalia. This is a result not so much of the decisions made by any particular leader as of the objective laws governing the second stage (economic independence) of the national liberation revolution. The African liberation movements today are struggling to achieve their national independence but at the same time are trying to achieve the second stage of the national liberation movements, which puts them in a different category than the African liberation movements in the late 1950's and early 60's. At that time the main struggle for African countries was for political independence, not an attack against the old feudal and pre-capitalist structure in their countries. The changes in the relationship of forces today between the socio-economic systems of socialism and capitalism, and the experience of the early African liberation movement for political independence has taught the present-day African liberation movements that the struggle is both for political and economic independence and for a type of internal social formation different from the old pre-capitalist and colonial structure.

The process of socio-political change inside the liberated areas of Guinea-Bissau, Namibia, Mozambique and Angola is a constant process along with the military struggle for liberation. In the liberated areas of Guinea-Bissau, which comprise about 2/3 of the countryside, PAIGC has set up a national political structure. There is an elected National Assembly of 120 people, 80 elected by the masses of the people and 40 appointed from PAIGC. The National Assembly will shortly proclaim the existence of the State of Guinea and give it an executive authority that will function within the country. In nearly 10 years of struggle, thousands of adults and youth have been taught to read and write. No fewer than 497 high and middle level civil servants and professional people have been trained, 495 people are studying in friendly European countries, while 15,000 children are attending 156 primary schools and five secondary boarding schools and semi-boarding schools with a staff of 251 teachers. Not only are hospitals and health centers in full operation, but also PAIGC has established small commodity factories and there is an extensive

agricultural program.

Under FRELIMO'S leadership over one million Mozambicans work and live in the liberated areas which cover more than 1/3 of the territory. After eight years of armed struggle, FRELIMO has changed the principles of colonial production. Products destined for the colonial economy, such as cotton and oilseeds had to be replaced by others which provided nourishment for the indigenous population. Thus in the liberated areas the production of cotton has been halted and instead there has been considerable development of production of foodstuffs. The old forced labor system of not producing for themselves but for the colonialists under slave conditions has been replaced by peasant co-operative movements. Today agricultural production has surpassed the level of production in colonial times despite the continued state of war, bombing and defoliation. There is also now stock fishing and small cottage industry. Regional hospitals have been set up. There are 160 primary schools with 20,000 pupils and 250 teachers. There is also one secondary school with 133 pupils. (*Objective: Justice*, January-March 1973, a United Nations publication, New York.)

National reconstruction has also started in Angola under the leadership of MPLA, which controls one third of the land populated by over one million people. In Angola the people are organized under councils for popular action whose members are directly elected by the people. These committees deal with production and the organization of self-defense as well as the administration of justice. They are based on the principle, "build to continue the battle until our people are completely free, so that complete independence will be fruitful and useful to all our free population." MPLA has established a Medical Assistance Service, the Angolan Red Cross, People's Shops for Commerce and Agriculture and national schools. This new stage of the African liberation movements indicates a two-fold revolution, the fight against colonialism and the struggle against the obsolete economic structure in building national reconstruction programs. Lenin clarified the difficulty in building for national reconstruction when he spoke of the social diversity of the present non-Western countries as a combination of different economic structures in unequal, so to say, proportions and forms. The multiform economic structure that is not clearly a defined social economic formation makes the programs for national reconstruction much more difficult since the struggle is against the local class structure and the colonialists. The revolutionary democratic essence of the emerging social systems in the liberated areas leaves the colonialists no illusions that they will manage to retain their position in these countries when the latter

win independence.

The new role of the African liberation movements today is also highlighted by the fact that all of them see socialism as the answer to their problems and are willing to accept openly aid from the socialist countries, especially the Soviet Union. This trend fundamentally makes them different from the early African national liberation movements that were in the main non-socialist in their orientation and did not openly accept socialist aid. Amilcar Cabral, assassinated leader of the PAIGC, stressed the importance of this fact by saying: "In the socialist camp we have always had a sure ally in the liberation struggle. It is the duty of the socialist camp, their historical duty, not only moral duty. And we must say that without the help of the socialist countries it would be very difficult to carry on our struggle. . . . It is the socialist countries and especially the Soviet Union which have helped us particularly. We have received important aid from other socialist countries with regards to commodities, such as Romania, Bulgaria, Cuba, GDR, Hungary, and we hope that all these socialist countries will do their utmost to increase their aid because they are historical allies—our struggle is theirs." (*African Agenda*, March 1973, Chicago.)

The imperialist powers are clearly watching the changing class forces operating in Africa and are especially seeking to turn the progressive changes in class relationships in the African liberation movements in their favor. To direct the young states and the present-day African liberation movements along the capitalist path of development has been the main strategic task of imperialism in Africa. Neocolonialism serves as the means for achieving this goal. The new changes in the struggles of the African liberation movements have been promoted by the changing nature of class forces in the world. The blow dealt the U.S. imperialists by the patriotic forces in Vietnam as well as the recent U.S. dollar crisis attest to the fact that the U.S. imperialists are desperately trying to hold on to their position as world policeman and world exploiter. The current African liberation movements are now facing a much more desperate enemy but have gained from the experience in the last decade of the world revolutionary forces' fight against imperialism and from the successes and failures of the early African liberation movements.

In Africa, as elsewhere, the forces of progress and social renovation are on an historical offensive. Imperialism cannot block the onward march of the national liberation movements. History is on the side of national liberation. Relying on the growing assistance and support of world socialism, the forces of national and social emancipation will surely win.

The Liberation Movement Between World Wars*

Impact of World War I and the October Revolution

The First World War and the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917, two historic events, have exerted great influence on the upsurge of the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples of America and Africa. Little is written about this fact today, and it is consciously ignored and disregarded. But it has long been known that many present-day progressive phenomena in the life of the peoples have deep historical roots. Therefore it is necessary to retrace the path of struggle for the triumph of progress, and to analyze separate stages of this struggle. Only then can one appraise such major historic moments as the contemporary national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples in America and colonial Africa. Only then can one appraise fully the progress achieved and understand the present contradictions experienced by the liberation movement of Black Americans and the struggle for African unity.

It is precisely with the First World War that the upsurge of the liberation movement of the Black peoples began. Worn out by the war, the colonial empires—Great Britain and France—were compelled to get their subject peoples to take part in the battle for the redivision of the world, promising to grant them freedom and independence. In their turn, the Black Americans were promised equality as compensation. But all these promises were forgotten the very next day after peace was signed. Lost hopes—that was the rich soil in which the shoots of a powerful movement for freedom sprouted.

The October Revolution of 1917 in Russia, which gave freedom to the peoples of the colonial provinces of the tsarist empire, roused the oppressed masses of Africa, Asia and America, paved the way for them to struggle for the restoration of their violated dignity. The socialist state, which came into being as a result of the revolution, and which proclaimed the creation of a new society based on the equality of nations and nationalities in all spheres of life—social, economic and political—became the beacon for the enslaved peoples.

* The author, Lily Golden, is a Candidate of Science (History) and a research associate in the Institute of Africa of the USSR Academy of Science. The English translation is by B. Bialek.

From it they derived moral strength, clearness of purpose. The victory of the proletariat in Russia imbued the oppressed world with the revolutionary spirit, stimulated the awakening of the consciousness and pride of the dependent peoples. Progressive public leaders, for whom Russia became the guiding star for the successful solution of the contradictions of capitalism floundering in crises, strove to direct the oppressed masses into the general stream of the world revolutionary movement for fundamental social and economic changes.

Following the establishment of Communist Parties in Europe, Communist Parties appeared in Africa. In the 1920s Communist organizations were founded in Algeria and Tunisia, in the Union of South Africa and in Egypt. In one form or another, the anti-imperialist movement had swept the whole African continent. An unprecedented upsurge of the liberation movement of the African peoples took place in the period between the two world wars. Different organizations, which united in their ranks Africans and the Black population of the USA, the West Indies and Latin America sprang up one after another. They were headed by Afro-Americans, imparting to these organizations an international nature. The activity of the Afro-Americans was conditioned by the fact that in the USA toward the beginning of the 20th century there had already crystallized definite forces and revolutionary traditions in the struggle for equality and civil rights, against racism and discrimination. In the USA a cohort of Black ideologists had arisen, who had great influence on the oppressed masses, which had already lost faith and become disillusioned in the so-called emancipation proclaimed in the manifesto on the abolition of slavery. Black intellectuals of the USA played an important role in molding national consciousness.

The Garvey Movement

The biggest and most powerful movement at that time was the Garvey movement, which arose in 1914 in Jamaica and became widespread in 1916, when Marcus Garvey came to the United States. The membership of the Universal Negro Improvement Association, an organization he headed, grew to mass proportions. The program of the Association was drafted at the first convention held in New York in 1921, at which Marcus Garvey was elected Provisional President of Africa. Speaking in the name of the African peoples of the world, the first convention formulated a "Declaration of Rights," which reflected their most vital and urgent needs and demands. The Declaration defended the rights of Afro-Americans, demanding the abolition of every form of racial victimization, segregation and discrimination in the sphere of work and wages, and protesting against deprivation

of the right to an education and of civil rights. It likewise defended the rights of Africans, calling upon them to fight against the laws which deprived them of their lands.

The reasons for the success and wide dissemination of Garvey's ideas lie in the historical and social conditions of life of the Black population the world over, and especially in the United States. Marcus Garvey came to the USA at the time when the mass immigration of Black workers to the United States from Cuba, Puerto Rico, Haiti, Jamaica and Trinidad had begun, workers who had brought with them their fighting traditions. At that time also, large numbers of Black Americans emigrated from the southern states to the North, where in connection with the war the demand for labor power had grown greatly, since large numbers of workers in industry were mobilized for the army and European immigration to the USA had ceased completely. This migration resulted in the creation of a Black proletariat, which found itself in the backyard of the capitalist state. The relations between the white and Black Americans became aggravated, leading to big racial clashes but also arousing the fighting spirit in the Black masses.

Garvey's ideas touched deep chords of response among the Black population of the USA at that time. He became the mouthpiece of their aspirations, and his activity corresponded with the spirit of resistance and protest, which had matured in the minds of the oppressed masses and sought an outlet. The Garvey movement gained such wide scope in Africa, the West Indies and Latin America that the government of Britain and France prevented Garvey's emissaries from entering their colonies. They also excluded his paper, *Negro World*, which had become the largest Black paper in the world, and they officially protested to the US government against the activities of Garvey. Numerous delegations from different African colonies attended the Congress of the Universal Negro Improvement Association. To some extent many prominent leaders in the national liberation movement in Africa felt the impact of his ideas. Among them we can name the former President of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah, and the former President of Nigeria, Nnamdi Azikiwe.

However, Garvey's radicalism rather quickly turned into conservatism. He was more and more carried away by his utopian idea of mass migration of Black people to Africa and no longer demanded for them racial and social equality in the USA. Garvey stood on a nationalist position, called upon the Black workers not to join trade unions of white workers, and completely renounced the struggle in defense of civil rights. He refused to cooperate with the Pan-Africanism headed by Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois and regarded mulattoes as en-

mies of the Black people.

