The African Communist

NO 73 SECOND QUARTER 1978

INTERNATIONAL ANTI-APARTHEID YEAR

INKULULEKO PUBLICATIONS

Distributors of *The African Communist*

PRICE AND SUBSCRIPTION

AFRICA	*10p per copy* *40p per year post free* *Airmail £5.00 per year* **(Readers in Nigeria can subscribe by sending 1 Naira to New Horizon Publications, 14 Tamakloe St. Mushin, Lagos. Or to KPS Bookshop, PMB 1023, Afikpo.)**
BRITAIN	*25p per copy* *£1.00 per year post free*
ALL OTHER COUNTRIES	*$1.00 per copy* *$4.00 per year post free* *Airmail $10.00 per year. US currency*

INKULULEKO PUBLICATIONS, 39 Goodge Street, London W.1.

THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST

Published quarterly in the interests of African solidarity, and as a forum for Marxist-Leninist thought throughout our Continent, by the South African Communist Party

No 73 Second Quarter 1978

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL ANTI-APARTHEID YEAR

The year from March 21, 1978 (the anniversary of the Sharpeville shooting in 1960) to March 20, 1979 has been designated by the United Nations General Assembly as Anti-Apartheid Year. It is to be hoped that in every country of the world the progressive forces will be taking effective action in solidarity with the forces opposed coincidingapartheid regime in South Africa.

At a time when the South African Government is on the offensive against its opponents in all sections of the population, the necessity for international solidarity action was never more urgent. The victory of

the Nationalist Party in last November's all-white election, coinciding as it did with the monstrous verdict in the Biko inquest, meant that the majority of the electorate had given Vorster their permission to stop at nothing in defence of white supremacy. The murder and torture of political detainees, the right to ban and banish, to restrict and censor – everything was permitted the government so long as it kept white power and privilege unaltered.

The political atmosphere in South Africa has never been more grim and threatening, reflecting the growing insecurity of the regime which, despite its electoral "mandate", has never been so isolated not only from the mass of the people of South Africa but also from world public opinion. Alarmingly, there are signs also that, with the full connivance of the authorities, the equivalent of the South American "death squads" is beginning to operate in South Africa. The murder of Natal university lecturer Richard Turner is only one example of the literally hundreds of assaults which have been made in recent years on men, women and even children of all races who refuse to bow down to the apartheid tyranny. Turner was killed in front of his children. Others have been maimed or injured, their homes blasted by bombs, their families terrorised.

This private terror is the counterpart of the legislative terror which the Vorster regime continues to inflict upon the South African people. At the very opening of the first session of Parliament after the election, the Government announced, not merely that it was continuing with its past policies, but that they were to be intensified. Bills were introduced turning the African unemployed into criminals who could be sent to penal colonies or into exile in their so-called "homelands"; and providing for the withdrawal of South African citizenship from all citizens whose Bantustans had been pushed into "independence". When Nationalist Party policy has been carried through to its full consequences, thundered the new Bantu Administration Minister Dr. Connie Mulder, no Africans would have South African citizenship; all would be turned into foreigners in the land of their birth.

Nor is this racist aggression confined to South Africa itself. In Namibia the Government is pushing ahead with its plan to install a puppet Turnhalle regime, while on the territory's northern borders the South African army, and its UNITA and Chilean allies, organise acts of aggression and subversion against neighbouring Angola and

Zambia. In Zimbabwe the intransigence of the Smith regime is only possible because of the continued reinforcement it receives from beyond the Limpopo. Soon South Africa is to be equipped with atomic weapons, if it is not so already, and no one can be in doubt that these weapons are directed against the governments of independent Africa. Even the Security Council has declared unanimously that the further strengthening of the South African forces constitutes a threat to world peace.

Yet South Africa, in its turn, is only able to continue its regime of murder and piracy because of the support it receives from its Western trading partners – because of the £10,000 million foreign capital invested there, and the massive trade it conducts with its western partners. In the Security Council the guilt of the West is exposed by the vetoes of the US, Britain and France against African proposals, backed by the socialist countries, for the imposition of economic sanctions.

This is where the International Anti-Apartheid Year comes in, providing the initiative for an intensification of the campaign to sever all links with the evil and brutalising regime of apartheid. It took 14 years of continually increasing pressure before the western three in the Security Council were forced to accept world demands for the imposition of the arms embargo. As the crisis in South Africa mounts to its peak, let all progressive humanity vow that it will tolerate no comparable delay in relation to economic sanctions.

The young people of Soweto and elsewhere, the freedom fighters in the ranks of Umkhonto we Sizwe, are daily demonstrating their courage and determination, their willingness to die in the fight for freedom. It is not only in their interests but in the interests of the safety and security of all the world's peoples, that the liberation movement is calling for a meaningful response to the UN appeal for Anti-Apartheid Year. The agony of apartheid must be ended. We urge all our readers to recognise their responsibility to do something practical NOW to help bring it to an end.

BUTHELEZI'S NEW ALLIANCE

The formation in January of a new political alliance between Chief Gatsha Buthelezi's Inkatha organisation, the Coloured Labour Party led by Mr. Sonny Leon and the Indian Reform Party led by Mr. Y.S. Chinsamy has met with a mixed reception. The alliance was announced at the KwaZulu "capital" of Ulundi after a day-long closed meeting between representatives of the three organisations. Speaking at a press conference afterwards, Chief Buthelezi, who had been elected chairman of the new alliance, said its purpose was to "lay the foundation for a possible future multi-racial national convention to map out a non-racial community and a new constitution for South Africa".

Precisely how the new alliance plans to go about its business is not yet clear. So far it has not even got a name. An interim committee consisting of three members from each of the three organisations was set up, with the first meeting scheduled for March 13. At the time of going to press no further details were available.

The call for a national convention to draw up a new non-racial constitution for South Africa is not new. It was one of the main aims of the Congress Alliance during the period it was able to function legally in South Africa, and was the main theme of the 1961 Maritzburg All-in African People's Conference which heard Nelson Mandela's first public speech since the Defiance Campaign of 1952 following the expiry of his banning orders. The Maritzburg conference called for a national convention of elected representatives of all adult men and women, without regard to race, creed or colour, to be held not later than May 31 – the day on which Verwoerd's Republic was to be proclaimed – to draw up a new constitution for South Africa. If the government ignored this demand, the people would be called upon to organise mass demonstrations on the eve of the declaration of the Republic. The conference called on all Africans to refuse to co-operate with the Republic or any other form of government "which rests on force to perpetuate the tyranny of a minority", and urged Indians, Coloureds and democratic Whites to join with the Africans in opposition to "a regime which is bringing South Africa to disaster".

The call for a national convention at that time met with wide support among all sections of the population, white as well as black.

The call for a national convention at that time met with wide support among all sections of the population, white as well as black. But the government's response was intransigent. The Maritzburg conference call was ignored. Instead a 12-day no-bail General Law Amendment Act was rushed through Parliament – the predecessor of the infamous no-trial detention Acts – and the Government banned all meetings and mobilised all its forces of repression to deal with the 3-day stay-at-home which had been called from May 29 to 31 to demonstrate the people's opposition to the proclamation of an all-white republic. After the brutal crushing of that demonstration, Nelson Mandela announced on Freedom Day, June 26, that the next phase of the freedom struggle would be a full-scale campaign of non-cooperation and that he would work "underground" to lead it. Later in the year, on December 16, the military wing of the liberation movement Umkhonto we Sizwe was launched and its manifesto declared:

"This is a new, independent body formed by Africans. It includes in its ranks South Africans of all races. . . .Umkhonto we Sizwe will carry on the struggle for freedom and democracy by new methods which are necessary to complement the actions of the established national liberation organisations. . . ."

Now, just over 16 years later, the call for a national convention is once more being raised. Of course, there is point, even at this late stage, in stressing that a national convention is the only alternative to the politics of confrontation on which the government is set – providing all parties are prepared to talk. But there can be no doubt about the Government's response. Buthelezi himself stressed at his press conference that the actual convening of the convention was the Government's function, but added there was no reason why other organisations should not start with the spade work. The point of the Ulundi gathering, he said, had been to emphasise that South Africa was one country and that all South Africans, regardless of cultural affiliations, were one people in one land.

Sonny Leon was even more specific. The Labour Party had repeatedly asked the Government to set up a national convention but this had been turned down and would be turned down again, he said, because South Africa had moved into a dictatorship. The purpose of the Ulundi meeting in his eyes was to bring about a consolidation of all

South Africans, no matter what the colour of their skins, so that they could live as a free people in a free country.

At a time when Vorster is trying to abolish the citizenship of the African people by pushing the Bantustans into "independence", and to destroy the unity of the black people by his "three parliaments" plan, which he hopes will turn the Coloured and Indian people away from the Africans, a reaffirmation of black solidarity is not unimportant. In the report adopted at its meeting in April 1977, our own Central Committee called "for the maximum unity in action of the Coloured and Indian people with their African brothers" and we have always stressed that the unity of all oppressed black groups must be mobilised if the enemy is to feel the full strength of the oppressed masses. Buthelezi, Leon and Chinsamy and their organisations have all rejected the new constitutional plan and there can be no doubt that their stand is backed by the majority of their respective communities. In the face of consistent black opposition, it is possible that Vorster's new constitution will never get off the ground.

On the other hand, having made their initial declaration, where does the black alliance go from here? It can be taken for granted they will run into government hostility. When Inkatha first indicated it wanted Africans other than Zulus to join its ranks, Minister of Justice Kruger warned that if it started to embrace other ethnic groups he would not hesitate to ban it. How much more intolerant will he be if it starts to embrace Coloureds and Indians as well?

For a start there is the Prohibition of Political Interference Act, which outlaws multi-racial political parties and meetings. Chief Buthelezi said the implications of the Act had not been discussed at the Ulundi meeting because what had taken place was not a merger of political parties – simply an alliance. However, this is merely a quibble for lawyers to argue over. The Government has powers under the Terrorism and Internal Security Acts to prohibit anything it wants to, and it will not hesitate to prohibit this new alliance if it considers itself threatened.

Whether or no the Government takes action will depend on the willingness and capacity of the new alliance to mobilise the mass of the South African people in effective action against apartheid and for national liberation. And here the past record of all the members of the alliance speaks against them. All are compromised by virtue of the fact

that they are helping to operate the Government's machinery of apartheid. Buthelezi is Chief Minister of his Bantustan (though he swears he will never ask for "independence"), and Leon and Chinsamy are members of the Coloured and Indian Councils respectively. To the extent that they are obliged and prepared to play the political game according to the rules laid down by the Vorster regime, they are fighting with both hands tied behind their backs and the only weapons available to them are their tongues. Words alone will never defeat the enemy.

In the report adopted at its April 1977 meeting already referred to, our Central Committee pointed out: "During the course of the historic months of resistance, all pacifist illusions and talk of non-violent change – so assiduously fostered by imperialist interests, the liberals, the Bantustan stooges and other collaborators among our people – have been totally shattered by the reality of the regime's bloody repression. It is now clearer than ever to our people that the only answer to the brute violence of our ruling class is the organised might of the masses, directed and led by the national liberation movement, in which armed struggle must play a key role. It is, therefore, one of the supreme tasks of our revolutionary movement to ensure that the armed struggle establishes firm roots in every part of the country."

At the same time, we have never insisted that the armed road is the only road of struggle; nor that all forms of struggle against apartheid must necessarily be illegal. There is scope for mass legal activity against the regime, and all who are prepared to mobilise the masses for this purpose deserve every encouragement. The emphasis, however, is on the word "struggle". There is a point where compromise becomes indistinguishable from collaboration. If the alliance cannot free itself from this taint, its capacity to lead the people in effective action will be correspondingly diminished. Significantly the Natal Indian Congress declared its backing for the new alliance on condition that its members resign from Government-created institutions. Black consciousness leaders have taken a similar line.

THE ETHIOPIAN REVOLUTION

We last discussed the situation in Ethiopia in our issue No. 69 Second Quarter 1977. In an article entitled "Problems of the Ethiopian Revolution", W. Jones wrote: "To be sure Ethiopia is not yet a socialist society but it is in the transition stage in which it is attempting to move in the general direction of socialism. . . . The main trend of development in Ethiopia today is a progressive anti-imperialist one in which the remnants of feudalism are being smashed and capitalist development curtailed".

Jones warned: "As is to be expected there has been and will continue to be fierce resistance from the local feudal and reactionary elements and world imperialism. There is a concerted conspiracy to create a political atmosphere of tension and insecurity in which a counter-revolutionary plot may be hatched. . . . . Within the armed forces there are elements who wish to stop the revolution in its tracks". His general conclusion was that "in such a situation it is the duty of communists and other progressive and democratic forces, notwithstanding political and ideological differences, to support the mainstream of anti-imperialist and socialist struggle".

Since then the issues have been greatly clarified by the Somali invasion of the Ogaden and the upsurge in the revolt in Eritrea. It should now be obvious to all that there is a carefully co-ordinated military campaign, backed by the reactionary Arab states and by the forces of world imperialism, to dismember the Ethiopian state and strangle the Ethiopian revolution in its cradle. On the outcome of the struggle in Ethiopia may well depend, not merely the fate of the people of that country itself, but the whole direction of the anti-imperialist revolution in the rest of Africa and the Middle East. The stakes are enormous. Ethiopia is one of the biggest states in Africa, with a population of 30 million. The Dergue is struggling to drag the country out of the swamp of feudalism and poverty into the mainstream of contemporary politics. The march of 30 million people along the road to socialism is shifting the balance of power in Africa and throughout the world against the forces of imperialism and neo-colonialism.

Not surprisingly, it is from the lips of the imperialists and their agents who have been trampling on African soil and sucking the blood of the African people for centuries that we now hear the demand that

African problems should be left for the Africans to solve, and that all foreigners should withdraw. We even hear President Siad Barre crying for help from the West on the grounds that Ethiopian resistance to his invasion amounts to an act of aggression against Somalia. Barre does not appeal to Africa, because he has violated one of the first principles of the Organisation of African Unity that state boundaries should not be altered by force.