The Pan-African Movement

Notwithstanding the fact that the Garveyite movement developed rapidly and embraced millions of the Black population of America, it ended in failure. The political decline of Garveyism is explained by the fact that the change in his policy obviously began to clash with the interests of the Black masses. New organizations appeared, which corresponded more to their requirements. Among them was the Pan-African movement. In February 1919, Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois convened the First Pan-African Congress in Paris, which was attended by 57 delegates from 15 countries, including 12 delegates from nine African countries. The Congress discussed three main ideas of the Pan-African movement: racial solidarity, economic independence and political self-determination.

At the Second Pan-African Congress Dr. Du Bois already spoke of the imperialist nature of the colonial regimes in Africa and Asia and stressed the need for socialist transformations as the most radical means for solving important problems confronting the Africans.

The Third Congress, held in Lisbon, demanded that Africans be granted the right to take part in governing their countries, the right to possess land and its resources, and the right to general and free elementary education. It raised the questions of training national personnel, of prohibition of the slave trade, of universal disarmament and a ban on wars.

The Fourth Congress acknowledged the international significance of the Soviet national policy and the important role of the USSR in supporting the national liberation movement in Africa. Among other things, it stated: "we thank the Soviet government of Russia for its attitude toward the colored races free of race prejudices and for its help to them."

The importance of these first four Pan-African Congresses lay in the fact that they promoted the development of the liberation movements in Africa and elaborated demands in defense of the African peoples. The Congresses gave the African leaders an opportunity to cooperate with one another. Though in the period between the two world wars the Pan-African movement was not a mass anti-imperialist movement and though only leading African intellectuals, who did not have a firm basis and connections on the African continent, took part in it, it nevertheless advanced and confirmed the idea of independence and the unity of the African peoples.

Much has been written about the Garveyite and Pan-African movements, whereas little information is available about the activities of

other mass liberation organizations. In my opinion they have exerted no less influence on the formation of national liberation and anti-imperialist movements.

The idea of the unity of all anti-imperialist forces was sounded at the First Congress of the Peoples of the East held in Baku in 1920. Taking part in its work were more than 2,000 delegates from different countries, including African countries. They discussed national, colonial and agrarian questions. In 1922, the Congress of the Peoples of the Far East discussed, among other things, the position of Communists on the national-colonial question and the cooperation of Communists with national-revolutionary parties.

In 1925, in Paris, a Committee Against the War in North Africa was created with Henri Barbusse, the well-known French novelist and Communist, at its head. Maurice Thorez, later the general secretary of the French Communist Party, headed the Central Committee of Action Against the War in Morocco, and on October 12 of the same year the Committee organized a mass political strike of 900,000 workers who, along with economic demands, expressed a protest against colonial wars. On February 10, 1926, a mass organization of proletarian solidarity—The International Workers' Assistance—and the German Committee Against Atrocities in Syria held a conference in Berlin of representatives of the national liberation movements of colonial countries and progressive international organizations to prepare for convening an international congress against the atrocities perpetrated by imperialism and colonial oppression. Taking part in this conference were 43 representatives from various parties and organizations, including delegates from Egypt, Morocco, the colonies of West Africa and the USA. The participants in the conference founded the League of Struggle Against Colonial Oppression and adopted a decision to convene an international congress of the oppressed peoples.

The Brussels Congress

Such a congress took place on February 10, 1927, in Brussels. Elected to its presidium were representatives of African countries—Lamine Senghor, Secretary of the Committee for the Defense of the Black Race, who represented French African colonies, Mohammed Hafez Ramadan, Chairman of the National Party of Egypt—and Roger Baldwin from the USA.

The agenda included the following items: the colonial policy of imperialism, common aims of national liberation movements in the oppressed countries, and proletarian and anti-imperialist movements in imperialist countries. Among the resolutions adopted were several

devoted to the position of the African peoples and the peoples of African descent, in which the Congress demanded that they be granted full freedom and independence.

The resolution on North Africa noted that the struggle of the laboring population of North Africa for the expulsion of the French colonialists from Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia was being waged with the fraternal help and support of the working class of France. The resolution on South Africa called upon all workers irrespective of the color of their skin and racial origin to unite; it called for workers' solidarity and joint actions. The resolution entitled "The National Liberation Struggle and the Working Class of the Imperialist Countries" formulated the idea of the oneness of the struggles of the oppressed peoples and of the proletariat of capitalist countries against imperialism.

The resolution entitled "The Colonial Policy of Imperialism and Its Influence on Colonial and Semicolonial Countries" contained an appeal to the working class of Europe not to limit itself to expressing sympathy with the fighters for independence and to protesting against the outrages committed by the imperialist oppressors, but to organize mass actions and strikes and prevent the sending of troops and military material to suppress the peoples fighting for their independence. The representatives of colonial countries more than once noted in their speeches at the Congress that in their struggle against imperialism they were receiving help from the Soviet Union.

League Against Imperialism

The Brussels Congress adopted a decision to establish the League against Imperialism, Against Colonial Oppression and for National Independence. The League became the first broad anti-imperialist organization, embodying a united front of the international working class, the progressive intellectuals of capitalist countries and representatives of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries of Asia, Africa, Europe and Latin America. It was joined by a large number of political, trade-union, cultural and public organizations of all the continents. The members of the League were Communists, Socialists, anarchists, Catholics, pacifists, nationalists and non-party people.

While the entire progressive public of the world noted the historic importance of the Brussels Congress and the establishment of the League, a slanderous campaign and police suppressions were launched against its spokesmen in the imperialist countries. The British authorities prohibited the distribution of literature issued by the League in their colonies, the French and Dutch authorities arrested members of the League. Among the arrested was a member of the Executive

Committee of the League, Lamine Senghor, who died in a French prison.

During the period between 1927 and 1929 the League was joined by a number of parties and organizations, among them the National Radical Party of Egypt, the National Party of Egypt, the North African Star, the General Confederation of Trade Unions of South Africa (both of white and Black workers), and the Negro Labor Congress of the United States.

Taking part in the Second Congress of the League in Frankfurt-am-Main, which opened on July 21, 1929, were 257 delegates from 33 countries, 84 of whom came from Asia, Africa and Latin America. The resolutions adopted at this Congress expressed protest against the inhuman exploitation and oppression of the African peoples by the imperialists. The Congress called upon the colonial peoples to unite with the exploited masses of the imperialist countries for joint struggle. The Congress adopted an appeal for action against economic, political and social discrimination, for full equality for people of African descent all over the world.

In the period between 1930 and 1935 the League continued to extend its activity. It published numerous pamphlets and leaflets, and mass meetings were held. In May 1931, in Paris, the League organized an exhibition "The Truth About Colonialism," which demonstrated the true situation in the French colonies. The exhibition graphically showed the partition of the world among the colonial powers, the seizure of Tunisia, the extermination of the population of Morocco, the atrocities of the Italian invaders in Tripolitania, the British-Boer Wars, etc. One of the halls was devoted to the economic and cultural progress in the Central-Asian Republics of the Soviet Union.

The last action taken by the League was in defense of the independence and the territorial inviolability of Ethiopia in connection with the aggression of Italy and the beginning of the Italo-Ethiopian war.

Trade Union Organizations

During the Frankfurt Congress of the League, the African delegates laid the foundation of an international union of workers of African origin. On their suggestion, on July 31, 1928, the Executive Bureau of the Profintern adopted a resolution on the establishment of the International Trade Union Committee of Negro Workers, which was made up of a number of delegates to the Sixth Congress of the Comintern. James Ford, a member of the Central Committee of the U.S. Communist Party, was elected chairman of the Committee.

Despite its comparatively brief period of existence, the International Trade Union Committee of Negro Workers played an important role in the history of the national liberation movement and the world labor movement. It trained a galaxy of revolutionary workers, a part of whom became the bearers of the ideas of scientific socialism in Africa. In the twenties and thirties, when the African labor and Communist movements were in their initial stages, the International Trade Union Committee of Negro Workers was the center of stable contacts between the representatives of the national liberation movement in Africa and the progressive industrial proletariat of the USA.

The International Committee showed much concern for the labor movement in Africa. In 1928 the Federation of African Trade Unions was established in South Africa, which had a membership of 3,500. Strikes were organized of dockers in Durban, stevedores and railroadmen in the seaport of East London, agricultural workers in the southwest of Cape Province. In Sierra Leone the organization of trade unions started in the mining fields and in the ports. The workers of Liberia founded a trade union—The Progressive Association of the Workers of Liberia—which was banned by the government a few years later. The struggle of African workers of French Equatorial Africa spread widely. A big demonstration of workers, under the leadership of Communists, took place on Madagascar. In Nigeria big disturbances broke out, during the suppression of which many workers became victims. In Gambia the trade union of workers of the margarine concern organized a general strike. The International Trade Union Committee rendered every kind of assistance to all these actions.

On the initiative of the Committee the First International Conference of Negro Workers took place in Hamburg in July 1930. The successful work of the Conference showed that a new social force—the African working class—had arisen in the African colonies.

Thus, the period between the two world wars was marked by the rise and growth of the anti-imperialist forces. Garveyism, the Pan-African movement, the Anti-Imperialist League and the International Trade Union Committee of Negro Workers promoted the growth of consciousness of the oppressed and colonial peoples. They played an important role in the history of the national liberation movement in Africa and facilitated its victory after the Second World War.

Israel's Setbacks in Africa*

During the first week of January 1973, three African states severed their relations with Israel: Congo-Brazzaville, Niger and Mali. Together with Chad, which severed relations last November, and Uganda, which did so last April, this makes five states that have broken off relations with Israel within the past year or so.**

And that is not all. The Israeli Minister of Foreign Affairs told the Knesset (Parliament) that a number of other African countries are, under "outside pressure," reviewing their relations with Israel. According to *Ha'aretz* of January 7, Israeli ruling circles are expecting diplomatic breaks with the Central African Republic, Dahomey and probably Togo, and over a longer period with Senegal and Sierra Leone.

The picture of Israeli relations with Africa seems to be one of disaster and resounding failure. The explanations given by the Israeli ruling circles convince nobody.

On January 6, one day after the break with Mali, Foreign Minister Abba Eban told a radio interviewer: "Most of the unfortunate mishaps affecting us in Africa lately are not the fruit of crises or tensions in the direct relations between us and the African states. They are the fruit of the pressure of external forces on certain African states which were or are vulnerable to threats, pressures and temptations." By external forces, the Israeli Foreign Minister and ruling circles mean Arab countries, mainly Libya. Even France was found "guilty" because three of its ex-colonies were among the states which severed relations.

But such explanations are ridiculous and superficial and do not touch the roots of these "unfortunate mishaps," especially when we recall that these outside pressures are not new and that the Israeli rulers had succeeded in establishing relations with these African countries in spite of them. Even Tamar Golan, the Ma'ariv correspondent, rejects the idea of reducing the whole question to "external pressures." She writes: "It would be a plain mistake to think that Libyan money was the only factor behind these latest developments." (December 12, 1973.)

* The author is a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel.

** Since this was written, Guinea and Burundi have followed suit, making a total of seven.—Editor.

What, then, is the background for this Israeli failure? And what is the way out?

Some Historical Background

In recent decades the African peoples began to realize their aspirations for independence after a bitter, centuries-long struggle against the barbaric oppression of the imperialist powers. This was made possible by the radical change in the world balance of forces in the period following World War II.

Because of this new international situation and the ever increasing national liberation struggles of the African peoples, imperialism was forced to withdraw. The noose of imperialist oppression began to loosen in Africa as in other parts of the world. While there were no more than four politically independent African states at the beginning of the fifties (in addition to the Arab countries), there are now 42 independent states covering 80 per cent of the continent's area. In addition, in the countries not yet independent there are strong national liberation movements and struggles with a sure perspective of victory.

This of necessity has created very strong and mounting feelings of unity and revolutionary cooperation among all independent African states and liberation movements, reflected in the establishment of the Organization of African Unity in 1963. This united movement is in turn related to the over-all international revolutionary struggle.

The general line of development in Africa is and will continue to be anti-imperialist, coinciding with the general struggle for liberation, peace and socialism, of which it is a part. Anyone who seeks a successful "African policy" must take this key objective fact into account.

Services to Imperialism

In the face of the powerful upsurge of the national liberation movement of the peoples of Africa, imperialism was forced to withdraw and to give them political independence. But having left by the door, it has sought ways to return by the window under a new banner of neo-colonialism. The rulers of Israel, who have closely tied their policy to the general strategy of imperialism because that has been essential in getting aid for their policy of aggression and annexation against the Arab peoples, grasped the situation and offered their services in helping to bring back imperialist domination to the African continent. They have many reasons for doing so, mainly the following:

1) Israel can present itself as a young state with a Western experience and technical level, but without the "ugly face" of the imperialist powers.

The U.S. professor, Michael Brecher, speaking about the desire of the Israeli rulers to serve as a bridge between the imperialist countries in the West and the ex-colonies, writes that "the fact that Israel has Western experience without the stigma of shame which imperialism has, makes it fit to play the main role in directing Western help, which could be suspected if given directly." (*New States of Asia: A Political Analysis*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1963, p. 147.)*

The rulers of Israel present themselves as the representatives of a small, progressive and peace-loving country without imperialist aspirations. Cooperation with Israel, they say, does not contain the negative features of cooperation with old imperialist powers. It is a country which can be a new model for progress in the third world, a model which is non-capitalist and non-socialist. In an article entitled "Israel—a Bridgehead for Social Democracy," the former editor of the Israeli newspaper *Davar*, Mr. Gotthof, after demanding the "liberation" of the newly independent countries "from the inevitable choice between capitalism and communism," writes: "In this, Israel can, undoubtedly, make a very important contribution by both personal experience or the help and guidance she gives to the peoples of Asia and Africa." (*Davar*, April 22, 1960.)

The Israeli rulers also present themselves as the representatives of a people which has the same interests as the peoples of Africa and has a similar history of sufferings. A delegation from the Republic of Central Africa visiting Israel was told by the Foreign Affairs Minister Abba Eban: "We both walked a long road of discrimination, sadness, and pain. Some because of their color, the others because of their religion." (Mordechai E. Kreinin, *Israel and Africa, a Study in Technical Cooperation*, New York, 1964.)

2) In the international struggle between the two main forces, capitalism and socialism, the Israeli rulers play an active role in the cold war against Communism, against the Soviet Union, and against the liberation forces generally, because they stand against Zionist annexationist plans and aggression against the Arab peoples.

Mrs. Golda Meir, the Israeli Prime Minister, speaking at the meeting of the Council of the Socialist International held in Haifa, April 1960, frankly described the role of the Israeli ruling circles:

*This quotation and that from Kreinin below are taken from Hebrew translations of these books and retranslated into English. They are therefore not precise.—Editor.

"The Communists, it seems, want the African politics to continue as they are, so that the hatred for imperialism, as they allege, will continue." She added: "International socialism can give the answer to Communist domination in developing countries in Africa only through experts who possess a socialist spirit and can be a strong link with developing peoples." And of course who can possess such a "socialist spirit" better than the rulers of Israel? And why should not imperialism accept these services which make it possible for the same imperialist wolf to penetrate into Africa dressed in the Israeli sheep's clothing?

It must be said that these African states are newly independent and their experience in state affairs is very brief. Imperialism left these countries without qualified social, scientific, technical or economic cadres, and nearly without armed forces. These countries were in dire need of all of these things. The one alternative open to them was to develop relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and seek their help. The Israeli rulers thought they could prevent this development.

3) A special interest of the Israeli rulers was to influence the African states to take their side in the Arab-Israeli conflict, or at least to neutralize them, and so to isolate the Arab countries, especially the progressive regimes. This can be considered the main strategic aim of the Israeli rulers in penetrating Africa.

The Israeli government serves imperialism, above all, against the national movement of the Arab peoples and their anti-imperialist regimes. It does so in accord with the inner logic of the chauvinistic, reactionary Zionist theory and practice followed by the Israeli rulers. Their established practice is raping the rights of the Arab peoples, especially of the Palestinian Arab people, and attempting to impose a capitulatory peace on the Arab countries. This can be made possible by hindering the development of the Arab peoples, by planting difficulties and obstacles in their way, and by waging aggressive wars aiming to break the backbone of the Arab national liberation movements.

In keeping with this inner logic of their chauvinistic mentality, they put themselves at the service of imperialism, against the interests of the Arab peoples and their national liberation movements, as well as against the national liberation struggles of peoples in other parts of the world. They align themselves with the imperialist strategy of aggression (the latest example was their decision last December to establish diplomatic relations with the criminal Thieu clique in South Vietnam). They do all this in return for imperialist help, including the necessary quantities of super-modern arms to

realize their Zionist expansionist aspirations. This is the unholy equation of interests which governs the relations between the Israeli rulers and the imperialist powers, especially U.S. imperialism. Accordingly, they consider every blow against imperialism's power as contrary to their own interests and they welcome every gain of imperialism.

This coincidence of imperialist policy and Israeli policy is against the real interests of the Israeli people, against the achievement of a just peace based on the national rights of all the peoples of the Middle East, including the Israeli and Palestinian Arab peoples, against the preservation of the good name of the Israeli people in the world. This neo-colonialist role which the rulers of Israel assigned themselves opened the door to Western aid. Big amounts of Western capital began pouring into Israel and through it to newly independent African countries and to other countries of the "third world."

4) There are also the special, "private" interests of Israeli capital.

The base of Israeli capitalism was laid during the period of the British mandate over Palestine. After the establishment of the State of Israel, a relatively big growth in the Jewish population took place. This produced a corresponding growth in the local market, and consequently a very big number of new enterprises and factories were built. New branches of production were opened. This situation attracted much foreign capital. The major part of this capital was invested in companies shared by local capital, governmental and private. The Israeli economist Tamar Gozhansky writes: "A system of attracting foreign capital for partnership in old and new factories developed in the country, a system of investing capital through special companies working to mobilize foreign capital, companies linked with banks and investments. This system today practically covers the majority of industrial enterprises and has a decisive influence in shaping the character of Israeli capitalism." (*Economic Independence—How?*, Tel Aviv, 1969, p. 83.)

This development of Israeli capitalism in close union with foreign capital, together with the narrowing of the local market and the drive to control new productive forces in other countries, pointed the Israeli dagger towards Africa, as well as towards other areas. "But," writes Gozhansky, "since Israeli capitalism is a relatively weak capitalism and its financial power is not sufficient to compete with the U.S. and West European monopolies, it has chosen to associate itself in the neo-colonial penetration by the more developed capitalist countries." (P. 104.)

By the end of 1967 the number of Israeli companies operating outside Israel's borders in Africa and other places reached nearly 120.

Of these, 30 were industrial, 40 marketing and the rest in other economic spheres.

Way Station for Monopoly Capital

The money of imperialist aid and private capital, especially U.S. and West German, has been pouring into Israel as a station on its way to Africa. A considerable number of Israeli companies operating in Africa are financed by various U.S. and Western European establishments. Also operating in Africa are joint-capital ventures—Israeli-American, Israeli-West German, etc. An example is the Control Company, a planning enterprise which was established jointly by the U.S. Control Data and the Israeli Tahal companies. Its annual turnover outside Israel amounted to \$750 million in 1967 (with a profit of \$40 million). By the end of the sixties, this company was considered, according to its managers, one of the first-class international planning companies working in the field of engineering services to developing countries, side by side with giant U.S. companies.

The Israeli companies active in building, industrial and agricultural planning, work mostly on the basis of U.S. and West German financing. This operates as follows: the developing countries receive loans from the International Bank or from U.S., West German or other banks. The Israeli companies bid for a share in the given operation and thus obtain the right to participate in the overall project. Other forms of participation are established directly through international planning companies, mainly U.S.

A part of the foreign monopolies which establish factories in Israel do so on condition of exporting the products to Asia and Africa. According to Kreinin, U.S. and West European producers of agricultural machinery had decided some time ago to establish enterprises for production in Israel with the partnership of local capital, in spite of the Arab boycott. These companies are the New Holland Machines and John Deere Intercontinental, both U.S., and the West German Haco Company. (*Op. cit.*, p. 174.)

Kreinin also describes Israel as a show-window for everything connected with agricultural installations, and as urging companies to invest capital in Israel as a means of penetration into the African markets which are not within their reach.

This applies as well to the foreign banks which operate in Israel. When the Exchange National Bank of Chicago decided to open a branch in Israel, one of the inducements was the special position which Israel occupies in commercial, investment and development relations with the states of Africa, Asia and Latin America. In trying to convince the owners of this bank to open its branch in Israel, the

Israeli representatives (according to *Ha'aretz*, August 28, 1970) pointed out that many countries which receive help from the Western powers prefer to receive it through a small country which will not threaten their independence. In this way, U.S. and other imperialist giant monopolies strengthen their position in Israel and penetrate into Africa under the Israeli banner.

The Israeli rulers, in establishing their African policy, were wise enough not to exclude progressive African states, hoping to win them to their side and to use this relationship to cover the ugly face of their policy. But the majority of the regimes with which they established relations were reactionary and pro-imperialist.

Military Involvement

When established, the newly-independent African states were nearly without armies. The Israeli rulers understood the importance of establishing military relations with these states and supplying military aid, aimed at encouraging pro-imperialist and reactionary forces. These relations included training of new military cadres and providing military experts and arms. The U.S. observer, Sanford Silverburg, documents the fact that Israel provided military aid to 16 African sub-Sahara states. (*Israeli Military and Parliamentary Assistance to Sub-Sahara in Africa*, masters thesis, American University, 1968, pp. 50-75.)

The Israeli experts in Africa played a big role in more than one reactionary coup d'état. The leader of Uganda, Idi Amin, speaking about the role played by these experts, accused them of intervening in state affairs and even trying to overthrow him, and said that this was one of the reasons why he decided to expel them from Uganda. At the same time it is known that these experts played a role in the coup d'état against the progressive Milton Obote regime in Uganda which brought Amin himself to power.

In the framework of these military relations, military training has been given to many reactionary and pro-imperialist African military leaders. According to the report at the Lusaka (Zambia) conference of unaffiliated countries held in September 1970, "more than ten thousand armymen from Africa had their military or semi-military training in Israeli army schools." (*Ma'ariv*, October 30, 1972.) Among them were parachutists, commando units, and officers who later became the rulers of their countries, such as General Mobutu of Zaire.