The target of the imperialists and reactionaries is the Cubans, Russians and advisers from the socialist countries who have rallied to the support of the Ethiopian government. Let it be noted once again that, just as in Angola, it is the socialist countries who have proved themselves the most reliable allies of the African people struggling to free themselves from imperialism and exercise their right to choose the socialist option. And let it be noted also that, just as in Angola, it is the imperialists, the reactionaries and the Chinese who have rallied to the support of the Somali invaders in their bid to hold back the Ethiopian revolution. The US tried to maintain an appearance of impartiality by calling for the withdrawal both of the Russians and Somalis from Ethiopian soil, as if their involvement in the affairs of Ethiopia were of the same order. (Incidentally the US only made this call when the tide began to turn against the Somalis.) But the rights and wrongs of the situation are quite plain. It is the Somalians who invaded Ethiopian territory, just as the South Africans, imperialists, mercenaries and their local agents invaded Angola in an attempt to destroy the legally established government of MPLA. And just as in Angola, the socialist countries have come to Ethiopia at the request of the legally established government to help defend their indigenous African revolution. This is an act of proletarian internationalism and fraternal solidarity for which the whole of mankind stands in debt to the socialist countries, and for which the Ethiopian government has already expressed its gratitude.

We do not know how many Russians and Cubans are in Ethiopia; we hope as many as the Ethiopian government asks for to secure the future of the socialist revolution there. And as for the call of the imperialists for the socialist forces to withdraw from Africa, let them, who were the first invaders and exploiters, first withdraw from the African continent, let them hand over their investments and other neo-colonialist booty to the African people, let them, who have

slaughtered, enslaved and exploited the African people for so long get out of Africa bag and baggage before they dare to complain about the socialist presence. As Cuban President Castro said in an address to the People's Assembly in Havana last December:

"What moral basis can the United States have to speak about Cuban troops in Africa? What moral basis can a country have whose troops are on every continent, that has, for instance, over 20 military bases in the Philippines, dozens of bases in Okinawa, in Japan, in Asia, in Turkey, in Greece, in the Federal Republic of Germany, in Europe, in Spain, in Italy and everywhere else. . . when their own troops are stationed right here on our own national territory, at the Guantanamo naval base? . . . It's a case of imperial arrogance. It's all right for the imperialists to have troops and advisers everywhere in the world, but we can't have them anywhere. That's a fine concept the US government has of logic, equity and equality.

"We're supporting African governments that have requested our co-operation; they are duly constituted governments, and revolutionary and progressive governments at that. Our military advisers are not lending their services to any fascist government anywhere in the world. Our military advisers are assisting governments that help their own peoples, support their own peoples and are either revolutionary or progressive governments. . .

"We don't deny it: we support and have sent military advisers to many countries in Africa, that's clear, that's very clear and on this we don't negotiate. (Applause.) This has nothing to do with the new U.S. administration; this is the traditional policy of our revolution. We're now helping and we'll go on helping Angola. (Applause.) We're noe helping and we'll go on helping Mozambique. (Applause.) We're now helping and we'll go on helping the Ethiopian revolution. If that's why the United States is blockading us, let them go on blockading us.

"Why doesn't the United States blockade South Africa, a racist, fascist country whose troops are committing crimes in Africa and whose minority is oppressing 20 million blacks? Why doesn't it blockade Rhodesia, where 300,000 white fascists are oppressing 6 million Africans, a country whose troops are perpetrating indescribable massacres of men, women and children in Mozambique? . . . . Why don't the Yankee imperialists blockade Pinochet? They blockade Cuba instead. What is understood by the African peoples is

that while the Yankee imperialists have sided with South Africa, Rhodesia and repressive and reactionary African governments, we've sided with the revolutionary and progressive peoples of Africa. We're fighting against fascism and racism in Africa.

"Historically it'll always be on record that while our role is a highly honourable one, the role played by imperialism is a shameful one. Since the African peoples trust us, they have requested our co-operation. And not only are we helping the governments of Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia and other governments in Africa, but we're also helping the liberation movements in Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa. (Applause.) We're helping them now and we'll go on helping them. (Applause.) And no matter what they do, the imperialists have already lost the battle in Southern Africa."

PURVEYORS OF LIES

The collapse of colonialism, which has become inevitable as a result of the upsurge of the forces of world socialism, the international working class movement and the persistent struggle waged by the forces of national liberation, has resulted in the intensification of the ideological struggle between the forces of socialism and those of capitalism. For this purpose the modern propaganda machine of imperialism, which commands powerful facilities, using the latest achievements of science and technology, is working at top speed. It reports battered ideological stereotypes over and over again. including the myth of "freedom" of the capitalist press. The methods used by the mass media, owned by a handful of monopolies, serves only one purpose, which is to strengthen class rule in a society based on exploitation.

In the United States the CIA is the greatest abuser of the media. It virtually controls all "black" and "grey" propaganda. "Black" propaganda, according to Victor Marchetti, a former CIA official, is identical with disinformation and dissemination of frank lies. "Grey" propaganda he describes as a mixture of half-truths and slight distortions to slant the views of the audience.

These "black" and "grey" propaganda experts are especially active in the third world using various methods of psychological warfare and

ideological subversion. A few months ago, Carl Bernstein, one of the two *Washington Post* reporters who uncovered the Watergate scandal, said that 400 journalists had carried out CIA assignments. According to the same sources, the CIA relied most extensively on the *New York Times*, CBS News, *Time* magazine and *Newsweek*. Recently Mr. William Colby, the director of the CIA until 1976, told Congress that the US should not be "so foolish as to forbid any relationship between American services and *foreign journalists*."

In the other capitalist countries the situation is no different. Britain, for example, set up a world-wide British propaganda network, principally to operate against "communism" and mostly in the Third World. This so-called "Information Research Department"(IRD) was set up by the Labour government after the war. The IRD supplied selected journalists with "information" and among them were some of the "best known" writers on foreign affairs. Britain paralleled many of the covert international propaganda activities of the CIA which have been extensively documented and exposed in recent times. These CIA activities included the funding of student bodies and other organisations in the Third World countries.

The London *Guardian* in a recent article described a typical IRD operation: "to study Eastern block press reports of drunkenness and produce an article rubbing in just how rife alcoholism was under communism. Senior officials concede that past material was heavily slanted." This is a typical example of British "grey" propaganda.

Besides supplying the local journalists with such material, IRD material was chiefly distributed world-wide through British embassies. Some of the journalists involved included old cold war warriors like Hella Pick and the "Soviet expert" Victor Zorza. Others were journalists connected with the *Financial Times, Observer, Telegraph, Economist* etc., and also trade union officials. The BBC External Service, sometimes naively regarded by some as "very objective", used "grey" and "black" propaganda extensively.

The IRD like the CIA published books written by well known anti-communists using a lot of IRD material. They also published a whole series of booklets on African, Asian and "Russian" affairs, as well as cyclostyled background briefings at regular intervals – of course all "slanted" and "heavily slanted".

Although the IRD is no longer "secure in its covert tasks",

government propaganda has not stopped. A new Overseas Information Department has been set up inside the British Foreign Office – with a very much wider brief.

The authors of articles on co-operation and interaction between the bourgeois mass media and the American CIA, British SIS and IRD and others like the West German BND do not deny that this "need" arises primarily from the overall strategy used by imperialism against the socialist countries, communist and workers' parties, trade unions, international democratic organisations and all progressive forces.

We in South Africa and Africa as a whole should draw important lessons from these exposes. We should ask who is funding individuals and organisations obviously working in the interests of the imperialists? Which of the dozens of periodicals etc. are financed by Western intelligence services? What is the role of the newspapers and magazines owned by monopolies from capitalist countries? Whom are the imperialists promoting in Southern Africa? What are the imperialists' tactics and strategy in and against progressive states such as Angola and Mozambique?

We should also be aware that this strategy of lies was conceived in an attempt to counter the rise of the world's first socialist state. It was intended to neutralise the revolutionary impact which the ideas of socialism, embodied in the new society under construction in the Soviet Union, had on the people of all countries, and to prevent the truth about the socialist world from gaining ground on all continents. Since the end of World War II the increased might and influence of the world socialist system, the weakening of imperialist positions and the general crisis of capitalism have forced bourgeois governments and mass media to co-ordinate their activities ever more carefully and conduct joint campaigns prompted by anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

The past sixty years have shown that no amount of propaganda campaigning can stop the victorious advance of Marxist – Leninist ideas, conceal the truth about socialism and reduce the impact of its inspiring example on the whole of mankind. Nevertheless we must be vigilant to spot and expose the imperialist lie before it can spread and do damage to our cause.

What has been exposed about imperialist propaganda tactics should make us query the Western concepts of freedom, democracy,

humanism etc. The questions must be asked: freedom for whom, to do what, in whose class interests? We should know who has been exploiting us, who are our friends and who our enemies.

HONORARY DOCTOR

The University of Amsterdam awarded Comrade Govan Mbeki an honorary doctorate in the Social Sciences last January. The award was in recognition of his work *The Peasants' Revolt*.

It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that the considerations which led to the making of the award took into account only the merit of *The Peasants' Revolt* It is impossible not to be influenced by the man, by what went to make him what he is, and by the place and times in which he lived.

Govan Archibald Mvunyelwa Mbeki was born on the 8th July, 1910, at Mpukane Location in the Transkei. He was the youngest of 8 children, having 6 sisters and 1 brother. He received his early education in a mission school conducted in an open church hall where 8 classes would do their learning in sight and sound of each other. Despite these difficult conditions, he went on to Fort Hare where he obtained his degree and trained as a teacher.

As a writer, he made his mark as a reporter and contributor to the *Guardian* and *Inkululeko* in the 1940's, especially on the question of the pass laws and the Bantustans which in those days were referred to as "Native Reserves". He continued his writings in the 1950's for *New Age* and *Liberation*, the most notable of his contributions being on the Ciskei famine in 1956 and the Bantu Finance Corporation in 1958.

Transkei in the Making appeared in 1939 as a series of articles in *New Outlook*. Later he was to become Secretary of the Voters' Association in the Transkei and then General Secretary of a united front known as the Transkei Organised Bodies. It was during this time that he was elected to the Bunga – the Transkei General Council. He was the first elected representative of the ex-students of Fort Hare on the university Governing Council.

Let's Do It Together, published in 1944, is a reasoned and eloquent appeal, primarily to the peasants and small farmers of the Transkei, a follow-up to *Transkei in the Making*, proposing the establishment of farming co-operatives. In very simple language, he says:

> "This means that by getting help, you do good to yourself; and by giving help you do good to others, you work for the 'common good'. And you cannot get the help you need without giving help to others at some time. While you are helping your neighbour to do his work, your heart is filled with happiness because you know that later he will help everyone else in their work; and the good of one person becomes the good of all."

His writings mirrored his activities and thoughts as a member of the African National Congress, tirelessly working to organise his people, to educate and to guide them along the path of deep-going social change. His own political development started early. While still in his teens, his interest was kindled by the I.C.U. The shooting at Cartwright's Flats in Durban and the killing of Johannes Nkosi in 1930 moved him deeply and set him on the freedom road from which he was never to turn back. He joined the A.N.C. in 1935. His qualities were soon recognised and he was elected to serve on the National Executive Committee as one of its first rank of leaders.

Later he became a member of the Communist Party of South Africa, and after it was banned in 1950 joined the underground South African Communist Party, serving as a member of its Central Committee.

After the banning of the African National Congress in 1960, when the military wing – the Umkhonto we Sizwe – was formed under the leadership of Nelson Mandela to conduct the armed struggle, Govan Mbeki was one of its leaders. He escaped the police net at Rivonia, but was arrested soon afterwards and is now serving a life sentence on Robben Island.

The Peasants' Revolt gives us but a brief glimpse of the man and the liberation movement of which he is an integral part. In honouring the man, the University of Amsterdam has above all honoured the liberation movement headed by the African National Congress. And in doing so it has recognised in this same liberation movement, the progenitor of the real South Africa that, save for those who wilfully refuse to see, is visibly emerging from the chains of centuries of bondage.

LESSONS OF THE MOZAMBICAN REVOLUTION

by Joe Slovo

"Victory", said President Machel in a Message to the Armed Forces (Sept. 25 1974), "does not consist of hoisting a new flag or adopting a new anthem however beautiful they may be. Our victory will be meaningful only with the triumph of the interests of the working masses through the implementation of FRELIMO'S programme."

This commitment to real revolution is, in the case of FRELIMO, not just the rhetoric which we have heard in other places in the euphoric atmosphere of independence celebration. It is a commitment forged by the revolutionary processes of the past 16 years, nurtured by the leadership of FRELIMO, and matured out of the real practice of struggle. Its roots are today deeply embedded in Mozambican soil. There were, of course, specific factors which influenced the form and pace of FRELIMO's march to victory. But many lessons, of more general relevance, can be learnt from a study of the Mozambican revolutionary experience. In particular, it is instructive to reflect on the way in which

FRELIMO's ideology was forged within the framework of revolutionary science, how it confronted the reality of Mozambican conditions, how it recognised and met the contradictions within its ranks to emerge as an unchallengeable united force, and how it mobilised the national and regional energies of its diverse peoples to transcend the confines of tribalism, racialism and narrow nationalism. In the more recent period FRELIMO's new perspectives shed light on the complex problems facing those in Africa who aim to build foundations for the construction of socialism in a post-colonial situation which has left our continent with a legacy of underdevelopment at every level of its socio-economic structure.

FRELIMO'S 3 CONGRESSES

In the 16 years of its existence, FRELIMO has held 3 Congresses each representing a specific stage in the Mozambican revolution. In June 1962, FRELIMO was founded and, in September of the same year, held its first Congress. In the following two years conditions were prepared for the armed struggle which was launched on the 25th of September 1964. At its second Congress in July 1968, far-reaching guidelines were endorsed for the success of the armed struggle and for its transformation into a revolutionary People's War. New decisions were taken to clarify the aims of the National Democratic Revolution against the background of emerging contradictions within the popular anti-colonialist movement between those who defended the interests of the broad labouring masses and those who wanted to expel Portuguese colonialism so that they could themselves gain the fruits of the exploitation of the Mozambican people.