Many mutual visits of military delegations took place. An example is the visit of the Congolese military delegation headed by Chief of Staff, Brigadier General Honore Ankolone, in March 1971, to discuss Israel's possibilities for training military forces and helping with the

military college they intended to build. There were also visits to African countries by Israeli high military officers, such as the visit of General Haim Bar-Lev to Ethiopia in September 1971, officially for recreation but in fact for studying the possibilities of deepening military cooperation.

Israeli weapons were provided to reactionary governments for smashing the struggles of African peoples. Israeli rulers are closely associated with the Pretoria-Salisbury-Lisbon axis. They provided the "Uzi" gun to racist Portuguese colonialists for use against the armed liberation forces of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). Of course, such deals are not carried out openly but usually through a third party like the West German military.

Israeli rulers have encouraged separatist movements aimed against the territorial integrity of independent African states. They stood on the side of the Biafran secessionist leaders against the unity of Nigeria. They stood on the side of the leaders of southern Sudanese tribes revolting against the unity of Sudan, especially at a time when the Sudanese government had a progressive character. Israeli arms were found in the hands of the revolting forces, as was then reported. They adopted Moise Tshombe, the pro-imperialist leader of the separatist movement in Katanga who was supported by Western capital and other imperialist forces. They opposed the Algerian people's revolution for independence. When General de Gaulle gave in to the Algerian people and a number of armed officers revolted against his decision, these officers were found with Israeli arms in their hands.

Israeli military cooperation, as well as economic and political cooperation, is especially strong with the racist regime in South Africa. South Africa is producing the Israeli "Uzi" gun. In May 1971 the head of the UN Committee for Anti-Apartheid Struggle accused the government of Israel of selling arms to South Africa despite UN decisions. The U.S. journalist C. L. Sulzberger wrote that Israel provided South Africa with plans for producing Mirage fighter planes. (*New York Times*, April 30, 1971.)

In the field of military experience, the Israeli rulers have much to contribute to South Africa. After the 1967 Israeli aggression against the Arab peoples, a South African military delegation visited Israel to study the Israeli experience. This and the experience of the 1956 Israeli aggression are studied in the South African military college.

New Advances in Africa

Since the beginning of the sixties an important qualitative and deep-rooted change has taken place in the newly independent African

countries. They have become stronger, more experienced and farsighted, more responsible to their peoples, more sure of their role in the world arena, and more closely related to the international revolutionary struggle. They have come increasingly to realize that the Israeli policy aimed at isolating them from the socialist camp and all forces of progress contradicts their national interests and aspirations.

Their experiences have taught them that neo-colonialism is the same old foe, which has changed its coloration but not its nature. They have recognized the "Israeli dish" as the same old poisonous fare. It is understandable that they want to reject it.

Another factor which has helped to accelerate this process is the Israeli government's policy of close ties with imperialism against socialism and the national liberation movements, especially as displayed in its anti-Arab policy in the Middle East. This policy has become a boomerang. The Mali Foreign Minister Captain Sesuku declared: "After the six-day war, nearly all states agreed with the opinion that Israel was responsible for the opening of war operations. They hoped to restore peace and understanding in the Middle East by implementing the Security Council resolution. But that never happened, and every now and then we are witnesses of murderous Israeli air raids against the Arab people." (*Ha'aretz*, January 7, 1973.) He added: "Israel is establishing settlements in occupied Arab territories, evicting the local inhabitants by force." He concluded with the hope that "the world family of nations would force Israel to respond to the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967 which calls for Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories." This was repeated, in one way or another, by other African leaders. We must keep in mind that Israel's policy of waging aggressive wars, repressing local populations in occupied territories and changing their demographic structure can never gain the sympathy of the African peoples, who have suffered much and are still suffering from the same policies.

Further, life has proven to the African countries that the economic help of their Israeli "friends" was actually no aid at all. The negative results showed that this so-called help was aimed at preventing the building of a healthy economy. It led only in one direction, resulting in the development of a one-sided economy that makes a country only a source of agricultural and raw material production. These products can then be imported and used in the industry of Israel and her partners. That is not the kind of development the African countries want and need. What they do need is comprehensive development, stressing the industrialization of the economy.

Perspectives

The reaction of the Israeli ruling circles to these latest developments in Africa shows that they either do not want to learn or are unable to learn the lessons from them and draw the correct conclusions. "The stand of the government as was summed up in the latest discussions of the Foreign Ministry is to persist in its present policy." (*Ha'aretz*, January 4, 1973.) More, in an editorial on January 7, *Ma'ariv* took an extreme, infantile stand, threatening Mali (and through Mali all African states). They wrote: "Mali is not the Soviet Union. We withstood even the breaking off of relations with the Soviet Union, and with it all countries of the Communist world. Certainly we can also overcome the absence of an Israeli Embassy in Bamako if we could gather from this the lesson concerning the doctrine of Israeli presence in Africa." And what is that lesson? The *Ma'ariv* editorial continues: "The Israeli presence must be selective even when the choice is also ours."

The *Ma'ariv* correspondent Tamar Golan regarded the cutoffs as "a balanced step, the basis of which lies in the recognition of the fact that in the existing conditions, Israel cannot grant the African states the marked and serious help they need." She concludes: "It would be better if the Israeli presence in such countries were in a low profile, more suited to the conditions." (December 26, 1972.)

Our Israeli Communist Party, which correctly evaluated the main direction of development in Africa and the international balance of forces, has stressed that the Israeli gains in Africa are only temporary. The Report of the Central Committee, adopted at the 17th Party Congress in June 1972 (shortly after the cutoff by Uganda), stated that "the gains of the Israeli government in Africa are only temporary, because the objective interests of the African states demand the strengthening of their economic and political independence. This, in itself, demands pursuing a policy against imperialist plunder and imperialist agents in Africa. The fall of the military, political and economic positions of the government of Israel in Uganda characterizes the direction of development."

The people of Israel are interested in normal relations of friendship and cooperation, in furthering the interests of both sides and not those of imperialist powers and their agents, the rulers of Israel and the reactionary pro-imperialist forces in Africa. The CC Report states: "The Israeli official policy in Africa stains the name of Israel among peoples. Israel's national interest demands completely different relations with the African peoples. The Israeli rulers' policy failed because it consists of an attachment to imperialist states and foreign

monopolies, and because it works to separate the African peoples, to sow conflicts between the African-Arab peoples and other African peoples, and to obstruct the path to national and social liberation."

What is needed, of course, is the strengthening of the movement to impose a radical change in Israeli policy, to end its involvement in the world aggressive imperialist strategy, to end enmity to socialism and anti-imperialist liberation movements, to end aggression and the occupation and annexation of Arab territories in the Middle East, and to follow a policy of peace, recognition of others' national rights, and friendship with the socialist world and all revolutionary, progressive forces. Only such a policy is in keeping with the spirit of our age and can serve the true interests of the Israeli toilers and people.

To Keep up with the Latest on the Struggles.
Ideas and Culture of Today's Youth, read:

THE YOUNG WORKER

Publication of the YOUNG WORKERS LIBERATION LEAGUE,
A Multi-Racial, Multi-National
Marxist-Leninist Youth Organization

Subscribe Now!

FIRST ISSUE: July-Aug., 1973!

1 Year, \$2.50

6 Months, \$1.25

Single Issues, 25¢

Encl. \$ _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Zip _____

(monthly except Jan. and Aug.)
Make checks payable to:

YOUNG WORKERS LIBERATION LEAGUE

29 W. 15th Street - 7th Floor
New York, N. Y. 10011

Wounded Knee and the Indian Future

The 71-day occupation of the South Dakota hamlet of Wounded Knee by several score Native Americans, February 27-May 8, opened the year of 1973 with an exposure of monopoly greed and government perfidy in respect to the Indian peoples of the United States of North America. During the occupation there began another exposure of monopoly greed and duplicity of high government officials in respect to the laboring majority of the U.S. population. Disclosures of the implications of the burglary, June 17, 1972, of the Democratic Party National Committee headquarters in the Watergate complex in Washington, D.C. unveiled a long-time and ongoing conspiracy to deprive the U.S. majority of Constitutional safeguards against authoritarian rule and increasingly ruthless exploitation by the owners of the means of production. Wounded Knee brought into focus the 500 year-long conspiracy between government and private interests that has dispossessed the Indian peoples of 97 per cent of their land (1.9 billion acres), reduced them to chronic hunger and abysmal destitution, and today is continuing the theft of the remaining 3 per cent (55 million acres) and attempting to drive them into monopoly capital's reserve army of unemployed and underemployed labor.

The Challenge of Wounded Knee

This singular concurrence of Wounded Knee and Watergate is more evidence of the refusal of the ruling class of U.S. capitalist society and the inability of its undemocratic two-party structure to secure the liberties and livelihood not only of racially-proscribed and fenced-off minorities, but of the entire laboring population. Moreover, it may be evident to others besides Marxists that this concurrence reflects a casual connection between Watergate and centuries of Indian extermination and attempted forcible assimilation. It can be argued that the political ethos of Watergate—contempt for Constitutional liberties of the people and the attempted bypassing of Constitutional measures and institutions to safeguard them—could not have developed if the non-Indian majority of the U.S. population had acted in time to secure their own self-interest in establishing just and humane relations with the Indians. Watergate points up the pertinence of an analogy drawn by Felix S. Cohen, author of the *Handbook of Federal Indian Law* and an official of the U.S.

Department of Interior during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt:

. . . the Indian plays much the same role in our American society that the Jews played in Germany. Like the miner's canary, the Indian marks the shifts from fresh air to poison gas in our political atmosphere. . . . (*Yale Law Review*, February 1953.)

In this sense, then, Wounded Knee signaled the urgent need of the U.S. laboring majority in their own self-interest to act in solidarity with the Indian peoples against the monopolies and their servile politicians. It challenged the sensitivity of the majority to sufferings inflicted on racially oppressed and exploited minorities. It pierced the virtually impenetrable miasma of racism and lies that has dehumanized Indians in the eyes of the majority and made them objects of hatred and ridicule, sometimes of pity, always of exploitation and violence. This was one of the stated objectives of the occupation's leaders. Obviously, they hoped their selfless action on the site of the mass grave of 300 of their unarmed ancestors, massacred by U.S. troops in December, 1890, would move the U.S. majority to support their demands in sufficient numbers to render unnecessary further Wounded Knees by the more than 300 tribes of Indian peoples.

The demands of the Wounded Knee Indians centered on the grievances of the 11,000-member Oglala Sioux tribe of the 2,500 square-mile Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, second largest of the 267 federally-recognized land units reserved for Indians. The per capita annual income on this reservation, including welfare, is \$850; the unemployment rate is 54 per cent in summer and 70 per cent in winter; and the pushout rate by the 12th grade in schools where 70 per cent of the teachers are white is 81 per cent. Originally encompassing approximately 4 million acres—notwithstanding the 1868 treaty's provision granting the Oglala Sioux all the land west of the Missouri River—less than one-half of this area remains in possession of the tribe and Indian families and individuals; 1 million acres are owned by whites and 1.5 million are leased to white ranchers at \$1 per acre per year.

So-called "self-government" is patterned on classic colonialist lines. Under the tribal constitution imposed under terms of the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act, the white superintendent appointed by the Department of Interior, as well as officials of the Department, may veto any measure proposed by the 20-member tribal council, the

president and five-member executive board of which are also designated by Federal officials. Many of the eligible voters boycott elections of the tribal council, held every two years, considering it alien to their traditional method of choosing leaders. The tribal government disposes of a 13-member police force, is allowed to designate workers for some 340 federal jobs, and appoints a tribal court. The court, however, may try only misdemeanors; felonies and crimes against Indians by whites come under the jurisdiction of whites!

Grievances and Demands

Accordingly, the Wounded Knee spokesman demanded re-examination by the federal government of the status of treaties with the Oglala Sioux, and strict observance of the terms of the treaties in regard to the tribe's land and the obligation undertaken by the government to protect Indian lives and provide such services as health care, housing, employment, development and education. Other grievances expressed but subordinated to this main demand called for an end to "cultural genocide" in the schools and religious matters, for control of Indian education by the Indians themselves, for an end to the atrocities and brutalities inflicted on Indians by state police and vigilantes, and for federal investigation of the activities of the tribal president, Richard Wilson, accused of graft and corruption, nepotism, obsequious deferment to the encroaching whites, and arbitrary rule through the tribal police and hired goons.

With few exceptions, the monopoly-controlled U.S. information media suppressed the main demands or minimized their importance. Instead, the media gave maximum coverage to day-to-day events of the Indians' confrontation with federal marshalls and vigilantes, and to the demand for an investigation of Wilson's activities. Concentration on this demand enabled the media and federal officials to attribute the Wounded Knee events to differences between so-called "mixed-blood" and "full-blood" Indians, between "urban" and "reservation" Indians, between "political ins" and "political outs." By thus representing the confrontation as the product of a "deep tribal split," the media and the government concealed its real character—that of a national liberation struggle by the Indians against the continuing plunder of the land and resources by private interests, with the aid of the federal government and its officials, and the default of the government on its commitments to provide protection and the public services for the Indians. Such a distortion of reality obviously conceals from non-Indian working people the connection of the Wounded Knee occupation to the struggle of the U.S. majority to defend their

liberties and livelihood from attacks by the same monopolies and government officials.

Actually, to head off non-Indian support for Wounded Knee, some government officials and media organs, and even Wilson and his allies, resorted to crude outbursts of anti-communism. They tried to discredit the occupation leaders by depicting them as "outsiders," and as one white vigilante said, "Chicanos, Negroes, Russians and Cherokees . . . the American Communist movement." The Oglala Sioux, of course, knew the truth. More than a month before the occupation, after failing to impeach Wilson, three groups of the tribe—the Landowners, Treaty Council and Civil Rights Organization—had invited the American Indian Association (AIA) to help in dramatizing the tribe's grievances.

Although Wounded Knee projected the grievances and demands specifically of the Oglala Sioux, these were also generalizations of long-standing grievances and aspirations of the Indian peoples as a whole, who number approximately 850,000 by 1970 Census count, including Alaska, but several times more if allowance is made for census undercounting and exclusion of many Chicanos and others of Indian descent. These grievances and demands go back to before the founding of the United States. "From the beginning," says the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education in Appendix I of its *Report*, "Federal policy toward the Indian was based on the desire to dispossess him of his land. . . . Treaties, almost always signed under duress, were the window-dressing whereby we expropriated the Indian's land and pushed him back across the continent." From 1778 to 1871 through nearly 400 treaties and agreements "the Indian tribes ceded to the United States almost a billion acres. Although treaty provisions vary, in general, the Indians retained lands for their own use which were to be inalienable and tax exempt. The Federal government in turn agreed to provide public services such as education, medical care, technical and agricultural training." (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1969, pp. 142, 143.)

During the 57-year "allotment period" under the Dawes Severalty Act of 1887-1934, the Indians were deprived of two-thirds of their remaining land, approximately 90 million acres, reducing their tribal land base to 56 million acres. The Bureau of Indian Affairs classified this base as 14 million acres critically eroded, 17 million severely eroded, and 25 million "slightly" eroded. Throughout the two and one-half centuries from the beginning of European settlements to 1890, the Indians struggled to keep their land. Their most important wars of resistance, waged in thousands of battles and

engagements, are cited by William Z. Foster in his *Outline Political History of the Americas*. (International Publishers, New York, 1951, pp. 213-220.)

After the end of Indian armed resistance in 1890, treaty violations continued. The grant of U.S. citizenship in 1924 (although not observed by some states until 1948); the so-called "New Deal" for Indians under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934; establishment of the Court of Indian Claims and the Indian Claims Commission in 1946 (with Congressional approval required before suits may be filed by Department of Interior-approved lawyers); adoption of Public Law 280 and House Concurrent Resolution 108 in 1953, which repudiated federal treaty commitments and transferred jurisdiction over Indian affairs to the states (the so-called "termination policy" zealously enforced by Indian Affairs Commissioner Dillon S. Meyer, who presided over the removal during World War II of Japanese-descended Americans to concentration camps)—each apparent change in government policy, however disguised as a step toward helping the Indians or meeting their demands for self-determination, was turned into a weapon of forced assimilation and appropriation of Indian lands.

Nixon's "New Policy"

When President Nixon on July 8, 1970, announced a new policy purporting to give the Indians self-determination, to continue acting as their trustee and protecting their land and resources, and ordered a restructuring of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), illusions arose that the Indians' grievances were at long last being heard. For several months certain new developments strengthened these illusions. Then came the awakening. Not only did the Nixon Administration fail to press Congress for adoption of enabling legislation to implement the promises, but other Nixon measures—revenue-sharing with the states, increasing military expenditures, policies fostering racial animosity among the white majority against the non-white minorities—in effect nullified the gesture of a new policy for the Indians and exposed its demagogic intent.

In the spirit of the White House's preoccupation with forging an extra-governmental apparatus to rule the people and suppress all opposition to the monopolies' drive for superprofits, arch-foes of the Indians in and out of the government engaged in unhindered activities. With Vice President Spiro Agnew as chairman, the new so-called National Council on Indian Opportunity acted to convert the tribal councils into instruments of Nixon's economic program and promoters

of "Indian capitalism," with the resultant increase of both intertribal and intratribal factionalism. The long-standing "conflict of interest" in the Department of the Interior, with the already monopoly-serving BIA subordinated to the Bureau of Reclamation, National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management, and the two Interior Committees in Congress deferring to lobbyists of private interests seeking land, water rights and minerals on Indian territories, continued to threaten their remaining land base. When the BIA was transferred to Health, Education and Welfare, many Indians interpreted the move as a step toward reviving the old termination policy, abandoning them to the states, repudiating all obligations under treaties, and laying the groundwork for seizing the rest of their land. During 1970, more than 200,000 acres passed out of their hands. And under terms concluded as recently as 1971, the Indians of Alaska have been deprived of all but 10 million acres of the state's 375 million acres.

"Grabs for Indian resources have reached the dimensions of a massive assault by all sorts of conglomerates and huge industrial combinations," wrote Alvin M. Josephy Jr., author of *The Patriot Chiefs* and *The Indian Heritage of America*, in an article published in the *New York Times Magazine* of March 18, 1973. "Tribe after tribe has become split into factions, as the Government has encouraged and aided coal companies to strip-mine Indian lands, much of them held sacred by the traditionalist Indians (those loyal to their ancient ways and spiritual beliefs); power companies to build monster, polluting generating plants, transmission lines, railroad spurs and truck highways on the reservations; and real-estate and industrial-development syndicates to erect large projects among the Indian settlements for the use of non-Indians."

Conditions of both reservation and urban Indians continue to deteriorate. "Life expectancy of a reservation Indian is 43 years; only 33 in Alaska and Arizona," writes William Meyer, whose Anglicized Cherokee name is Burning Bear. "Infant mortality is twice that of the rest of America. We have a 50 per cent high school dropout rate. . . . Jobs simply do not exist on the reservations. Unemployment may be normally as high as 75 per cent. . . . The yearly earnings of most reservation families fall far below the national level of poverty." (*Native Americans: The New Indian Resistance*, International Publishers, New York, 1971, pp. 43-44.) The approximately 400,000 Indians living in cities (by the 1970 census estimate but about six times that number according to Indian estimates) have found, for the most part, their change of residence has been from one area of

poverty to another. In the conditions of growing automation and cybernation, of racist discrimination by both employers and trade unions, the untrained, unskilled Indian newcomers land on the bottom of the job ladder, receiving the lowest wages for the dirtiest, most onerous work, and living in the worst conditions of urban blight and official neglect.

Unpunished crimes against Indians continue along with deprivation by theft and fraud. Indians are murdered without provocation and sometimes "for fun" by law officers and white bigots. They are continuously subjected to brutal beatings and arrests on trumped-up charges or no charges at all, to indictments on framed charges by lily-white juries and maximum sentences by white judges, to prison sentences without due process of law, and to abuses and harassment by vigilantes who are encouraged and instigated by local authorities. Like Blacks and Chicanos, they form a percentage of the jail and prison population far higher than their percentage of the population as a whole, 35 to 50 per cent in South and North Dakota, Colorado, New Mexico and Arizona, 68 per cent in Idaho. Redress of grievances in the courts is seldom gained, and in any case is subject to long delays and costly litigation beyond their means.

Mounting Resistance

Confronted with these increasing threats to their lives and their lands, to their very survival, the Indian peoples have renewed and increased their resistance. Recent demonstrative actions and confrontations, of which Wounded Knee is an example, reflect this trend. Occupations of Alcatraz Island in San Francisco Bay, Ellis Island in New York Harbor, numerous offices of the BIA including the headquarters building in Washington, D.C., and abandoned U.S. military and other installations; demonstrations in Boston and Plymouth Massachusetts on anniversaries of the landing of the Pilgrims, in San Francisco during Memorial in South Dakota; fish-ins at the Mount Rushmore National Memorial in South Dakota; fish-ins on the Quillayute, Puyallup, Yakima, Green, Nisqually and Columbia Rivers and the Puget Sound waters of the Pacific Northwest; the seizure of an area of Lassen National Forest and other territory claimed by the Pit River Indians of California; appeals for intervention in their behalf to the United Nations—these and other manifestations of their resistance during the last decade have broken through the conspiracy of the government and the media to forestall the U.S. majority's awareness and support of their just demands. None of these recent actions was more important, however, in presenting

a carefully formulated and detailed program for the Indians' future than that of the convergence of Indian caravans in Washington D.C. on the eve of the November 7, 1972, national elections.

The "Trail of Broken Treaties and Pan-American Native Quest for Justice," as its organizers called it, was, in the words of one of its two co-chairmen, Robert Burnette of the Rosebud Sioux, "the first national Indian effort we have ever made." The action and the "position paper," a manifesto of 20 demands, were planned and formulated by representatives of eight national Indian organizations and endorsed by four others. The first four mile-long caravan arrived in Washington just before dawn on November 2 and was joined by other caravans before the Trail's mission ended November 8, after the country's first inhabitants had been cold-shouldered by the government, threatened with violence, and forced to prepare defenses in the BIA building against forcible eviction by massed federal police and troops.