With the conquest of political independence, the essential objectives of the Democratic National Revolution had been attained and the conditions had been created to advance to the next stage – the stage of People's Democratic Revolution. At the 1977 third Congress historic decisions were taken to transform FRELIMO into a vanguard party basing itself primarily on the working class in alliance with the peasantry, supported by progressive elements of other labouring classes and groups. The Party, guided by the scientific ideology of the Proletariat – Marxism-Leninism – has, as its prime objective, the building of a Mozambique which is free of all forms of exploitation of man by man. In the words of the new programme:

"The path leading to such an objective includes various stages. The stage that in essence was successfully concluded after the conquest of National Independence, is the stage of the National Democratic Revolution. *Only after the construction of People's Democracy will it be possible for the Mozambican labouring classes led by their vanguard Party, to pass to the following stage, that of the Socialist Revolution.*" (My emphasis)

The Party declares itself to be the leading force of the State and Mozambican society. The basis of its ideological and theoretical activities are the experiences of the Mozambican people and Marxism-Leninism. Its internal structures are guided by the principles of democratic centralism. Individual and collective discipline are central. Emphasis is laid on adherence to proletarian internationalism which is proclaimed an immutable principle and a constant of the struggle waged by the Party. In terms of the Statutes, membership of FRELIMO is restricted to those who live exclusively from the fruits of their work.

The new tasks which the Mozambican revolution has set itself can only be fully understood against the background of its past struggles and achievements. To grow from one stage to another higher one, is possible only if the right seeds were planted in the earlier seasons of struggle. Especially when the main immediate task is popular and national in character and serves the general interests of a wide range of class and social forces, a revolutionary movement must be on its guard against groups of aspirant exploiters who will try to stop the revolution at the point when they can become the main beneficiaries of the people's sacrifices. The primary question facing all contemporary liberation movements, especially at the stage of the anti-colonial struggle, is how to resolve these inevitable contradictions without unduly narrowing the base which needs to be mobilised in support of immediate aims. It is FRELIMO's special merit that it skilfully maintained a correct balance in this respect and was thus able to lay the basis for the inspiring perspectives adopted by its third Congress.

FRELIMO IS FORMED – THE FIGHT FOR UNITY

The task which faced the few revolutionaries who had banded together in 1962 to create a front for the liberation of Mozambique was indeed a formidable one. The new organisation had to be constructed from disparate groups operating mainly in exile, many of whose members were still influenced by tribalism and regionalism, without any common

strategic approach other than a broad opposition to Portguese colonialism. Vital questions relating to the aims of the struggle or the true identity of the enemy had either not been defined in the old organisations or were answered in different ways. It is understandable, therefore, that in this early phase the unity which was established was both reluctant and fragile. FRELIMO records that this beginning of the new organisation was "marred by mutual recriminations, expulsion, withdrawal, as between exile politicians who refused to give up the dead futile infighting of an irrelevant brand of nationalist politics" (Editorial *Mozambique Revolution* April-June 1972).

A group of younger militants within the new organisation immediately set about the task of attempting to build a movement which was united in substance and not merely in form. Above all they began to elaborate an ideology and a programme of struggle without which unity is merely a cliche and has no real or effective meaning. Amongst these were outstanding militants who had already made Marxism-Leninism their ideological lodestar and who skilfully applied its principles to reflect the reality of the different stages of the Mozambican revolution.

In Spetember 1962, within three months of FRELIMO's birth, a programme was elaborated, defining the struggle against imperialism, and underlining the broad strategy of people's struggle and national reconstruction. This programme served as a foundation stone for later ideological development. In the course of the following years FRELIMO moved inexorably from a concept of liberation struggle to a concept of bringing about a democratic revolution in Mozambique. Those who were unable to adjust to the needs of the developing revolution were rejected by it.

The decisive role in bringing the existing organisations together in 1962 was played by militants who had come from inside the country where they had been working in underground conditions. It was this same group which helped shape the developing revolutionary political line. Because their experiences were restricted to clandestine activities, they perhaps lacked the tradition of all-round organisation. But the amalgam of this group with those militants in the exile organisation who showed a capacity to last the revolutionary course, helped structure the political party at the time of FRELIMO's creation. At this stage, and until his assassination in 1969, the founding president of FRELIMO, Eduardo Mondlane, played a role which was of inestimable

importance. This initial act of unity of June 15th 1962, was only the beginning of a difficult and complex process. Local conditions determined the precise way in which FRELIMO resolved the contradiction between the need for the broadest possible alliance and the temptation of bringing this about at the expense of fundamental ideological principle. But the general lessons of the FRELIMO approach in this field have relevance beyond the purely local Mozambique experience. In the words of President Machel:

> ". . . . actual practice has shown that unity based on the negation of the enemy and on just the demand for independence was not enough. It was essential that unity be achieved on the basis of a clear and unequivocal definition of the principles of what we want to do, how we want to do it, and what kind of society we want to build, and above all, the principles asserted must be lived by and developed through consistent practice."

Attempts in Africa and elsewhere to build a unity based on purely formal expressions of togetherness or to impose a unity from outside without regard to the principles enunciated by Comrade Machel, have always had the effect of sabotaging and weakening the struggle against the main enemy.

THE ARMED STRUGGLE IS LAUNCHED

The dream which the founders of FRELIMO had in 1962 of a free Mozambique took 12 years to be translated into reality. But at that time "when FRELIMO was formed, the objective of uniting all Mozambicans and overthrowing the colonial fascist system seemed to many illusiory or utopian." (Machel Message on the 10th anniversary of the start of the armed struggle: July – September 1974).

Although some preparations were made soon after the formation of FRELIMO (including the training of armed militants) it was only at the July 1964 meeting of FRELIMO's Central Committee that a decision was taken to embark on a protracted armed struggle for the total liberation of Mozambique. In the two preceding years, FRELIMO, in a bid to achieve its aims by peaceful means if possible, made genuine attempts to negotiate with the Portuguese Government and to mount pressure through the United Nations. The decision to break with this policy was not taken lightly. In 1970 FRELIMO's official organ (July – September 1970 no.44) discussed the problems that were taken into account before the grave and serious decision was taken to have re-

course to armed struggle as the only way forward.

Firstly, a decision had to be taken on whether the armed struggle was really the only way left open for the achievement of independence. We must remember that FRELIMO had before it at that point examples of several African colonies achieving independence through political and legal struggle which did not include the use of organised violence. *Secondly*, if the armed path was the only legitimate path open to the liberation movement in Mozambique, was it practical and was FRELIMO capable of embarking upon it? At that point FRELIMO had only about 200 trained comrades and a minimum of weaponry:

> **"Only a visionary could pretend that this force would have been able** to defeat the powerful Portuguese army, which had stationed in Mozambique at that time 30,000 troops equipped with the most modern war material. On our side, there was also the problem of supplies, for those 200 fighters had a limited quantity of ammunition and it was not clear how it could be replenished in order to continue the war."

Thirdly, FRELIMO had to take into account the psychological element which it regarded as no less important. It was aware that centuries of oppression and colonialist propaganda had conditioned the Mozambican people into harbouring a kind of religious fear of the Portuguese. And the 'Mzungo' was almost a god – untouchable, invulnerable. Thus without breaking down this feeling of impotence and inferiority the armed struggle was doomed to flounder.

Fourthly, the Mozambicans were still far from regarding themselves as one people and the level of national consciousness was extremely low. The enemy, as in all such situations, had encouraged ethnic divisions which had roots deep in the past and it stimulated and accentuated tribal consciousness.

> **"Like all imperialists, the Portuguese had followed the policy of 'divide and rule'. The result was that individuals from different parts of Mozambique, speaking different languages, were suspicious of each other and sometimes quite hostile."**

But perhaps those who paint a gruesome picture of bloodthirsty motivation behind modern people's armed struggle should be reminded that the factor which was uppermost in the minds of the leaders of FRELIMO in weighing the path of struggle to be followed, was the awareness of the suffering war would bring to the Mozambican people.

"Would armed struggle be worth the cost? Would it not be better to continue with the known evils of exploitation and oppression so as to avoid the horrors and uncertainties of war?"

The 1964 meeting answered all these questions in turn. Portuguese colonialism had made it abundantly clear that its colonies were constitutionally part of the metropolis and that the fascist regime would never allow the alienation of any part of the Portuguese territory. Its answer to FRELIMO was increased repression and it closed all possible avenues to radical change by methods which did not include organised violence. Thus whatever may have happened in other parts of Africa, in the case of Mozambique and the other Portuguese colonies there could be no question of any negotiated settlement with Salazar and Caetano-type regimes. In this connection it should also be remembered that the Portuguese economy itself was too weak and dependent upon its imperialist partners to favour the type of constitutional solution which had occurred in some parts of Africa where the imperialist masters voluntarily relaxed their direct political control in the expectation that their neo-colonial grip would be maintained through indigenous groups.

What then of the disparity of strength between Portuguese Colonialism and the people? FRELIMO was convinced that the initial numerical disproportion of forces in favour of the colonialists would in time be reversed with the integration of larger and larger numbers of the population into the struggle. By its very nature people's armed struggle always begins in a situation in which the enemy has overwhelming superiority in almost every department of military importance except the one which will eventually lead to its destruction, and that is its base amongst the masses. But of course as we well know the logistical problems cannot be ignored and FRELIMO was confident that the international context of their struggle would facilitate a solution.

"Independent African countries had promised their support to the liberation struggle in no uncertain terms at the recently created Organisation of African Unity. The socialist block was strong, and by the very nature of the policy of the socialist countries their support for our struggle was assured".

FRELIMO was also convinced that once the armed struggle started the psychological factor would begin to operate in favour of the liberation movement and the myth of Portuguese invincibility would be exposed.

> "It was necessary that our people should see the colonialists falling under the fire of our weapons, for then all the mental inhibitions created by previous oppression would begin to dissolve."

Despite its awarenness that a war would inevitably cause hardship and suffering the FRELIMO Central Committee was convinced that the people were ready to endure the cost of eradicating colonialism.

Once the decision had been taken the whole FRELIMO organisation was mobilised to prepare for armed struggle. The Department of Internal Organisation dedicated itself to mobilising the people internally and the Department of Defence began creating the necessary logistical and practical preconditions. On the 25th September 1964 the armed struggle was launched in Chai in Cabo Delgado province. It was quickly followed by operations in the other provinces of Zambezia and Niassa and Tete.

> "Acting with flexibility, undertaking operations against targets far apart from each other, the first guerrilla units succeeded in frustrating the enemy's plans for repression which had been laid out long be before. It was these militants, badly-equipped, with a high sense of determination and patriotism, who created the conditions for the consolidation of the armed struggle . . . They (the Portuguese) were forced to concentrate their troops in a limited number of places in order to diminish their vulnerability; they abandoned the small isolated administrative posts; they reduced the circulation of vehicles on the mined roads where our fighters were active. In this way they lost control over increasingly large regions and consequently our fighters could circulate freely, openly contact the population and develop the organisation necessary to successful armed struggle." *(Mozambique Revolution* April–June 72, p. 14).

The dramatic measure of FRELIMO'S achievements in the following years was the fact that by 1968 it was able to hold its second congress inside the liberated territory of Mozambique. The enemy was powerless to prevent the congress or interfere with its proceedings despite the fact that two months before it was held, FRELIMO had announced it would take place.

In those four years of dedicated struggle FRELIMO's guerrilla army increased from a few hundred to more than 10,000 fighters. The very success and development of the struggle had created conditions for the improvement in the supply of weaponry both through capture from the enemy and through the receipt of further and more sophisticated supplies from anti-imperialist states. The action of the guerrilla had once

and for all destroyed the myth in the minds of the Mozambican people that Portuguese colonialism was invincible. With each passing year it was the Portuguese soldiers who became increasingly fearful and demoralised, whilst the revolutionary action of FRELIMO was having the effect of welding the Mozambican people into a single unity in which tribal, ethnic and regional differences were being effectively undermined.

There is a dialectical logic in this. The enemy starts off all powerful because the people are powerless and are reluctant to risk their all until action convinces them that they must in the end triumph. Again, ethnic division is an obstacle to the successful launching of revolutionary struggle. Without roots amongst the people and mass contact with them, successful armed struggle is impossible. Yet without successful armed struggle the prospect of developing mass organisation and contact amongst the people is limited. To fight a people's war we need weapons, part of which we get from the enemy. But to get these weapons from the enemy we need weapons. To end the misery of domination and exploitation we fight a protracted war but inherent in the war is enormous sacrifice and suffering by the people.

The precise way in which FRELIMO resolved these contradictions was partly determined by the specifics of its own history and situation. But, broadly speaking, most of these problems are common to every revolutionary movement which, like ours, is forced by history to struggle for social change by a strategy which includes armed violence. The way in which FRELIMO successfully resolved these contradictions is not only an inspiration to those facing the same kind of odds which FRELIMO faced in 1962 but helps reinforce the guidelines of revolutionary struggle everywhere.

THE POLITICAL LINE

FRELIMO's 16-year history is not just the history of the armed battles it fought against the enemy nor of the way it perfected the organisational and technical apparatus to meet the demands of people's war. It is also the history of the forging of a political line. Revolutionary collectivism, revolutionary politics and revolutionary ideology were becoming more and more the touchstone of every department.

FRELIMO's official organ and the statements and resolutions of its congresses and various sessions of its Central Committee over the last decade show unmistakably the consistent maturing of its ideology. They show too how ideology was moulded in action and for action.