Of the 20 demands presented to the government, 15 seek a redefinition of relations between the Indian peoples and government on federal, state and local levels, and propose the establishment of institutions in keeping with such relations according to a proposed timetable. The nub of these 15 demands is the assertion of the sovereignty of "Indian Tribes and Nations," and the insistence that "all Indian people in the United States shall be considered to be in treaty relations with the federal government governed by doctrines of such relationship." The remaining five demands call for restoration of the Indians' land base to 110 million acres, including 40 million acres in Alaska; protection of the Indians' religious freedom and cultural integrity; guarantees of the right of self-government and the establishment of means to implement that right; control by the Indian communities of governmental functions for health, housing, employment, economic development and education.

Clearly, acceptance and implementation of these demands are economically feasible for a government that squandered several hundred billion dollars in an effort to beat and bomb the Indochina peoples into submission, and to buttress fascist and colonialist regimes elsewhere in the world. Federal funding of a long-range program of public works, housing, schools and health centers for reservation and urban Indians, on a scale comparatively insignificant in relation to military spending, would meet most of the needs of the Indian peoples. The obstacle lies elsewhere—in the political sphere. On January 9, the White House rejected the 20 proposals of the Trail of Broken Treaties. On May 31, the White House rejected the Wounded

Knee demands, claiming in a letter to the traditional leaders of the Sioux that only Congress has the power to make basic changes in the government's relations with the Indian peoples.

From this it is evident that support of the non-Indian majority is essential for achieving a just and democratic solution of the problems of the Indian peoples. In the coming struggle to forge this support, Marxism-Leninism offers tested and proven guide-lines. Especially topical and relevant are the appeals of Marx and Engels to the English working class to cast off its own exploiters by joining the Irish struggle for emancipation from the same oppressors. So too were the anniversary observances last year of 50 years of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. Its successes in establishing equality both in law and in fact for the more than 100 nations and nationalities within its borders, and in developing relations of friendship and mutual cooperation among them, are a major source of its present power and prestige. These successes were fruits of the efforts of the Bolsheviks under the leadership of Lenin during their long struggle to win the Russian workers for the liberation of the nations and peoples oppressed by czarism. They are instructive especially in relation to the struggles of the peoples of the Soviet Northern and Central Asian territories, peoples whose conditions were similar to those of the Indian peoples of the U.S.A.

In its report to the 20th Convention of the Communist Party of the United States of America, the Party's Commission on Indian Liberation outlined a program of measures to be fought for that are in essential respects almost identical to those of the Twenty Demands. In addition the Commission recommended that the Party examine ways and means of including within the anti-monopoly movement "not only demands of Indian workers but the special demands of the Indian people as a people."

Now the tempo of developments in the rising Indian resistance has given high priority to the acceleration and expansion of these efforts.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

HERBERT APTHEKER

US Imperialism and Racism: A History *

Racism is a social phenomenon; hence, it has a history, that is to say a beginning, a development and, there is reason to believe, a termination.

Racism—i.e., the idea that particular people or peoples are significantly and immutably inferior to other peoples in important characteristics, especially intellectual and moral, and that these stigmata have their origins in biological roots and are therefore unfailingly transmitted from generation to generation—is, historically speaking, a modern idea. (Needless to say, perhaps, the standards by which "inferiority" and "superiority" were established were set by those who announced themselves as superior to begin with!)

Reactions of difference, of fear, of hostility in the face of strangers recur in history—as do reactions of welcome, interest and even veneration before strangers. But these, including the former, were not features of racism as above defined and as constituting the essence of what we mean by the term.

That meaning comes into the so-called Western world with the beginnings of mercantile capitalism in about the 16th and 17th centuries; it is a reflection of that system's conquest of the colored peoples of the world—especially those inhabiting Africa—and of the fact that such conquest meant extraordinary cruelty, naked robbery, systematic slaughter and—above all—enslavement via a highly organized slave trade in a new world, "discovered" and conquered and occupied as part of the appearance and development of that same capitalism.

All this—certainly the most foul sustained atrocity in history—it must be emphasized is conducted by Christian societies; something of the need for special rationalization appears when one observes that the first English slave-trading vessel was named "Jesus." The particular need for rationalization for the 18th- and 19th-century

* This paper was the keynote address at a Symposium on Racism held at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, April 1973.

U.S. is clear when one recalls not only its Christian roots but also its birth-certificate which announced that "all men are created equal" and affirmed the revolutionary concept of popular sovereignty.

Noting that the Declaration of Independence means white men when it speaks of all men being created equal, calls to mind the fact that the Declaration did not mean to include women when it said men and that it actually limited even the idea of men not only to those who were colorless but also to those who were propertied—for it must be remembered that in 1776 about one-third of the white male population in the rebelling nation were indentured servants. They, with the poor in general, were not part of the term "people" in proper 18th-century political science.

Emphasis must be given to the fact that all class societies—which means all recorded history—manifests elitism based upon wealth and sex. Thus, the idea of the inferiority of women in general and of the propertyless masses as a whole permeates all class society, long antedating capitalism. Capitalist society welcomes and in many ways intensifies both these traditional forms of elitism; in addition, capitalism creates and sustains racism—the most foul, most poisonous form of elitism. In this sense, there was a certain intellectual preparation for racism; it took over, intensified and deepened the elitism with which the ruling class had considered women in general and poor people in particular—as being in fact inferior creatures. On the latter, note in the language the double meanings of: poor-poor; rich-rich; noble-noble. Observe also the relationship between, for example, proper-property; propriety-proprietor, etc.

At the earliest period of the enslavement of African peoples, the justification was that they were animals. In the face of the fact that white men found African women sexually desirable and the further fact that copulation between white men and African women produced infants, persistence in concepts of bestiality produced certain embarrassments for the white men. Further, it was at once discovered that while cows and horses never had to be forbidden to read or to assemble together and never mutinied and rebelled, these "non-humans" from Africa did present such necessities and such proclivities. Furthermore, if they were human, they had souls—and souls not yet saved. Surely the Church had a vested interest, then, in affirming their humanity—what a treasure of millions of souls to be saved for Christ!

The latter harvest induced its own difficulties for there did exist a tradition of enslaving heathen, but for Christian to enslave Christian was something different. The delicacy was subject to flexibility,

however; it was, indeed, affirmed by law in English colonies in the 17th century that conversion did not mean emancipation. This, too, helped make useful the idea of racism—of the immutable and significant inferiority, of one of the Christians to the other—a condition which helped justify the enslavement of the inferior by the superior. Indeed, with the marvelous ingenuity characteristic of the human brain in search of rationalization, this very asserted inferiority made it a Christian *duty* on the part of the superior Christian to hold in slavery the inferior one. Here we have a root of the "white man's burden," and the paternalism so significant an ingredient in chauvinism, i.e., one must "take care of" his slaves!

(One may note an analogous development in terms of anti-Jewish paranoia. Up to the latter part of the 19th century, the rationalization for so-called anti-Semitism was religious—i.e., the Jews' rejection of Christianity. But with the appearance of monopoly capitalism in Europe, and the U.S., anti-Semitism became rationalized in terms approximating racism—i.e., the fact that Jews were not Anglo-Saxons or Aryans, whatever these terms meant.)

. . .

The relationship between the rise of capitalism and the ravishment of Africa and the enslavement of its peoples is well established: the classical description and analysis appears in the first volume of Marx's *Capital*. Because of the special relationship of the slave trade to the development of mercantile capitalism in the U.S. and the basic significance of that trade and of slavery for the developing economy in the U.S., especially but not only in the South, there is an intense organic connection between capitalism in the U.S. and the appearance and maintenance of a racist social order.

Similarly, the relationship between monopoly capitalism, imperialism and the special exploitation of the colored peoples of the world, particularly in Africa, is well established. The Berlin Conference of the 1880's, in which the major capitalist powers divided Africa among themselves, reflects this connection. Again, however, there is a special and organic connection between U.S. imperialism and the strengthening, nationalizing and further rationalizing of racism.

There is, as there should be, a library on the relationship of Middle East and Latin American oil and the development of imperialism in general, but there is not yet a book, let alone a library, on the relationship of the oil of Mississippi, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas and the rise of monopoly capitalism in the U.S. Fundamental to the process whereby the mercantile-industrial capitalism of the Lincoln

era became the monopoly-finance capitalism of the McKinley-Roosevelt era, was the conquest of the South by northern capitalism (and of the West and Southwest one must add—which brings in the genocidal war upon the Indian peoples and the expropriation of their resources, and the anti-Asian and anti-Mexican chauvinisms—also culminating in that same era and enhancing the racist pollution).

But at stake in the crushing of Reconstruction and later the crushing of Populism was the acquisition of the colossal resources of the South and then their retention, and there is more oil in the Southwest than in most other parts of the world, not to speak of the coal, iron, sulphur, lumber and cotton of the South. Hence to crush popular and democratic and therefore objectively anti-racist movements in the South meant the acquisition by this young industrial capitalism of a veritable empire within its own borders—an empire of colossal extent (Texas is the size of France and Germany, for instance) and of enormous wealth. And as for the labor force, there at hand were (then) nine million Black people and twelve million white people, most of them propertyless, with a heritage of intense racism on the basis of which those twenty millions could be divided, kept unorganized and subjected to the superexploitation characteristic of Venezuela or South Africa.

The process may be traced in terms of laws and institutions. It is in the 1880's that the process of legalizing and enforcing a racist society commences in the South. This process culminates in the constitutional disfranchisement of the Black people, in appropriate amendments beginning in Mississippi in 1895; South Carolina, 1895; Louisiana, 1898; North Carolina, 1901; Alabama, 1901; Virginia, 1902; Georgia, 1908; Oklahoma, 1910.

Observe also that the Supreme Court after undertaking in the 1880's the destruction of anti-racist legislation coming from Reconstruction, helps speed and consolidate the affirmative institutionalizing and legalizing of a racist society by the 1896 decision of *Plessy vs. Ferguson*. Note that this comes the year after Booker T. Washington in 1895 announced his program of acquiescence in the subordination of the Black millions in the South.

All this—the state laws, the Supreme Court's acts, the Tuskegee machine and the general policy of mass terror and wholesale lynchings, marking the years from 1885 to about 1910—are undertaken, too, in an effort to suppress very significant popular resistance by Black people and by white people, separately and together. One may simply mention here the great Populist movement in the South or

the general strike of Black and white workers in New Orleans in 1892, or the organized militancy which produced the challenge by the Black man, Homer A. Plessy, resulting in *Plessy vs. Ferguson*. One should note here, too, especially since the literature neglects it, that there still exist important anti-racist feeling in the nation as a whole. For example, from 1891-1895 eleven northern states passed significant civil rights laws and in 1899 Utah and Montana prohibited segregated schools, while in 1892 the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church denounced racism and called for a national campaign against it.

It is to stem all this, pervert it, thwart it, in North and South, among Black and white, that one has the development of the Tuskegee Machine, the Plessy decision, and the intensification of chauvinist propaganda.

All this is going on during the period of the burgeoning of U.S. monopoly capitalism, the appearance of U.S. imperialism. This relationship is not simply temporal; it is causal.

Much has been written about the development of monopoly capitalism in this post-Civil War generation. There is a mountain of literature on the Rockefellers, Hills, Harrimans, Carnegies, Armours, Havemeyers and Morgans who make their debuts during this era, crush competition, perfect their monopolies and start—especially with the Spanish-American War of 1898-99—their careers as international tycoons.

But just as the enslavement of millions of Afro-American workers here for hundreds of years is neglected in historical literature as a key explanation for the speed and magnitude of the development of U.S. capitalism, so the conquest of the South and the forcible repression of the Afro-American people is neglected in the literature on the rise of U.S. imperialism. The fact of the matter, however, is that when monopoly capitalism in the United States turned its attention seriously to overseas investments and to the appropriation of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Cuba and the Philippines, it simultaneously turned its attention seriously to investments in the South and to the establishment of terrorist domination of the Southern masses and especially of the Black people. Just as the former activity produced the most rabid type of jingoism, so the latter, basing itself on the racism derived from slavery, produced the most virulent form of white chauvinism. Just as the former resulted in the imposition, by law, of second-class citizenship upon the peoples of the new colonies, so the latter had the same result for the masses of the so-called New South and especially for the Black people.

Contemporaries, especially among Afro-American leaders like Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois and William Monroe Trotter, pointed out the connection between U.S. aggression overseas and the mounting terror against the Black people. Others observed this, too. Thus, Senator George F. Hoar of Massachusetts, one of the very few Republican leaders to oppose imperialism, pointed out that the ideological justification for the subjugation of the people of Cuba, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Philippines was identical with that hitherto offered by Bourbon Democrats on the so-called Negro question. Moorfield Storey, distinguished Boston attorney and later the first president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was a leader in the anti-imperialist movement. In 1905, while re-asserting his conviction "that our Philippine policy is wrong," Storey added, "I feel that it is also responsible for the reaction at home against the Negroes."

At the same period the Bourbon Senator Tillman of South Carolina remarked: "Republican leaders do not longer dare to call into question the justice or the necessity of limiting Negro suffrage in the South." And again, on the floor of the Senate: "I want to call your attention to the remarkable change that has come over the spirit of the dream of the Republicans. Your slogans of the past—brotherhood of man and fatherhood of God—have gone glimmering down the ages. The brotherhood of man exists no longer."

It is pertinent to observe that the treaty annexing the Philippines would certainly have failed of ratification by the Senate had there not existed a coalition on this question between the Republicans and the Bourbon Democrats.

By the late 1880's there was in full swing in the South what its people called "The Great Barbecue," by which they meant the conquest of their land by Northern capital. In 1880 the South produced 400,000 tons of pig iron; by 1890 this was quadrupled. In the same decade the quantity of timber taken from southern forests more than doubled and there ensued an enormous expansion in the furniture industry. From 1880 to 1900 the number of textile mills in the South increased three and a half times, the number of spindles over seven times, and by 1915 there were more cotton textile mills in the South than in the rest of the country. Bituminous coal production in the South leaped from six million tons in 1880 to 52 million tons in 1900. Other industries, like tobacco and railroads, grew correspondingly.

Consolidation came with growth, a fact which may be indicated by mentioning the appearance in the 1890's of such giant corporations as the American Tobacco Company and the Tennessee Coal, Iron and

Railroad Company. While some of the early capital for this expansion was local, as the movement continued a greater and greater proportion of the capital investments came from northern monopolies. Thus, by 1900, while half a billion dollars were invested abroad, one billion dollars had been invested in southern manufacturing. By 1900 J.P. Morgan & Co. controlled the Baltimore & Ohio, the Southern and the Central of Georgia, and by 1907 the recently formed United States Steel Corporation (also dominated by Morgan) had absorbed Carnegie Steel and the tremendous properties of the Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad trust centered in the Birmingham-Chattanooga area.

Monopoly capitalism has fastened itself nowhere and upon no people without a struggle. This is as true of the southern people in general and the Black people in particular as of any other people in the world. I have documented this resistance elsewhere in print and space does not permit expansion at this point.

To smash this resistance, to resubject the Afro-American people to special oppression and fully to conquer the South, U.S. imperialism turned to the weapons of fraud, terror and white chauvinism. When these three instruments succeeded in smashing opposition, it was that same imperialism which saw to it that the laws codifying and sustaining white chauvinism, to which references has already been made, were passed.

The brutality of this imperialism was complete everywhere. It was H.O. Havemeyer, of the Sugar Trust, who told the Federal Industrial Commission in 1899: "I do not care two cents for your ethics. I don't know enough of them to apply them. . . . As a business proposition, it is right to get all out of a business that you possibly can."

It was a leading Republican newspaper, the San Francisco *Argonaut*, which said in January 1899:

The Anglo-Saxon methods of warfare do not appeal to the Malay (i.e., the Filipino). In pursuance of our imperialistic plans, it would be well to hire some of the insurgent lieutenants to betray Aguinaldo and other chieftains into our clutches. A little bribery, a little treachery and a little ambuscading, and we could trap Aguinaldo and his chieftains. Then, instead of putting them to death in the ordinary way, it might be well to torture them. The Spaniards have left behind them some means to that end in the dungeons in Manila. The rack, the thumbscrew, the trial by fire, the trial by molten lead, boiling insurgents alive, crushing their bones in ingenious mechanisms of torture—these are some of the methods that would

impress the Malay mind. It would show them that we are in earnest. . . This may seem to some of the more sentimental of our readers like grim jesting. It is not. It is grim earnest.

In June 1894, the *Nation* reported the Right Reverend Hugh Miller Thompson, Bishop of Mississippi, as justifying lynching because "the laws are slow and the jails are full." In November 1898, Colonel A. M. Waddell said in North Carolina, according to the *Raleigh News and Observer*, that "we are resolved" to win the elections in Wilmington "if we have to choke the current of Cape Fear with carcasses. The time for smooth words has gone by, the extremist limit of forbearance has been reached." Five days later the colonel led an armed force against the Black-white administration of Wilmington, slaughtered scores, and announced himself the new mayor, and the federal government gave silent assent.

In 1900 the San Francisco *Argonaut* said: "We do not want the Filipinos. We want the Philippines. The islands are enormously rich, but, unfortunately, they are infested by Filipinos. There are many millions there, and it is to be feared their extinction will be slow." That same year Senator Tillman of South Carolina announced on the floor of the United States Senate: "We took the government away. We stuffed the ballot boxes. We shot Negroes! We are not ashamed of it."

And the respectable Republican papers of the North—the organs of monopoly capitalism, of that which had usurped the South and that for which the Tillmans worked—nodded approval. Thus, in 1898, the *Philadelphia Record* said: "We have evidently just begun the task of Americanizing the African," and the Providence, Rhode Island *Journal* editorialized that same year, that perhaps the Black person "could be made a more orderly citizen if there were restored something like the old interest taken by the masters and mistresses in the Negro boys and girls around them."

The Black "boys" and "girls" were made "orderly citizens" and "Americanized" in the inimitable manner of U.S. imperialism. That is, from 1889 through 1901 there were 1,955 recorded lynchings or an average of 165 lynchings per year for 12 years. Thus, in these dozen years of the rise of U.S. imperialism there occurred 42 per cent of all recorded lynchings from 1882 through 1947.

* * *

To back up the fraud, terror and laws went the evolving of a modern "scientific" white chauvinism. The writings of Herbert Spencer

in sociology, Madison Grant in anthropology, William A. Dunning in history, William McDougall and the whole paraphernalia and corruption of so-called intelligence tests in psychology, the distortions of Darwinism, bolstered this chauvinism.

To give an idea of what this meant I shall quote simply the work of an anatomist, R. B. Bean of Johns Hopkins University. In 1906, Bean published in the very widely circulated popular magazine, *Century*, a study of "The Negro Brain." Here were his conclusions—and they were broadcast by the general press: "The Caucasian and the Negro are fundamentally opposite extremes in evolution . . . it is useless to try to elevate the Negro by education or otherwise, except in the direction of his natural endowments. . . . Let them win their reward by diligent service." When, three years later, Franklin P. Mall, Professor of Anatomy at Johns Hopkins and founder of the *American Journal of Anatomy*, proved Bean's work to be fraudulent and his conclusions nonsensical, his—Mall's—report appeared only in the *American Journal of Anatomy*. It did not reach the audience which had been exposed to Bean's vicious lies.

Even the organized labor movement showed the effect of rising chauvinism. Thus, the AFL which had had a rather good record on Black-white unity in the late '80's and in the early '90's, began to adopt itself more and more to a Jimcrow pattern by the end of the century. By the early 1900's its craft base and general opportunism were nowhere reflected more tellingly than in its crass white supremacist practices.

This is the period of the proliferation on a mass level of such garbage as the Rev. Charles Carroll's *The Mystery Solved: The Negro a Beast* (1900) and his *The Tempter of Eve* (1902); of Thomas Dixon's *The Leopard's Spots: A Romance of the White Man's Burden* (1902) and his *The Clansman: An Historical Romance of the Ku Klux Klan* (1905)—the basis for the first mass-displayed motion picture, *Birth of a Nation* (1915).

It is the time when magazines like *Colliers*, *Saturday Evening Post*, *North American Review*, *Century*, etc., published the most blatantly racist stories and essays.

As George H. White of North Carolina—the last Southern Black member of Congress until 1972—said in his farewell address on January 29, 1901 in the House, "Possibly at no time in the history of our freedom has the effort been made to mold public opinion against us and our progress so strongly as it is now being done."

Here are a few examples of the kind of crass racism appearing in this period from most distinguished sources.

Edward A. Freeman, perhaps the most honored historian writing in English in the late 19th century, visited Herbert Baxter Adams, of Johns Hopkins University and leading founder of the American Historical Association. Recalling his impressions of the United States for an English publication—the *Fortnightly Review*, September 1882—Mr. Freeman remarked that the social problems besetting that country arose from its racially mixed population; he thought they could all be solved if only “every Irishman were to kill a Negro and be hanged for it.”

John W. Burgess, then Dean of the Faculty of Political Science at Columbia University, was writing in his two-volume opus, *Political Science and Comparative Constitutional Law* (1890-1891) that if what he called barbaric peoples resisted “the exercise of force in imposing organization . . . the civilized state may clear the territory of their presence” and in the magazine published by Columbia University, the *Political Science Quarterly*, in September 1895, this Dean urged a halt to immigration because: “We must preserve our Aryan nationality in the state, and admit to its membership only such non-Aryan race-elements as shall have become Aryanized in spirit and in genius by contact with it.”

In 1903 the *American Sociological Review* was publishing statements such as, “slavery was the most humane and the most practical method ever devised for ‘bearing the white man’s burden.’” And five years later, in 1908, the same *American Sociological Review* was publishing this: “It is only through the recognition that the average Negro is still a savage child of nature that the North and the South can be brought to unite in work to uplift the race.”

These being the published views of such people and such organs one may, perhaps, understand what Du Bois faced and one will begin to have some comprehension of what he accomplished. One can better, for example, understand the significance of a book such as his *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903); the very title of that book—affirming that Black folks have souls—will carry greater meaning to the person who understands the context and the society within which it was produced. One may also be able better to compare the scientific status of one like Du Bois and one like Columbia’s Dean and the editors of the *American Sociological Review*.