But here, as on the battlefield, the path was not always easy and many who were unable to progress with FRELIMO fell by the wayside. On FRELIMO's 10th anniversary its Central Committee declared:

> **"Today the Mozambican people have an active fighting organisation which has consolidated itself in the course of a rich and deeply lived political experience. Many stumbling blocks made our path difficult** and many vital choices had to be made; but it was in the course of **making such choices that we have found our strength and affirmed our purpose."**

In the initial period the majority of the founding members of FRELIMO were psychologically unprepared for the armed struggle and most of them eventually deserted the organisation. *(Mozambique Revolution* April–June 1970, p. 8). Again, even amongst those who had no doubts about the necessity for taking up arms to destroy Portuguese colonialism, deep-seated differences emerged on the relationship of armed struggle to the overall revolutionary processes in Mozambique. Some members of FRELIMO saw the armed struggle as automatically capable of setting up a chain-reaction. They believed that the people would support it whether it was well organised or not. They were also convinced that the struggle would be a short one and the enemy could be defeated quickly and easily. This showed that they considered armed struggle to be:

> **". . . merely a technical and mechanical expedient. Such leaders, in effect, refused to consider armed struggle as a process of people's participation and as the fundamentally political undertaking which it is."** *(Mozambique Revolution* April–June 72, p. 14).

An important corollary of this wrong position was that

> **"The army is merely an executive body assigned the task of liquidating as many enemy soldiers as possible but not concerning itself with politics."**

One of the core problems in elaborating a strategy of struggle in any situation is a careful and correct definition of the enemy. Especially in a colonial type situation in which the oppressor comes mainly from the European white ethnic group, the people understandably tend to ident-

ify the oppressor and colonialism with every white man. In the case of Mozambique, FRELIMO was strongly opposed to such a generalisation. Over and over again it stressed that:

> **"FRELIMO's popular and revolutionary line . . . defines the enemy not on the basis of race or national origin but rather on behaviour. From the very outset, FRELIMO has maintained that our enemies are not persons of white colour, or of Portuguese origin, or any other nationality, but all those persons, white or black, Mozambican nationals or foreigners, who are opposed to our ideals of freedom and total independence . . . . FRELIMO's political line which advocates the total abolition of racism and tribalism, has been fully adopted and implemented in its entirety by the FRELIMO fighters."** *(Mozambique Revolution* Oct.–Dec. 72).

This approach was one of the foundation stones of FRELIMO's rejection of racialism and backward nationalism and enabled it to implant into the consciousness of FRELIMO cadres and the Mozambican people the vigorous and liberating ideas of revolutionary nationalism. The understandable feeling of bitterness against the white Portuguese as a group had to be "transformed into political awareness of the need to fight oppression, to direct our weapons against the system of oppression, not against mere skin colour." *(Mozambique Revolution* April–June 72, p. 13). Such an approach certainly did not weaken or blunt national consciousness. It helped stimulate a national awareness which served the interests of the nation as a whole and isolated those both inside and outside FRELIMO who demagogically attempted to abuse national sentiment for career and sectional purposes. Reporting on FRELIMO's Central Committee meeting of May, 1970, *(Mozambique Revolution* April–June 1970) said:

> **"The enemy has two faces: the principal and direct enemy is Portuguese colonialism and imperialism, which are open enemies whom we confront daily in the battlefield, and in relation to whom no doubt, no confusion is possible. The other face is that of the indirect secondary enemy, who presents himself under the cover of a nationalist and even as a revolutionary, thus making it difficult to identify him. The Central Committee reaffirmed that the characterisation of the enemy for us will never be derived from colour, nationality, race or religion. On the other hand our enemy is that one who exploits or creates conditions for the exploitation of our people, whatever his colour, race, nationality or religion."**

And the enemy from within showed itself at different times and in different guises as FRELIMO's revolutionary commitment grew and as it was scoring more and more successes in its efforts to transform the liberation struggle into a democratic revolution. Attempts were made to destroy FRELIMO from within by a variety of methods including the assassination of FRELIMO's outstanding first president, Eduardo Mondlane, in February 1969.

The winning of liberated zones created conditions of a new type. FRELIMO had to organise the life of the population in these zones and this immediately posed choices concerning the goals of the struggle and the type of economic, political and social system to be established in the country. Freedom was no longer a blue-print for the future to which glib lip-service could be paid by all who claimed to be opponents of Portuguese colonialism; it posed concrete choices. The ideological contradictions which simmer underneath in every organisation in this type of situation, came to the surface and choices could no longer be hidden.

> **"How to structure the economy in the liberated zones? How to organise the school services, the hospitals? Should we cope with colonialist-capitalist model which had just been removed, or should we adopt a system based on the needs and will of the people? . . . Those who had come to the revolution to become wealthy, motivated by their personal interest, wanted the system to remain the same — which would just expel the colonialists, re-establish the structures** created by the Portuguese, and take their place in positions of **control. The revolutionary comrades took a diametrically opposed position. They knew that if this happened there was no justification for the struggle. Why fight if everything will continue as before? They wanted a completely different system where all the vestiges of** colonialist and capitalist influence would be eliminated. They **wanted a system that would really serve the interests of the people and which could never resemble, not even vaguely, the system of the exploiters and oppressors."**

By December 1972 the FRELIMO Central Committee reaffirmed that FRELIMO was a front which ensured the participation of all genuinely anti-colonialist forces. At the same time it made it crystal clear that this front has "as its point of departure the negation of the exploitation of man by man." *(Mozambique Revolution* Oct.–Dec. 72, p. 2). FRELIMO totally rejected those within its ranks who saw the

taking of power as a means to continue to oppress and exploit the people, with the meaningless difference that all the negative functions of the colonial system would now be performed by black Mozambicans. Another tendency which FRELIMO fought uncompromisingly was the idea of establishing an elitist intellectual core who would be exempt from participating in the struggle and who would be "saved" until such time as they would be installed as leaders of a free Mozambique. These various anti-revolutionary and anti-popular tendencies were represented by people like Lazaro Kavandame, Mateus Gwenjere, Uriah Simango and a few other representative of internal reaction. They were an impure load such as every revolution carries, but which the Mozambique revolution discarded through the unbending vigilance of revolutionaries within FRELIMO against every form of reaction, and through their uncompromising fight for the victory of the revolutionary political line at every stage of the struggle. In the words of President Machel on the day independence was declared:

> **"This. . . struggle required a constant fight to clarify and develop FRELIMO's political line, especially as regards the definition of who is the enemy and the nature, methods and objectives of the fight. The successive dividing lines that were drawn within FRELIMO and the process of cleansing our contradictions which arose reflected antagonistic interests, the contradiction between the working masses and a handful of new exploiters who wanted to take the place of the colonial bourgoisie as an exploiting class.**
>
> **"This victory (the decisions of the historic Central Committee meetings held in April 1969 and May 1970) which led to the cleansing of our ranks and the deepening of FRELIMO's ideology, created the conditions for transforming the armed struggle into a people's war, for going over from a liberation struggle to the higher phase of a people's democratic revolution."**

It is not really possible in a short treatment to do justice to the whole panorama of FRELIMO's growth in revolutionary practice and ideology in the decade which marked its victorious progress towards a free Mozambique. It is always tempting to attribute the speed and depth of its achievements to certain objective factors such as the undoubted advantage of a well situated friendly border from the inception of its struggle. No doubt these and other factors played some part in determining the rate of FRELIMO's progress, but without the subjective achievements the revolution could not have been

won. In this connection it is worth recapitulating some of the recommendations President Machel made in 1972 to FRELIMO's Centre for Military and Political Training (CPPM). They provide an inspiring clue to the political line whose universally valid ingredients became the vital instrument for Mozambique liberation. In brief summary they include the following:

> The work of the CPPM is not to produce 'killers' but to train revolutionary fighters. What characterises the FRELIMO fighter is his political consciousness. We must learn to fight against the enemy lurking in our minds i.e. the capitalist ideology imposed by colonialism and the feudal ideology inherited from tradition. We must not treat men as automatons who must receive or carry out orders whether or not they understand them or have assimilated them. Leaders must fight against the harmful tendencies of solving problems through administrative decisions. The first battle is to instil national consciousness, stress the importance of unity and of wiping out tribalism. Class consciousness must be made more acute and deeply felt together with the need for close unity between the workers and peasants to win power. We must wipe out the spirit of individualism and foster the collective spirit. The militant must be instilled with a spirit of responsibility. He must feel that he is FRELIMO, that FRELIMO's fate depends on his behaviour. The fighter must distinguish friend from foe even if the latter is concealed under the same colour, language, family ties or tribal markings as their own, even if he raises his flag with us. This is essential if the barrel of our gun is always to be trained on the correct target.
>
> The emancipation of women is one of FRELIMO's central tasks There is a need to fight reactionary prejudices among both men and women about women's abilities and their role in the revolution, in society and in the home. The struggle of the peoples and workers of the world against exploitation of man and to build a new society is a decisive factor in creating favourable conditions for the victory of our struggle in the present era. The internationalist spirit is an essential characteristic of revolutionary forces. Study combined with practice is a fundamental weapon. In the final analysis the principal contradiction lies in whether it is to be a handful of exploiters, old or new, or the masses who are to control the means of life. Because the leaders personify FRELIMO's political line their behaviour, unity or disunity, their discipline or indiscipline, their hardworkingness or laziness, their collective spirit or selfishness, their revolutionary dedication or corruption; —whichever of these habits predominate will be interpreted as the reality of FRELIMO's line. Leadership is collective and responsibility is collective.

THE REVOLUTION CONTINUES
Laying the Foundation for a Socialist Mozambique

Perhaps the most difficult period in the life of a revolution is the period immediately following the defeat of the direct enemy. Up to that moment the fight to smash the obvious and visible obstacle to the attainment of independence dominated the struggle and, in broad terms, determined the nature of the democratic alliance. Victory sets the scene for fresh battles to be fought if the people are to inherit the fruits of the new life for which they fought with great sacrifice. But, unless the seeds have already been sown during this period it may be too late to ensure that the process for which the struggle was started in the first place, is not stopped in its tracks. *Because it was conscious of this truth FRELIMO insisted that the kind of society which would be constructed when the enemy has been defeated should be defined long before the victory is achieved.* The easy way would have been to embrace equally all who paid lip service to nationalism without regard to their class and social tendencies. And because of FRELIMO's loyalty to the basic tenets of the science of revolutionary struggle President Machel was able to say on Independence Day:

> "With the proclamation of the People's Republic of Mozambique we are starting a new phase of our history in which we are going to put into practice everywhere in the country the politcal, ideological, economic, social and cultural gains won during the struggle. To say People's Republic is not to voice an empty and demagogic formula. To say People's Republic means to give substance to the aspirations of millions of dominated Mozambicans for whom independence is a precondition for the end of exploitation and the establishment of a People's regime . . . To say the People's Republic is to say Revolution."

The 3rd Congress of Frelimo has begun to chart the new path in this continuing Mozambican Revolution – the building of a People's Democracy in order to lay the economic, social and cultural foundations for the eventual construction of a Socialist State. The Central Committee report, the Programme, the Party Statutes and the Economic and Social Directives deserve close study.

Here, I wish to touch on a few aspects of these documents which make an important contribution to fundamental ideological problems facing the African revolution in general. FRELIMO emphasises that the answers to these problems will be found in the experiences of tradi-

tional revolutionary struggle and scientific socialism, by a strategy which is evolved from a synthesis of the specifics of a particular revolution and the general principles of Marxism – Leninism.

Implicit in FRELIMO's approach are certain basic postulates which have general validity. These are: that the construction of socialism presupposes the existence of a relatively advanced modern industrial base; that a new state must be won which will ensure social control of the means of production; that such a state cannot be won except in the struggle against internal and external forces whose class interests will impel them to resist the transformation; that such a struggle can only be successfully led by a revolutionary political vanguard guided by scientific socialism; and that none of these objects can be lastingly achieved without overcoming the dependence on the world capitalist economy.

THE TRANSITIONAL STAGE

FRELIMO's new programme recognises that before Mozambique can pass to the stage of Socialist revolution, the political, material, scientific and technical bases must be constructed. Thus amongst the main tasks of the present stage of the People's Democratic Revolution are: the liquidation of all forms of foreign domination, the elimination of the legacies of the traditional-feudal and colonial-capitalist societies, the extension and consolidation of democratic people's structures based on the objective interests of the broad labouring masses, the struggle on the production front to increasingly satisfy the people's basic needs, the strengthening of the power of the workers and peasantry and the further development of a new kind of state apparatus and state power, the ensuring of the country's defence capability and its internal security. The programme spells out the measures needed to give effect to these objectives in the political and ideological spheres and in the spheres of the economy, labour and social policy, health, education and culture, foreign policy, the State and national defence and public security.

A CLASS APPROACH

The construction of a new popular-democratic order (as a stage towards Socialism) demands a class approach. It calls for a clear definition of the role of each of the classes of Mozambican society, as well as

the mutual relations between the different classes. The Programme proceeds to state unambiguously that the working class, as the leading class of history, is alone 'capable of embracing the whole process of the transformation of nature and society and of promoting and guiding this process.' This involves working consistently for the strengthening of the political and social role of the working class and cementing its alliance with other revolutionary classes and groups, more especially the peasantry. The People's Democratic State is regarded as the embryo of a Socialist State and its dominant class basis is the 'Revolutionary – Democratic dictatorship of the Workers and Peasants.'

Of the peasantry, the programme records that it is the most numerous stratum of the population and is the principal force of Mozambican society. The working class in alliance with the peasantry constitute the leading force and the political basis of People's Democratic Power. The prime task in relation to the peasantry is to free them from the remains of traditional production and to encourage higher forms of productive and collective life.

The specific role of the other classes and groups in Mozambican society is also defined. Within the framework of a State dominated and controlled by the working class in alliance with the peasantry, there is room for other social forces. These include patriotic intellectuals who must be progressively freed from the spirit of elitism and dedicate themselves to the service of the people; artisans and small property owners who have an interest in struggling against the monopolies, side by side with the other labouring classes.

THE VANGUARD PARTY AND WORKERS' POWER

A distinction is made between the basic class foundation of the People's Democratic Order (workers in alliance with the peasantry) and the role of other classes and groups. This distinction is of vital importance during the transitional phase towards socialism. The doctor, teacher, engineer, bureaucrat, upper echelons of the army, small shopkeepers, small peasant proprietors, artists and other variants of the middle strata have a positive role to play, but according to FRELIMO, only if they serve and subordinate themselves to the ideology and interests of the working class and peasantry. FRELIMO's programme is based on the premise that socialism cannot be constructed without workers' power. State forms which set out to create conditions for the eventual con-

struction of a socialist order need to be dominated, at every level, by the working class and its main ally the peasantry, guided by the ideology of Marxism-Leninism.

In Africa, in the last 15 years, many sincere attempts to create transitional conditions for the construction of socialism have floundered precisely because no effective means were found to place real power in the hands of the working people led by a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist vanguard. Is there a basis for the creation of such a vanguard in countries like Mozambique and Angola? Is what they have done practical or relevant for other parts of independent Africa?

It has sometimes been argued that working class power and working class vanguards are not just the product of imaginative thinking; a precondition for both is the existence of a sizeable and stable proletariat, historically evolved by more or less advanced capitalist relations of production. And, it is added, Africa is in short supply of both these factors. Hence, the argument goes on, whilst the theory is unimpeachable, the real situation forces us to find alternative state forms which are nonetheless able to focus on the long term socialist option.

A full answer to these arguable propositions would need more space than the context of this article allows. But in summary, it can be said that:

a. There are now only a few parts of independent Africa which cannot boast of a stable urban work force, part of which could be correctly described as a proletariat.

b. A working class rarely, if ever, gives spontaneous birth (in the purely deterministic sense) to a revolutionary workers' party and its scientific ideology. A vanguard, representing the historic interests of an existing proletariat (however small) or one in the process of formation, is usually the creation of a few advanced workers and revolutionary intellectuals.

c. History has proved that such a party is able to gain the following of the broad labouring masses even when the proletariat itself is still small and weak. Viet-Nam is one of the more recent examples of this possibility in a situation in which the proletariat proper was proportionally no bigger than its counterparts in many parts of Africa. Now Mozambique and Angola reinforce the feasibility of such a perspective.

d. The absence of an advanced technical and industrial base at the time when independence is attained is relevant to the complexity and length of the transitional phase towards socialism but is not an insuperable obstacle to the establishment of State political power based on the workers and peasantry. This is facilitated by the fact that in most cases the bourgeoise is small and weak and usually begins to act as an instrument of neo-colonialism soon after independence.

e. Indeed, without the emergence of a state based on the workers and peasantry, led by a vanguard party, there can be no effective and lasting construction of conditions which will pave the way for a socialist transformation during the transitional period. Put in another way, it is only a State with such a class foundation which can consistently lead the working people in the class battles (both internal and external) which become more intense in the post-liberation period.

f. A key factor which compensated for the legacy of underdevelopment from the period of colonial rule, is the existence of a strong world socialist sector which has already shown a capacity to help defend liberated countries against direct or indirect interference, and makes possible a decreasing dependence on the world capitalist market and its previous monopoly of technical expertise.

(In general I want to emphasise that I am dealing with the post-colonial state. The problems of the role of the working class, as an organised entity, during the phase of the anti-colonial struggle, is a more complex problem which requires separate treatment.)

The emergence of independent states in post-war Africa is an important advance in the anti–colonial revolution. Even in those which have not yet moved effectively towards an order based on the political power of the working people, some steps have been taken to begin the construction of a national economy and they have played a positive role in anti–imperialist struggles. But in analysing the character of "progressive anti–imperialist" states (a shifting category covering a wide range of populist regimes), we must guard against overlooking the real internal class power relations. It is these relations which will ultimately determine both the consistency of anti-imperialist align-

ments and more especially, whether the commitment to a socialist future is merely rhetoric. Without the transfer of *political* power to the working class and its allies there is little chance to effectively transform the production relations and the whole society in the direction of a socialist order. And it is only a revolutionary vanguard of the working class which can effectively guide this process. These are two of the universal and necessary starting points of scientific socialism and they are implicit in the steps taken in Mozambique and Angola.

The Central Committee report to FRELIMO's 3rd Congress declares:

> **"The creation of the Party arises as a necessity for the development of the Revolution.**
>
> **The new stage of the class struggle and the construction of the bases for the subsequent passage to socialism demands a new instrument:** the vanguard party . . . without a revolutionary party which **can lead the worker and peasant masses and other working people through all the phases of class struggle, through all the economic,** political and ideological battles, *it is not possible to build socialism."* (my emphasis);

The translation into practice of the aims which FRELIMO has set itself poses a number of complex questions. How to consolidate the controlling influence of the vanguard party (which of necessity will consist of a small proportion of the people) whilst avoiding elitist tendencies? How to ensure at the mass level the participation of the revolutionary classes, not merely as objects of mobilisation but as creative participants in the whole process? How the organs of popular power relate to the vanguard party, how they develop a life which does not conflict with FRELIMO's primacy as the controlling guide of the state and the whole society but which, at the same time, gives them a meaningful role in the governing apparatus?

These and many other equally fundamental questions will be answered by future revolutionary practice. The documents and decisions of the 3rd Congress provide only the broad guidelines. But the skill with which FRELIMO, in its relatively short life, has steered the course of the Mozambique revolution, gives cause for confidence that the aims of the present phase will be achieved.

SOVIET PSYCHIATRY AND THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

by A. BAKAYA

Following on from the 1975 Helsinki Accords for European security, a vast campaign has been launched against the Soviet Union primarily, and the Socialist countries in general, around the concept of human rights. Emotions have been stirred about the so-called abuse of psychiatry and the western press and some organisations have unashamedly used dubious information to sensationally whip up anti-Soviet feelings.

Psychiatry and dissidents have become the new bogeys to stir up fear and hatred against socialism which in only 60 years in the Soviet Union has produced unprecedented advances in all spheres in the lives of Soviet citizens. Maternity care, child care, health care, education, housing, protection of the environment for people, security in jobs, rights for the elderly, scientific advances, respect for one's fellow citizens, facilities for sport and culture for all, internationalism and peace — these are achievements which even the most reactionary elements in our world have to admit.

Every single citizen in the socialist system is guaranteed security for the necessities of life and within this security each man, woman and child has the opportunity to develop to the fullest potential of his or her individual being. These are human rights which every human being in the whole world, regardless of race, colour or creed needs as a foundation. They constitute the right to life without which there can be no contentment and lasting joy in being a member of human kind.

Whose interests are being served when the agreements for a basis of peace for Europe and the world are being challenged on the issue of human rights? Who benefits from racism and apartheid, from racial discrimination in the capitalist countries, from unemployment, from poor educational and health facilities? Only the profit makers and exploiters. "Abuse of Psychiatry" in socialism is a capitalist red herring, a trick to sow confusion amongst people seeking a way of life that capitalism is unable to provide.

At the 6th World Congress of Psychiatry held in Honolulu, Hawaii, in 1977 a resolution condemning Soviet psychiatric practices was supported by only 19 countries, while 33 countries voted against, including countries like Sweden, India and Greece. The resolution was sponsored mainly by the British, Australian and New Zealand Psychiatric Associations and supported by the USA. (Three countries at this international meeting of scientists produced spoilt ballot papers, though nobody knows how they managed to spoil their papers.At any rate their votes were not counted.) However, on a card vote, the resolution was carried by 90 votes to 88. The voting system used gave delegates a number of votes based on the number of paid-up members in their association. This favoured the developed countries at the expense of the undeveloped. For instance, India, the second most populous country in the world with 500 million citizens, had only 1 vote. This is how 33 countries could muster only 88 votes on the card vote, while 19 countries mustered 90 votes and thus carried the resolution.

Developing countries, especially from the Afro-Asian sector of our world, ought to take heed, since reactionary circles often advance the argument that voting rights at the United Nations should be weighted according to each country's financial contribution to the UN coffers. It can easily be seen that this would serve the interests of the rich countries at the expense of the poor, and nullify the principle of one

country, one vote which now prevails.

The text of the resolution which was forced through the conference in this way was, in part:

> "That the World Psychiatric Association take note of the abuse of psychiatry for political purposes and that it condemn those practices in all countries in which they occur and call upon the professional organisations of psychiatrists in those countries to renounce and expunge those practices from their countries; and that the WPA implement this resolution in the first instance in reference to the extensive evidence of systematic abuse of psychiatry for political purposes in the USSR."

No convincing evidence to support the charges against the Soviet Union was presented to the conference.

THE SOVIET SCENE

The Soviet delegation was made up of psychiatrists from Moscow, Leningrad, Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Estonia and led by Dr. E. A. Babayan, Deputy Minister of Health of the USSR and Head of the Council of Psychiatry and of the Permanent Committee on Narcotics. The corridors and foyers of the conference hall were flooded with anti-Soviet propaganda and propagandists. Central to the propaganda campaign was a book published a few weeks before, by Bloch and Reddaway, in which they list some 200 Soviet citizens who they allege are in mental hospitals because of political dissent.

Dr. Sidney Bloch is not known to be a passionate dissenter about psychiatric services in South Africa, his birthplace, where he studied medicine before specialising in psychiatry abroad. His non-medical British collaborator and co-author, Peter Reddaway, lectures in political science in London. Reddaway knows that the economic structure of the apartheid system gives rise to the evil social conditions in our country, of which psychiatric cruelty is only one example.

Conference under the chairmanship of the W.P.A. president, Dr. Rohm, had a procedural device which restricted the Soviet delegation from dealing with all the non-scientific, non-medical allegations that were poisoning the scientific atmosphere of the conference. Dr. Babayan, however, drew the attention of the delegates to some facts, namely that many of the list of 200 had nothing to do with politics but were in psychiatric institutions for acts

of violence such as the use of knives against others and even murder. They were in psychiatric institutions because under Soviet law they were found to be not in control of their behaviour and hence not liable because their acts were related to mental illness.

Forensic psychiatric examinations generally involve a board of three psychiatrists and if they diagnose mental illness the patient is subsequently examined by psychiatrists in the institution to which he or she has been sent for treatment and not with the intention of punishing them.

This procedure of expert examination is aimed at the reliable diagnosis of the mental illness and this influences the nature of the treatment received. Others of the list of 200 had never been or were even considered to be mental patients but were in prison for acts illegal in Soviet law. Some had committed offences, had been suspected of being mentally ill, sent for a forensic psychiatric examination and found not to be mentally ill and thence returned to face criminal charges. Reference was also made, by name, of people who had been in psychiatric treatment in the USSR and had left to be in the "free world". Some of these had subsequently found themselves in psychiatric hospitals in the USA, Vienna and Paris; one is known to have committed suicide in the West.

Some former Soviet citizens were now in the West and they have allegedly been wrongly diagnosed as mentally ill by USSR psychiatrists. Dr. Babayan asked whether they had since been examined by western psychiatrists and asked for opinions by professional western psychiatrists on their psychiatric condition which would be evidence of healthy people being diagnosed as being mentally ill.

In addition, the Soviet delegation, in accordance with medical ethics, presented to the Psychiatric Association documentation of their diagnosis of mental illness for those individuals who had been committed to mental hospitals.

There is also the opinion of prominent western psychiatrists who held international office in psychiatry and who had been invited to the Serbsky Institute of Forensic Psychiatry to examine patients whom Soviet psychiatrists had diagnosed as suffering from mental illness. Those who accepted the invitation and inspected the Institute were satisfied that all the patients they saw and the psychiatric

documentation they examined did not indicate that persons were being detained in a mental institution if they did not have a mental illness.

It is not surprising then that 33 countries voted against the anti-Soviet resolution. In the light of the facts presented to the Conference by the Soviet delegation, Dr. Weinberg of the USA switched the attack from "abuse of psychiatry" in the USSR to one of Soviet psychiatrists perhaps making diagnostic errors. As Dr. Babayan of the USSR delegation pointed out: the question of diagnostic mistakes is a medical-scientific question; the matter of Soviet psychiatry abusing medicine for political purposes is a political question.

The Honolulu Conference of the World Psychiatric Association also heard scholarly papers from Soviet psychiatrists on biological aspects of psychiatry, psychopharmacological reports in treating mental illness and physiological features in mental diseases. Dr. Babayan read a paper on the organisation of psychiatric services in the USSR, principles governing psychiatric treatment, and the legal process for psychiatrists to adhere to in arriving at a conclusion to detain an involuntary patient in hospital. He discussed Soviet studies and guardedness about the use of electro-convulsive therapy (ECT); the total legal prohibition on the brain surgical procedure known as leucotomy and lobotomy; the guarantee of rights of mental patients to rehabilitation in work, payment of pensions etc. This paper was well received by the more than 4,000 delegates at the Conference.

CAUSES FOR CONCERN

Proof of my argument that the Honolulu Conference was rigged against the Soviet Union for political, not scientific reasons is provided by the fact that reprehensible practices in psychiatry in other countries, including our own South Africa, were ignored.

The New Zealand Psychiatric Association, which was one of the sponsors of the anti-Soviet resolution might look into some of the research going on in its country. Sleep deprivation (i.e. forcibly keeping a person awake for 36 or more hours at a time) is being employed as a treatment for depression. What is the scientific rationale for such a "treatment"? How does this method, used by the torturers in South Africa and Northern Ireland to break the psychological balance of political prisoners, become a treatment for

severe and chronic depression? How humane are the experiments in the USA in planting electrodes in the brains of prisoners to control their behaviour? What of the brain surgery like leucotomy or lobotomy that is employed for mental patients in Britain and the USA and some other countries?