Naturally, then, the textbooks which educated the youth of the land reflected this “scholarship.” Thus, the *Morse Speller*, by S. T. Dutton, published in New York City in 1896, stated: “To the Caucasian race by reason of its physical and mental superiority, has been assigned the task of civilizing and enlightening the world;” and *A System of*

Modern Geography, by S. A. Mitchell, published in Philadelphia in 1892, affirmed that white people were “superior to all others in intellectual and moral development, and are the leaders of Christian civilization,” while the *Natural Advanced Geography*, by John Redway, published in New York in 1898 by the American Book Company, assured its readers that the African peoples were “the least civilized of all races.”*

This is the moment of the appearance of Kipling’s poem, “The White Man’s Burden” (1899) which was more widely reprinted and recited in the United States than in Great Britain; here is its key stanza:

Take up the White Man’s burden
Send forth the best ye breed—
Go, bind your sons to exile
To serve your captives’ need;
To wait, in heavy harness,
On fluttered folk and wild—
Your new-caught sullen peoples,
Half devil and half child

One sees the motif of unselfishness, as repeated by that latter-day Disraeli, Richard Nixon, affirming the unspeakable assault by U.S. imperialism upon the peoples of Indochina as a magnificent exercise in compassion and philanthropy!

In the United States, the historical evidence demonstrates that imperialism, basing itself upon the white supremacy of slavery, developed and nurtured white chauvinism as its ideological reflection and bulwark. Hence, to struggle against racism is to struggle against imperialism. If that struggle is lost, a fascist United States will appear. A fascist Germany meant disaster for humanity; a fascist United States will mean ultimate catastrophe for humanity. Nothing less than this is at stake in the effort to extirpate racism.

* These, and many other examples, will be found in the very useful work by Ruth M. Elson, *Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, 1967.

BOOK REVIEWS

TONY MONTEIRO

James Forman's Pseudo-Marxism

Frederick Engels, in his response to Eugene Duhring's "scientific" philosophy, termed Duhring's book, *Revolution In Science*, a bouquet to the glorification of Duhring by Duhring. James Forman's book, *The Making Of Black Revolutionaries*,* is similarly, a glorification of Forman by Forman. Characterized by an inordinate exaggeration of his personal contribution to the civil rights movement, it develops a political position upon which Forman hopes the Black liberation movement will orient itself. Thus, though devoting great attention to autobiographical questions, the book has a far more important political meaning. We are, then, more concerned with Forman's ideological positions than with the autobiographical labyrinth that is presented. Indeed, while supporting the most exhaustive study of the Black liberation movement, we stand opposed to this urging being transformed into misleading pseudo-scientific posturing. With Engels we stand against "Freedom of science . . . (being) taken to mean that peo-

* James Forman, *The Making of Black Revolutionaries: A Memoir*, Macmillan Company, New York, 1972, \$10.95.

ple write on every subject which they have not studied, and put this forward as the only strictly scientific method." (Frederick Engels, *Anti-Duhring*, International Publishers, New York, 1939, pp. 10-11.)

Without doubt the present moment requires a consistent scientific approach to all questions, caricatures of science are no substitute.

James Forman enters the present stage of ideological advance in the Black liberation movement decorating himself in the costumes of the "new" communism, of the socialist of the "new" type. However, the embellishment is the extent of the new, and the announcement rings hollow as the counter-communist, anti-scientific socialist essence of his views become obvious. Drawing on renegades from the Marxist-Leninist movement from Karl Kautsky to George Padmore and Mao Tse-Tung for guidance, Forman develops an eclectic hodge podge that objectively compromises the movement's anti-monopoly content. Therefore, while making overtures in the direction of Marxism, Forman's views preserve elements of both left and right revisionism. Forman states that his early ideo-

FORMAN

87

logical positions were in the main based upon philosophical anarchism, finding their concrete form in the philosophy of Camus. However, this anarchism has been influenced by petty bourgeois nationalism and various varieties of revisions of Marxism. Thus the views of Forman, though presenting the forms of radicalism, in substance are anti-revolutionary. Marx very early defined the substance of the radical of this mold when he spoke of Proudhon. He stated: "A petty bourgeois of this type glorifies *contradiction*, because contradiction is the basis of his existence. He is himself nothing but social contradiction in action." (Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, International Publishers, New York, 1963, p. 193.) Indeed, for the radical of this type the social movement becomes a platform where one's "being" is realized. Thus the book becomes a vehicle to preserve a leading ideological position for Forman in the movement.

The ideological thrust that Forman assumes is expressed mainly in relationship to the Black liberation movement. The cornerstone of his approach has two aspects: firstly, the consideration that Black people in the United States are a domestic colony, and secondly, that the only method by which to achieve liberation is through armed struggle, thereby raising the question of the mode of the transition from a tactical to a strategic question.

On the colonial theory Foreman establishes his case by stating: "We are beginning a campaign

among Afro-Americans to declare themselves Overseas Africans, a people ruptured from their culture, colonized, who only live in the United States." (Page 485.) He further states: "We also come to assert that we consider ourselves and other black people in the United States a colonized people; a colony within the United States in many ways similar to colonies outside the boundaries of the United States." (Page 489.) Firstly, though agreeing with Forman that there are definite similarities in the oppression of Blacks in the United States and the colonial and neo-colonial oppression of our African sisters and brothers, we cannot agree that the substance of Afro-American oppression is colonial. As Henry Winston quotes from the Communist International in his pamphlet *Strategy For a Black Agenda*:

It is not correct to consider the Negro of the South as a colony of the United States. Such a characterization of the Black Belt could be based in some respects only upon artificially construed analogies, and would create superfluous difficulties for the clarification of ideas. In reflecting this estimation, however, it should not be overlooked that it would be none the less false to try to make a fundamental distinction between the character of national oppression to which the colonial peoples are subjected and the yoke of other oppressed nations. Fundamentally, national oppression in both cases is of the same character, and is in the Black Belt in many respects worse than in a number of actual colonies. On one hand the Black belt is not in itself, either economically

or politically, such a united whole as to warrant its being called a special colony of the United States. But on the other hand, this zone is not, either economically or politically, such an integral part of the whole United States as any other part of the country.

The colonial theory, then, exaggerates the similarities to the extent of being blind to the important differences. It sacrifices the struggle for full political, and economic equality on the altar of national separation.

But more, the colonial theory is totally blind to the class struggle, and particularly its multi-racial, multi-national character in the United States. It sees Black people and their allies among the non-white people of the United States facing a mass of reaction including both the white working class and the monopolists. The struggle against oppression then becomes only the struggle for national liberation; the class struggle of course diminishes in the face of the so-called exhaustion of the revolutionary potential of white workers. Here then, for Forman, is the case for the elevation of the national liberation struggle to the position of vanguard of the struggle for socialism. Since, according to Forman's line of reasoning, the main contradiction on a global scale is between the victims of colonialism and neo-colonialism and imperialism, and not socialism i.e. the working class in power and imperialism, then, the main contradiction domestically must be between the colonized Black people and the imperialist oppressors

and the allied white working class.

However, history has proven, James Forman notwithstanding, that there is no solution to the national question in general, or the Black liberation question in particular which avoids the class question. In this instance, we come no closer to understanding the road to the liberation of Black people by, for whatever reasons, divorcing it from the objective class interests of all workers. It is incorrect to substitute the enormous revolutionary democratic energy of Black people for the socialist class interest of the working class. Such a posture will lead only to rhetorical short cuts to the answer and not to the answer itself. Moreover, rather than placing the questions of Black liberation and socialism in their proper relationship, by placing them lopsidedly it objectively defers the solution to both questions. Finally, it substitutes a dogmatic scheme for a dialectical attitude to the question. Indeed, the sum and substance of the views of Forman on the national question are Maoist. The petty bourgeois prejudice concerning the working class, the opting for nationalism rather than proletarian internationalism, and the retreat into dogmatism and schematization on major questions of policy are all characteristically Maoist.

To establish himself as a true "revolutionary" Forman invokes armed struggles as the only mode of struggle for the liberation of Black people. The spurious equation of the civil war path as synonymous with revolutionary

transformation is radical-sounding, but in policy tends towards the right, i.e. towards retreat and strategies that retard the people's offensive struggles. Forman states that by 1965 "the necessity of advancing from the ballot to the bullet had become clear to me. . . . I knew that the ballot would never solve the basic problems of poor people. . . ." (P. 440.)

This limitation of tactical questions to "the ballot or the bullet" is rhetorical, giving a misleading understanding of the tasks of building mass organizations both of an advanced democratic and of a revolutionary nature. It places the question as either the people immediately voting for radical change, or else going into preparation for armed struggle. What of the unions, Black liberation organizations, peace groups and so on, all of which have a democratic anti-monopoly content? The armed struggle slogan provides an escape hatch from participation in these important movements. In fact the armed struggle position denotes a significant turn away from mass action. Forman states:

When the Selma-to-Montgomery March took place, at last, some SNCC people served as marshals but we had generally washed our hands of the affair. Aside from the problems with SCLC, it had become very clear to most of us that mass marches like the March on Washington and the Selma-to-Montgomery March had a cathartic effect. Their size created the impression that "the people" had made a show of power and changes would be forthcoming, but actually they served as a safety valve for the American system by

taking the pressure off . . . (P. 441.)

Thus, the "super-revolutionary" is in essence a cover for pessimism and negativeness.

Forman, though, proclaims himself a partisan of socialism, something we must commend. He states: "We must see clearly what we are for, as well as against. Some time ago I came to the conclusion that only under socialism can the problems of Black people and of all humanity be solved." (P. 551.) While associating fully with Forman's socialist aspiration, we must divorce ourselves from Forman's conceptual understanding of socialism. Indeed, Forman's socialism, which is derivative of Padmore and Mao, is in the main counter-socialist, anti-working class and anti-communist. As Marxism-Leninism points out, and as life continues to confirm, there is no socialism and cannot be any socialism that is not based upon the dictatorship of the proletariat. Forman's conceptualization repudiates this, because it is based upon a rejection of the working class, upon a rejection of Marxism-Leninism and upon rejection of the party of Marxism-Leninism—the Communist Party.

In conclusion, at a moment when tens of thousands are searching for true revolutionary theory, for Marxism-Leninism, Forman, like Padmore, acts as an obstacle. His association with revisions of Marxism serves the interest of anti-communists, who also associate themselves with revisionism. Forman's theories must be rejected.

TRAVEL WITH
ANNIVERSARY TOURS

AND MEET THE PEOPLE FACE TO FACE

*The Travel Agency That Meets All Your Needs
We Arrange Tours and Individual Travel*

*Come With Us . . . See for Yourself. Our Tours Emphasize People.
Take One of the Following and You, Like so Many Others
Who Have Travelled With Us, Will be Deeply Impressed.*

PARTIAL LIST OF TOURS:

Friendship Tour I ★ August 8-August 26 ★ \$875
Moscow-Kiev-Leningrad-Odessa-Lvov-Moscow

Estonian Tours III ★ August 15-September 5 ★ \$890
Moscow-Leningrad-Tallinn-Moscow

Industries and Farms Tour II ★ September 5-September 26 ★ \$945
Moscow-Kiev-Kharkov-Minsk-Vilnius-Riga-Moscow

Central Asia Tour ★ September 30-October 24 ★ \$945
Moscow-Tashkent-Bukhara-Samarkand-Dushanbe-
Baku-Erevan-Tbilisi-Leningrad-Moscow



ANNIVERSARY TOURS

Room 1428, 250 W. 57th Street
New York, New York 10019
Telephone: (212) 245-7501

Room 211, 1154 North Western Avenue
Los Angeles, California 9029
Telephone: (213) 465-6141