Western psychiatrists who use electro-convulsive therapy so freely on their mental patients might consider more carefully the Soviet Ministry of Health's reluctance to use electric shock as a treatment because "upon repeated applications (it) may lead to changes of micro-circulation in the central nervous system, to point haemorrhages, to changes in the glial-tissue of the CNS and so on". (p.3 Babayan, 1977)

We all know of the risks to psychological well-being of the drugs LSD and LSD-25. Since 1967 these have been unconditionally prohibited for use on human beings in the USSR. In the free world it is a human right for individuals to volunteer to take the drug for scientific experiments!

RACISM, PSYCHIATRIC SERVICES AND PRESIDENT CARTER'S HUMAN RIGHTS CONCERN

"Between 8000 and 9000 Africans suffering from mental disorders are detained against their will in privately owned institutions in the Republic of South Africa. These Africans are the object of a business deal between the State and profit-making White-owned companies which receive Government subsidy on a per capita basis against the provision of custodial care for mental patients referred to in a Government publication as the 'sediment of mentally maladjusted persons and deviates.' There is not a single Black psychiatrist in South Africa, and vital decisions about thousands of African patients are made by *part-time physicians who do not even speak the language of the patients.* (My emphasis) While the majority of the White mental patients are receiving care in services provided by the State (the provision of psychiatric beds per 1,000 of the White population is 3.3 times greater than for Africans), the majority of the African mental patients are certified as mentally ill by the State and transferred involuntarily to profit-making private 'sanatoria'. About one third of the whole mental health budget of the Republic of South Africa subsidises this operation". (Abstract: WHO Study "Apartheid

and Mental Health Care", April 1977. U.N. Document. 77 – 06695).

These private institutions made a profit of R3,404,000 fo 1974-75 and increased profits to R5,252,000 for 1975-76, from th mental suffering of Black patients. The majority of the above psychiatric patients are probably suffering from severe mental diseases. Mostly no service or very little exists for persons suffering from neurotic disorders. Suicide figures for Durban in 1971 (cited by Fatima Meer) show that Africans now have the highest suicide rate in the province. Moreover African suicides are by young persons whereas White suicide is predominantly a phenomenon of advanced age.

The World Health Organisation study condemns apartheid as a source of psychosocial stress and illustrates this point by reference to the ferocity of apartheid in its disregard for the Africans as people with an interest in their own lives as well as the future of their children. The life of the African is one of forced uprooting from a geographical residential area and the social community so created. Blacks in general and especially Africans suffer under laws that legally force splitting of families; we live under enforced economic deprivation and poverty and have forced upon us an inferior status. The laws and the social system which the police brutally maintain project us as general creatures. "Jy is maar net in kaffer/koellie/hotnot" — we are not considered to be persons and so a process of de-individualisation and alienation is actively fostered against us.

Basic insecurity about one's rights to live in the city forces one to unbearable tolerance of insult and exploitation because to lose one's job carries with it the risk of being endorsed out of the city. Pass law harassment and arrest for technical infringements involve imprisonment, loss of wages, payment of fines. One appears helpless and children and family grow up seeing and experiencing this atmosphere of helpless insecurity and the absence of simple continuity of family life.

Protest and attempts to bring about a change from apartheid are inhibited by fear of Bureau of State Security (BOSS) informers and agents. Arrest carries with it the terror of social isolation; torture by days and nights of sleep deprivation; standing in one position thus

limiting proprioceptive feedback stimulation as well as disrupting blood circulation and thereby creating central nervous system disorientation; electric shock and blows and kicks to every part of the anatomy; the insult and humiliation of nakedness and helplessness while being taunted by the security police between unexpected blows. Such is the state of human rights and the terrorisation of humanity that President Carter and the World Psychiatric Association might address themselves to.

Of 48 persons known to have died in detention and while under interrogation by the security police (up to the end of 1977) 38% are officially said to have died by suicide; 12% are said to have died by falling, some down stairs others by falling out of high windows in the interrogation building. Only 26% are said to have died from illness.

A scientific body concerned about human rights and its abuse should not be able to overlook this, but these issues were never raised at Honolulu. How could the delegates overlook this absence of human rights and also similar reports of terrorisation of the people in countries such as Chile and Paraguay?

When President Carter of the USA talks of human rights it would be good if he looked at the medical services available for the Black Americans, the Chicanos and other of the deprived people who because of racism and exploitation are the poorest people, the first to be unemployed, the least likely to get a higher education in their wealthy and scientifically and technologically advanced society. Let President Carter and the American Psychiatric Association who are so concerned about human rights check the slanderous suggestions of their Professor Jensen and his collaborators who propagate theories about the genetic inferiority of Black people. Do Black people not have human rights? Is the suggestion that they are born inferior not an infringement of their human rights? Let the American administration and the various American scientific bodies check Daniel Moynihan (former U.S. Ambassador to the U.N.) when he suggests that Black family ties are loose and therefore are the cause of many of the social difficulties Black people live with. Such a statement is an insult to Black people because it suggests we do not share the need for the social function that the family provides as an initial social base. Moynihan's thesis is that we are slightly different from the White races (meaning White Americans and other White people in capitalist countries) and

perhaps therefore human rights are different for us. Unless you control such people who produce pseudo-scientific theories that "justify" our oppression you cannot assure us the right to realise our human potential. Capitalism and racism can produce the excuses, it is the provision of the facilities and services we need that will be proof of concern for our human potential and our human rights.

THE ORGANISATION OF SOVIET PSYCHIATRIC SERVICES

Psychiatry is a specialist medical service as is any other specialist branch of medicine. In the USSR all psychiatric treatment is part of the general care of the population and is guaranteed as a right by the Soviet Constitution. Mental disorders are generally precipitated by stress and treatment includes helping the patient by reducing stress. At the same time, the patient should not, wherever possible, be deprived of as normal a life as is possible. Of the 832,000 doctors in the USSR some 20,000 are specialists in psychiatry and all work in the health service. None is in private practice.

The majority of psychiatric patients in the USSR (90%) are *out-patients* or in day hospital treatment and these services are conducted from what are called dispensaries. These are locally based clinics under the direction of a psychiatrist to which a person may go of his own accord or be referred from a physician to a neurologist and thence to a psychiatrist.

The psychiatrist examines the patient and will prescribe medicines if these are necessary or advise on other specialist treatments which are conducted from the dispensary. Such other treatment is done only by psychiatric staff or by other professional personnel under the direction of the psychiatrist.

Follow-up care is also organised from the dispensary and the regular check-ups that are conducted on discharged patients are done by psychiatrists or skilled nursing staff who visit the patient in his or her home to ensure that the person is not relapsing or deteriorating and is taking his medicines where this is necessary. The psychiatrist might advise a change of job or, for example, recommend a stay in a non-medical rest home (sanatorium) if he considers this to be in the patient's interest. As Soviet law guarantees the right to work there are no practical difficulties. The doctor's advice is acted on. The trade

unions will help financially if the patient needs to go for a rest to a non-medical rest home.

The rights of citizens also apply to the patients. Such services are available to all patients, whether psychiatric or general medical cases. Patients requiring hospitalised treatment go to mental hospitals. In these hospitals the patients are divided into what are called "quiet patients" and "non-quiet patients". The latter are usually violent and suicidal patients, i.e. patients who are a danger to themselves or others. The psychiatric and other hospital staff are obliged to treat all patients with dignity and with consideration for their wellbeing. Patients who have to be restrained e.g. when they are being violent, are taken care of by trained nursing staff. There are no individual hospital cells and well staffed wards ensure that the staff can cope with the patients. A patient who is in the "non-quiet" category can be transferred to the "quiet" category and vice versa.

One of the problems with some psychiatric conditions is that patients refuse or do not recognise the need for treatment. Should a person require hospitalisation and if he or she refuses to accept treatment voluntarily then a board of three psychiatrists must do the initial examination to try to make a diagnosis. The members of the board have to sign such a certificate individually. The patient will then be seen by the psychiatric staff at the hospital to which he is sent and their opinions are recorded. Thus up to seven psychiatrists might have examined the patient within the first 24 hours of his involuntary hospitalisation.

We detail this aspect of medical care to indicate the material services that make the right to health care in the Soviet Union a real right. The training of medical, nursing, occupational therapist, psychological and other staff is costly; paying salaries and maintaining buildings and equipment costs money. All this is a service that is free to the citizens of the USSR. To carry out treatment and the care of psychiatric patients requires a lot of staff. For example to calm a patient by giving a hot bath with constantly running hot water for three hours is more expensive in staff terms than it is for a nurse to give an injection to tranquillize a patient who is over-excited. Adequate trained staff and free medication are part and parcel of health care for psychiatric patients.

Patients' progress is regularly reviewed and nobody is kept in

hospital for longer than is necessary. Also, this implies that patients are not discharged earlier than they should be because of shortage of hospital beds. The constitutional rights of all citizens ensure that the rehabilitation of patients advised by the doctors on discharge from hospital is guaranteed to the patient.

Follow-up care which also requires the service of professional staff is part of another principle in Soviet health care — namely preventive medicine, technically called psychoprophylactic services. It is in the interests of the patient to prevent illness, mental illness included, rather than wait for the illness to become full blown and then be engaged in trying to cure the patient.

All these services involve an elaborate network of state-provided facilities and all the services are free to the citizens.

In most Western countries, treatment services in all branches of medicine, but possibly more so in psychiatry (where such is available) is inadequate. Private practice (i.e. fee paying patients) flourishes and as the cost of treatment is very high, only a wealthy minority obtain a decent level of service while the majority of people either get an inadequate state hospital service or are permitted to wander the streets and parks and, as is sometimes debated, they are free to exercise their right to choose to kill themselves (suicide) rather than suffer the misery which is part of their illness.

DEMYSTIFICATION AND PSYCHIATRY

Psychiatry and mental illness provide a superb area for propagandists to employ in their anti-Soviet campaign, mainly because the thought of being considered mad stirs all kinds ot passions in all of us. The layman probably believes that psychiatry is all about treating people who have totally lost contact with reality and are either raving lunatics or caught up in absurd beliefs of being grandiose persons such as Napoleon or Jesus Christ. Such cases do exist but are few and far between and recent advances in psycho-pharmacology make the possibility of helping and restoring them to normality a much more encouraging prospect.

The bulk of patients who require psychiatric care are people who maintain normal behaviour patterns but are in distress because they find they cannot act in accordance with what they rationally know to be the facts. Their emotions become disturbed. Their self-confidence

is shattered.

Psychiatry recognises that delusions are a sign of a more complex morbidity. Delusions are false opinions and beliefs which do not correspond with the true position of things and which cannot be dispelled by producing rational evidence. Delusions may take various forms and for the purpose of this discussion, to show the complexity and the need for expert diagnosis, I quote from a Soviet textbook on psychiatry (Russian edition 1965) published in English in 1969. Delusions of grandeur may be present as a sense of "exaggerated importance, of greatness . . . . . or unwarranted confidence in one's intellectual powers or in the great social importance of one's personality. A patient maintains that he can easily write a masterpiece of literature, that he has great talents as an actor, or that he can hold high social positions or high public office and influence world affairs". (p.47, *Psychiatry,* Portnov and Fedotov).

Some delusions may be based on a false presumption but may involve a formally correct pattern of reasoning. Such a delusion includes ideas of persecution since the sufferer interprets the non-recognition of his false presumption as the result of intrigues by his enemies.

These examples have been included to indicate both the difficulty and complexity of a psychological disorder. Any person might have a false belief or idea but such ideas do not remain inflexible in the light of objective reality and reasoning and do not persistently dominate the person's thoughts and actions. The problem for the expert is to differentiate a *false belief,* however strongly held, from *a delusion.* The importance of this distinction is that a delusion occurs in the context of a more general morbidity and it is this illness that has to be treated. One does not treat a delusional idea.

Western psychiatry has been very extensively influenced by Freud's idealistic interpretations of the workings of the mind. Freud's theories, while containing some interesting observations, are idealistic because they concentrate on describing how ideas have become distorted and therefore unrelated to objective reality. Such theories have been criticized in the West by many psychologists and psychiatrists as unscientific. The alternative to Freudian psychology in the West generally takes the form of a mechanistic view of man and this thread runs through the research on leucotomy and also behaviourism.

Pavlov has been a major influence on Soviet psychiatry and psychology. His main influence has been in emphasizing the dialectical relationship between mind and body. Psychiatric problems are therefore viewed as resulting from faulty workings of the nervous system, and treatment is sought through the protection of the nervous system from undue stress. Methods of treatment are influenced by this scientific background and are being continuously developed. But in addition, such a theoretical approach to the workings of the mind requires the services and facilities of a vast social and medical network.

An example is in the use of insulin therapy — the patients are put into a coma by medicine. In the coma they have to be maintained so that secondary complications do not occur. In a deep sleep for a lengthy period of time, the patients must be artificially fed; their heart, lungs, kidneys etc. have to be stimulated so that these vital organs are not disturbed from their normal functioning. Such treatment is expensive in time and personnel. Doctors, nurses and other hospital facilities are intensively employed. Soviet psychiatric scientists report the value of such treatment for some forms of schizophrenia. Why do western psychiatrists ignore such reports? Is it because they cannot provide such a service for their patients?

Preventive psychiatry is another area on which Soviet health care concentrates attention. This requires vast individual and environmental monitoring. Soviet psychiatry has much to teach western psychiatry. Soviet psychiatrists learn from the west: it would be for the good of mental patients living in the west if the "free world" psychiatrists learned from their Soviet and other international scientific colleagues. (Wing, 1974) This is what a World Congress of Psychiatrists ought to be about: exchange and debate about scientific issues for the benefit of human kind. To relieve the misery and distress of the psychiatric patients is the objective of psychiatry, not to capitalize on their illness for political purposes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Lader M: *Psychiatry on Trial* Penguin (England) 1977

Bloch S. Reddaway P: *Russia's Political Hospitals* Gollancz (London) 1977

WHO Report: *Apartheid and Mental Health Care* U.N. Special Committee against Apartheid, April, 1977 Document 11/77 (77—06695).

Group of Black Doctors in South Africa: *Health and Health Services in South Africa* June 1977. U.N. document 77—12282.

Babayan E.A.: *Legal Aspects of Psychiatry in the Soviet Legislation,* Paper presented to W.P.A. World Congress, Honolulu, 1977.

Wing J.K: "Psychiatry in the Soviet Union," *British Medical Journal* 1974, 1,434—6

International Herald Tribune: Oct. 31, 1977
"Psychiatric Charges Divide U.S.-Soviet Talks".

State Bulletin' — Honolulu, Hawaii—September 1st 1977
"Psychiatric Parley Condemns Abuses".

Text Books On Soviet Psychiatry

Morozov G. & Romasenko V: *Neuropathology and Psychiatry,* Peace Publishers (Moscow, undated)

Portnov A.A. & Fedotov D.D: *Psychiatry,* Mir Publishers (Moscow 1969)

Psychiatry, Philosophy & Theory

Caudwell C: *The Concept of Freedom* Lawrence & Wishart (London) 1965

Wells H.K: Ivan P. Pavlov
Toward A Scientific Psychology & Psychiatry, International Publishers (N.Y.) 1956

Wells H.K: *Sigmund Freud — A Pavlovian Critique,* International Publishers (N.Y.) 1960.

Political Alliances and Communist Party Independence

by William Pomeroy

In 1977 the Communist Parties of both India and Sri Lanka suffered severe electoral setbacks. The reasons for this in both cases were similar. Both parties had been in alliances, informal or formal, with governing parties of the national bourgeoisie, and it was identification with those bourgeois parties and with a shift to the right that those parties in government began to pursue that tended to injure the two Communist Parties in the eyes of the working masses.

In both countries the setback was temporary in nature and the Indian and Sri Lanka Communist Parties, after frankly and self-critically assessing their errors, have been correcting mistakes, have been leading new militant working class struggles, and have begun to regain lost influence.

These experiences in India and Sri Lanka, however, deserve close attention because they typify certain problems of strategy and tactics in developing countries in the present period, in which the great historical process of a shift in the international balance of social forces toward

socialism and away from capitalism, and particularly away from its imperialist aspects, is becoming more accentuated.

In particular the problems have to do with reaching and conducting unity alliances with varied, non-working class groupings. A number of Communist Parties in developing countries other than India and Sri Lanka have also been confronting these problems, including Communist and worker parties or groups in African countries.

The question of alliances by a revolutionary working class vanguard party with bourgeois nationalist or bourgeois democratic movements in countries that had not yet shaken off feudal relations or the colonial oppression of an imperialist power was dealt with by Lenin in 1920 in a "Preliminary Draft of Theses on the National and Colonial Questions", prepared for the 2nd Congress of the Communist International. Communists, said Lenin, "must enter into a temporary alliance with bourgeois democracy in colonial and backward countries, but must not merge with it and must under all circumstances uphold the independence of the proletarian movement even if in its most embryonic form." (Collected Works, 4th edition, Vol.31, pp. 122-28)

At the same Congress, Lenin, in a "Report of the Commission on the National and Colonial Questions to the 2nd Congress of the Communist International", discussed further the problems of such alliances in view of the tendency of the national bourgeoisies to reach a rapprochement with imperialism and to join forces with it against revolutionary movements. Lenin said that "we, as Communists, should and will support bourgeois-liberation movements in the colonies only when they are genuinely revolutionary, and when their exponents do not hinder our work of educating and organising the peasantry and the broad mass of the exploited in a revolutionary spirit. If these conditions do not exist, the Communists in these countries must combat the reformist bourgeoisie . . . " (Collected Works, 4th edition, Vol.31, pp. 215-20)

A number of Parties were to suffer the consequences of attempting to carry on alliances with the treacherous national bourgeois elements, the most disastrous being the massacre of Communists in China in 1927 by the erstwhile ally, Chiang Kai-shek.

The Leninist concepts were formulated for Communist Parties in their early stages of development under colonial or very backward conditions. In general, however, the formulations have remained valid after national liberation and into the stages of eradicating feudalism and neo-

colonial relations. In developing countries that have adopted non-capitalist features the alliances of Communists with revolutionary national democrats have been close and fruitful, whereas in developing countries where a national bourgeoisie has chosen a capitalist path or where capitalist features have been enlarged since independence the Communists have had alliance problems.

THE INDIAN EXPERIENCE

After its independence, India became a vast arena of struggle between trends in both of these directions. A progressive sector of the national bourgeoisie has undertaken, with mass support, to create a public sector of the economy, to carry out land reform, to extend democratic forms and to pursue an essentially anti-imperialist, non-aligned foreign policy that includes close friendly relations with the socialist countries. On the other hand, a reactionary sector of the national bourgeoisie has sought to strengthen private monopoly capital interests, to curtail land reform, to restrict democratic forms, and to shift foreign policy toward closer ties with imperialist powers.

The Communist Party of India has correctly sought to reach alliances with the bourgeois Congress Party (which held power from independence in 1947 until the 1977 election) or with the forces in it that pursue national democratic aims. This political line has been followed both on the national level and in the various states. For a long period the Communist Party was identified with the policy of forging a united front with the left-centrist forces in the Congress Party under Nehru and under Indira Gandhi.

In June 1975, in the face of destabilising intrigues by reactionary bourgeois opposition groups attempting to bring down the Indira Gandhi government and to establish a government that would serve monopoly interests, the Congress Party regime declared a National Emergency, suspended democratic processes, and introduced authoritarian rule. The Communist Party of India supported the declarations of the Emergency, seeing it as necessary to deal with a dangerous and deteriorating situation.

The Gandhi government, instead of mobilising the masses in democratic participation around measures of curtailing the power of the reactionary bourgeois sector and of advancing a national democratic program, moved steadily to the right, using the Emergency to impose sac-

rifices on the working people while giving concessions to the monopolists. Mass disaffection of the working people who had previously voted for the Congress Party and its allies resulted. As a consequence, when manoeuvred into an election in March 1977 by the reactionary forces grouped around the Janata Party, the Congress Party, nationally and in most states, was overwhelmingly defeated and swept out of office.

In this election the Communist Party, at least in part as a result of its association with the Congress Party government and with endorsement of the Emergency, saw a drop in its vote from 6,936,000 to 5,310,000 or from 4.73 per cent of the total to 2.82 per cent, and had its parliamentary seats cut from 23 to 7.

A Plenum of the national council of the Communist Party of India that met in the first week of April 1977, after the election, made a thorough assessment of the setback. It declared:

> "The main reason for this election result is undoubtedly the monstrous misuse of the Emergency powers against the common people, the suppression of the civil liberties of the democratic forces which created a suffocating atmosphere, the brutal assault on and atrocities committed particularly against the toiling people through compulsory sterilisation and demolition of their dwelling places, large-scale arrests, harassment and persecution of innocent people.
>
> "Along with this came attacks on the living standards and trade union rights of the working class, the heaping of tax burdens on the working peasantry and oppressive methods of collection as well as the failure to give them a remunerative price for their produce."

As pointed out by the Plenum, slanderous attacks on the Communist Party and harassment of its members attempting to mobilise the people in struggle against repressive measures had accompanied blatant anti-democratic moves. Although the Party had eventually undertaken to expose and to resist the undemocratic steps, this, the Plenum stated, was both too late and too little:

> "The National Council of the CPI is . . . of the opinion that it was a serious mistake for our Party not to have called for the lifting of the Emergency once its negative features had begun to come to the fore. A proper understanding was lacking that vast emergency powers could not be allowed to remain in the hands of a bourgeois state and its bureaucracy for a long time. There was the mistaken understanding that the Emergency could be used to bring about progressive shifts in the state power in a national democratic direction. The progressive potentiality of the national bourgeoisie and of its

representatives in the Congress headed by Smt. Indira Gandhi was overestimated. It was insufficiently realised that the fight against the increasingly anti-people and anti-democratic aspects of internal policies of the Congress Government had to be given priority by our Party even while supporting its anti-imperialist foreign policy, as well as progressive internal measures. It was insufficiently realised that a progressive foreign policy cannot be eventually safeguarded and carried forward except on the basis of a corresponding internal base in terms of progressive and democratic home policies. Because of our wrong understanding, in our practical day-to-day work regarding struggle against anti-people aspects of Government policies, our Party underplayed this struggle in order to avoid confrontation with the Indira Gandhi Government." (*Information Bulletin*, Prague, Vol. 15, No. 8, 1977)

The Plenum concluded that "In the minds of large sections of the masses our demarcation from the Congress became blurred. The independent image of our Party was eroded." This question was subsequently discussed in greater depth and detail by a member of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of India, Mohit Sen:

"Take the mistake that our Party has committed and which led to the loss of its independent image and the erosion of its independent mass base. Does it mean that the Party had a correct united front policy but a wrong position regarding its independent role? Not at all. The mistake that it committed was precisely a mistake of united front policy, the essence of which was overestimation of the progressive potential of the national bourgeoisie. It was a mistake of failure to properly apply the line of unity and struggle in relation to the national bourgeoisie and its then dominant political party, the Congress under the leadership of Smt. Indira Gandhi.

"At the same time, it has to be realised that the independent role of the party and the consolidation as well as expansion of its independent mass base cannot be achieved only through the united front . . . The independent mass base of the party . . . can be built up only when together with a correct united front approach and policy, certain other essential work has been done. In essence, this other work amounts to taking the whole of the party to the people — its philosophy, program and organisation. It means taking due care that the people see the party not just as the builder of this or that kind of united front but also as a party which has its own independent totality of views on life and the world. This means that the party must constantly check up on whether the people are seeing the whole of the party or only a part of it." (*Party Life*, Journal of the Communist Party of India, Vol. XIII, No. 23, December 7, 1977, p.8.)

In effect, the CPI has been led through its form of alliance with the Congress Party to permit itself to be hindered in educating and organising the broad mass of the exploited in a revolutionary spirit.

This experience, it needs to be stressed, does not point toward an abandonment of alliance or united front strategy and tactics. In the Indian state of Kerala a long-standing alliance of the Communist Party with a progressive regional organisation of the Congress Party was strongly upheld by the voters in 1977, who returned the coalition to office. The issue is one of how far a Communist Party should go in reaching and preserving an alliance with a national bourgeois party, and at what point it should be terminated if it involves the compromising of the Communist Party's independent role and of its principles.

IN SRI LANKA

The setback suffered by the Communist Party of Sri Lanka in the July 1977 elections in that country had almost identical circumstances with those that occurred in India. In Sri Lanka the setback was perhaps more serious because the Communist Party had not only been in a generalised alliance with a party of the national bourgeoisie, the Sri Lanka Freedom Party (SLFP) headed by Prime Minister Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, but had participated in the cabinet of the government itself that had been elected as a United Front Government in 1970.

When the 1970 election took place, the united front entered into by the Communist Party of Sri Lanka, which brought about the defeat of the reactionary bourgeois United National Party, was undoubtedly a correct step. As the Communist Party, in its assessment of the period, has stated:

> "As a result of this decision, it was possible both to defeat the reactionary UNP government in 1970 and to carry out certain important anti-imperialist and progressive measures that represented a necessary and inescapable stage in the advance towards the goal of socialism.
>
> "In particular, it was possible to complete the struggle for political independence, make considerable headway in the advance to economic independence, and carry through various acts of nationalisation which dislodged certain foreign and local capitalist interests from entrenched positions that they occupied in the economy."
> (*Sri Lanka's General Elections, 1977*, pamphlet of State of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Sri Lanka, August 14, 1977, Colombo, p.3)

However, the initial steps in these directions by the United Front Government, which was dominated by the SLFP, were not pursued very far and were not implemented to the benefit of the people as a whole. Progressive changes were negated by the government's failure to act to end Sri Lanka's dependence on world capitalist markets and economy, the crisis of which had a disastrous effect on Sri Lanka's economy, causing a 300 per cent increase in the cost of living and an escalation of unemployment to 26 per cent of the labour force. The Communist Party's call for increased economic relations with socialist countries and for a socialist restructuring of the country's economy was ignored. On the contrary, the bourgeois SLFP abused its political power by permitting unprecedented private and family patronage and the pervading of every aspect of public life with corruption, which created newly-rich sectors and reinforced rather than curtailed private capitalism.

The right wing of the SLFP, in these circumstances, assumed ever-greater influence, and together with parts of the bureaucracy and the heads of the security services drew Prime Minister Bandaranaike into a governmental coterie that ruled outside of the cabinet that contained Communist and other left representatives. As the economic crisis worsened, these bourgeois political forces advanced "package deals" with the left. In its statement analysing the 1977 election results, the Communist Party of Sri Lanka said of this pre-election period:

> "Compelled to yield to certain demands of the Left and radical forces in regard to land reform and the imposition of ceilings on the accumulation of wealth and the ownership of houses, they (the SLFP right wing) sought in turn to involve the Left and radical forces in a policy of demanding 'sacrifices' from the masses by getting them to accept a lowering of their already low standards of life and levels of consumption.
>
> "For a short time the SLFP right-wing was able to get some sections of the Left and radical forces to join in the demand for such 'sacrifices' from the masses. But the fact that such sacrifices were not being enforced on the *mudalalis* and other capitalist sections around the SLFP right-wing leaders, or on the new rich who were emerging from the Convertible Rupee Account scheme, soon became obvious. The extravagance and ostentatious living of these new-rich sections became an affront to the masses, who were suffering under immense difficulties.
>
> "As a result of this mistaken association of a section of the Left with the demand for 'sacrifices' from the masses, the left as a whole

became identified in the popular mind with the burdens they had to endure. It was also at this time that mass support began to shift from the United Front to the only alternative at that time, the UNP, as was witnessed in the results of several by-elections." (*Ibid*, pp. 6-7)

The deterioration of the United Front Government and the ascendancy of the SLFP right wing was spread over several years, from 1971 to the beginning of 1977, when the Communist Party finally withdrew from the government (another left party, the Lanka Sama Samaja Party, had been expelled from the government in 1975 by a right-wing manoeuvre). In the July 1977 elections the Communist Party sought to project a Left alternative by entering into a United Left Front together with the LSSP and a People's Democratic Party, running independent candidates on a socialist-oriented programme.

This, however, proved to be too late to redeem the situation. The United Left Front was utterly defeated in the election. The Communist Party lost all of its seats in the parliament, including a seat held since 1931, and the working class and Left as a whole lost all representation. As victor, the reactionary bourgeois United National Party took 139 of the 166 parliamentary seats.

In its post-election Statement, the Communist Party of Sri Lanka, listing its defects and shortcomings since 1970, cited among them the following:

"Certain sections of the Left movement believed that it was necessary to get the masses, even temporarily, to agree to lower their levels of consumption, which were already intolerably low. This idea stemmed from a misconception that the presence of the two Left parties in the government was tantamount to a change in the nature of the state and a qualitatively new stage in the development of the revolutionary process and popular consciousness. The belief that it would be possible to get the masses to agree to such 'sacrifices' was also based on a subjective overestimation of the situation. Such a demand on the masses, especially when made in conditions where capitalist relations were dominant in society and where the Left itself did not have sufficient power to enforce at least similar sacrifices from the rich, put the Left and wide sections of the masses in opposition to each other.

"Another shortcoming was the failure of the Left, on several occasions, to supplement the proposals it put forward with the United Front and the government with mass mobilisations outside in support of such proposals. Although prompted by concern not to play into the hands of the UNP or damage relations within the

> United Front, this failure in practice weakened the fight for the proposals of the Left. The masses, too, had no way of knowing the independent positions of the Left on many important matters. As a result, the Left failed to maintain its own separate identity and was associated in the minds of the people with many wrong policies of the SLFP leaders." (*Ibid.*, pp. 10–11)

It is evident that in both the Indian and Sri Lanka situations the Communist Parties had put themselves in the position of seeking to preserve an alliance with unstable sectors of the national bourgeoisie to the point of neglecting the principled fight for the interests of the working class, i.e., the class struggle conducted in a revolutionary spirit. In both cases there was a failure to appreciate fully the nature of the bourgeois state, as it functions in developing as well as developed capitalist countries, and the inability of a left minority in parliament or government to alter that nature merely by its presence. The consequence was a partial loss of the two parties' independent identity and a compromising of themselves in the eyes of the masses.

These experiences of the Indian and Sri Lanka Communist Parties make it plain that Lenin's formulations on Communist alliances with national bourgeoisies, which were defined for an earlier stage of national liberation from colonialism or very backward social relations, are just as valid for the present stage of struggle against neo-colonialism and for clearing the path to a socialist orientation in development.

Some may believe that, in this historical period of a decided shift in the world balance of forces in favour of socialism and its adherents, national bourgeoisies with which alliances are formed will be more inclined in the light of world trends to adopt progressive positions. Essentially, this would be a tendency to ascribe to fledgling national bourgeoisies the characteristics of national democrats who are mainly classless elements that adopt revolutionary positions for non-capitalist development; it would ignore the fact that wherever capitalist relations take root the impulse to capitalist development and wealth-getting is inexorable, and that the primary force that can check this and compel socialist alternatives is a strong, united and militantly-led working class and worker-peasant alliance.

In view of this historical truth, united front arrangements or alliances with national bourgeoisies become feasible only with undeviating recognition from the national bourgeois sectors that the interests of the working class must be taken into account and that Communist Parties

must have the unimpeded right to give leadership to the working class. The clearly-seen independent programme of the Communist Party and the freedom of the Communist Party to organise and educate workers and peasants in a revolutionary spirit remain the indispensable ingredients of present-day class alliances.

OTHER EXAMPLES

It would be instructive, perhaps, to glance at the approach of Communist Parties in other developing countries to united front policies. In varying degrees, a number of countries besides India and Sri Lanka have forms of alliance by Communist Parties with national bourgeois parties or governments. All of these Parties have similar problems of maintaining revolutionary vigilance and of adhering to revolutionary principles.

The Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas is another Communist Party in Asia that has had a form of alliance with a ruling national bourgeois grouping. Its circumstances involve greater difficulties and uncertainties than in the case of India and Sri Lanka. For one thing, when the PKP entered into its "national unity" agreement in 1974, the Philippine government of President Ferdinand Marcos had been for two years a martial law regime that had suspended elections, the national legislature, political parties and their activity, the right to strike, and other processes normally considered democratic. Furthermore, an Anti-Subversion Law that had outlawed the PKP continued on the books.

Nevertheless, the PKP felt it possible to reach its agreement with the Marcos government and, as part of it, to dissolve the armed forces it had led in armed struggle of varying intensity for over 30 years. In the agreement, the PKP gave public and active support to positive policies of Marcos (including land reform steps, greater emphasis on industrialisation, development of relations with socialist countries and with "third world" trends for a new international economic order as part of a shift away from the former U.S. imperialist-dictated foreign policy, renegotiation of long-standing unequal treaties with the U.S. on military bases and trade, and others). In return, President Marcos permitted the PKP a form of semi-legality and allowed it to build legal mass organisations of workers, peasants, women and youth.

PKP acceptance of the agreement was in response to the initiative of the Marcos government for such an arrangement, which it sought as part of an effort to win mass support for reform measures. The govern-

ment attitude heeded by the PKP was expressed in Marcos' Presidential Decree No. 571 which declared that "in the interest of peace and order, the attainment of objectives to reform society and extend optimum benefits to the masses of our people, it is necessary that these elements (i.e., the PKP and its mass organisations) be welcomed to the folds of the law and given fresh opportunities to contribute their share and integrate their efforts towards the attainment of its goals including, but not limited to land reform, a more equitable distribution of wealth, the rehabilitation and development of Mindanao and other areas of the country, and the promotion of trade unions."

The PKP, however, from the outset of the "national unity" agreement, has tried to dissociate itself from the restrictive and other negative features of the authoritarian Marcos regime, calling for the lifting of martial law restrictions and for the encouragement of democratic participation of the masses in all aspects of national development. Especially, the PKP has vigorously opposed the Marcos policy of opening doors to multinational corporation investment and of seeking huge loans from imperialist lending agencies as the means of promoting industrialisation and national development.

Within the context of martial law government, the PKP has endeavoured to play its independent role by mobilising the masses it can reach in support of the regime's positive policies and in criticism of its negative policies. In a recent assessment of the regime, the PKP declared:

> "A valid criticism of the martial law administration does not lie in over-concentration of powers in the President, but in the fact that such powers failed to spur the mobilisation and participation of the broad masses of the people in pushing for the implementation of national programmes for social justice and economic democracy. The absence of popular involvement and support led to the strengthening of pro-imperialist forces whose interests are in direct conflict with those of the working masses and who seek to prevent the Government from fully implementing its reform programmes. The people will naturally support concentration of political powers if these are clearly applied to advance their cause." (*The Philippine Path to Social Progress*, PKP programme adopted at its 7th Congress, July 1977)

While striving to preserve and to give more content to its "national unity" agreement with the Marcos government, the PKP has felt it necessary to become increasingly outspoken with its independent position. On December 17, 1977 a national referendum was held in the

Philippines, decreed by President Marcos, which posed the question of whether or not the people are in favour of President Marcos continuing in office as both President and Prime Minister after the convening of an Interim National Assembly (i.e., maintaining his authority even after a form of electoral representation is restored). The PKP, in a public statement, recommended the people to vote "Yes" in the referendum.

However in its statement, the PKP subjected the martial law government to searching criticism:

> "On the whole, while the goverment has launched certain progressive measures, it has also set in motion certain countervailing measures that tend to offset the gains from these reforms. In the economic sphere, the fruits of progress created by industrialisation have never seeped down to the masses, giving rise to a situation where the grand rhetoric of the government on improving the people's welfare is now being met by cynicism and growing discontent."

The ballot provided in the referendum contained a blank sheet for people to write their views and opinions. The PKP made this appeal concerning its use:

> "The coming referendum is an excellent opportunity for the masses to appreciate and advance the following concrete demands through the "remarks sheet" on the ballot:
>
> 1) Lifting of martial law so that organisations of the people, including the PKP, can organise and participate in all aspects of life as freely as possible;
>
> 2) Restoration of the right to strike;
>
> 3) Full implementation of land reform not only in rice and corn areas but in all agricultural lands;
>
> 4) For a free and independent economy – strict control of transnational corporations; nationalisation and/or Filipinisation of key industries;
>
> 5) Immediate withdrawal of U.S. bases on Philippine soil;
>
> 6) Strengthening of relations with socialist countries;
>
> 7) Strengthening of relations with Third World countries and the movement of non-aligned nations;
>
> 8) Sectoral and proportional representation of workers and peasants in the interim Batasang Pambansa (National Assembly) and other decision-making bodies;
>
> 9) Free and honest elections from the barangay and the Sangguniang Bayan (local councils and cooperatives) to the highest levels of government."

(*On the December 17 Referendum*, PKP Statement signed by PKP General Secretary Felicisimo Macapagal)

A "national Unity" alliance in the Philippines, where the national bourgeoisie has only begun to assert an independence from imperialism and to restructure backward economic relations, is inclined to be limited, fragile and generally hazardous. The PKP has encountered harassments and restrictions in the course of it, and martial law press control and denial of freedom to publish political literature hampers the capacity of the PKP to present its independent position to the people. However, against the risks of being identified with the negative aspects of the bourgeois authoritarian rule, the PKP has had to weigh the positive changes that have been initiated and the need to fight for their broadening and extension.

IN PERU

Another illustration of an approach by a Communist Party to the question of a united front alliance with the national bourgeoisie is provided by the position of the Communist Party of Peru in regard to the military government in that country. The military government was first established in 1968 and undertook nationalisation measures against imperialist firms, land reform, and social changes that benefitted the nation and the people.

As the Communist Party has stated: "The Peruvian Communist Party fully supported the anti-imperialist, anti-oligarchic, and progressive measures of this government, though there was neither identity of ideology, direct mutual understanding or agreement." (Statement of Political Commission of the Peruvian Communist Party, May 19, 1977)

Since 1968 changes have occurred in the military government's leadership and in its carrying out of the programme that had been initiated. Influencing these have been, as in the case of Sri Lanka, the effects of the world-wide capitalist economic crisis on Peru, which have adversely affected working class living standards and placed serious obstacles to national development plans. The military government under the new President Francisco Morales Bermudez has shown a tendency to retreat on revolutionary aims and to adopt a reactionary national bourgeois attitude toward the working class. Its four-year plan for political and socio-economic development of the country put forward early in 1977 contains retrogressive features that conflict with its positive proposals.

On May 13, 1977, the Peruvian Communist Party's Political Com-

mission met with President Bermudez and presented its position on the development plan and its proposals for continuing the process of "national and social liberation" set in motion in 1968. The content of this meeting was summarised in the Political Commission's statement of May 19, 1977.

"While we do not see the possibility of building socialism in Peru in the immediate future," said the statement, "we are convinced that the Peruvian revolution should begin with national liberation and the elimination of the political and economic might of imperialism and the oligarchy, the chief culprits of our country's backwardness and dependency."

"However," the statement went on to say, "a revolutionary process can never attain its goal unless it relies on the broad popular masses, the working people first of all. This condition is imperative today, too, to consolidate and formalise what has been achieved. But mass support can only be won by advancing slogans with a patriotic and social content. The first should include important anti-imperialist measures, the second, measures aimed at a radical improvement of our people's working and living conditions."

The Peruvian Communists pinpointed as the chief defect in the development plan "the government's striving to overcome the economic crisis, dependency and backwardness along the capitalist road." They then examined the points of agreement and disagreement between the Party and the military regime:

> "We note the full or partial coincidence of views on the following aspects of the plan: the striving to formalise the structural changes; incorporate a declaration of human rights in the Constitution; maintain the role of the state in planning economic development, in industry, domestic and foreign trade; continue the agrarian reform; restructure industry with the aim of meeting the vital demands on foreign technology; elaborate a long-term industrial development plan; carry out social transformations in the sphere of health care, employment and the situation of women; uphold relations with all countries of the world and conduct a policy of non-alignment as well as a policy aimed at weakening tensions in relations with neighbouring countries.
>
> "At the same time we note that the plan suffers from a serious shortcoming: attributing the roots of the present economic and social ills to the wrong, and at times secondary, causes, also leads to the proposal of erroneous solutions. They include: measures aimed at converting foreign and national private capital into a motive force

> **of economic development; unwillingness to adopt new measures of struggle against the multinational corporations and the oligarchy, a benevolent attitude to the penetration of private capital into the state sector of the economy. It is also incorrect to lay the blame for all the existing difficulties at the door of the trade union movement without pointing to the true culprits – imperialism and the oligarchy." (Statement of the Political Commission of the Peruvian Communist Party, May 19, 1977)**

Urging a return to the anti-imperialist, anti-oligarchic policies that motivated the 1968 military assumption of power, the Peruvian Communists then proposed "formation of a broad united front uniting everyone who seeks to defend the revolutionary gains and enjoying the support of the government if it indeed considers itself a continuer of the spirit of the first stage of the Peruvian process."

Such a united front in association with the national bourgeois government has not developed in Peru. On the contrary, the continuation of policies by the government injurious to the interests and conditions of the working class led to sharp confrontation within two months of the Communist meeting with the President where national unity questions were discussed. In July 1977 the Peruvian Communist Party supported and helped lead a general strike in Peru for improved wage and living standards and against the government's acts of harassment of trade unions. Prolonged strikes of miners and metalworkers followed, with Communist participation in the illegal strikes, the government carrying out mass arrests of trade union leaders including Communists.

At the time of the general strike, the Peruvian Communist Party issued another statement pointing out its continued support for positive aspects of government policies, such as land reform, maintenance of the state sector in the economy and others, but asserting unequivocally its determination to pursue its primary duty to defend and advance the interests of the working people.

These and other examples of Communist Party alliances and approaches to alliances with parties or forces of the national bourgeoisie in developing countries, each having its own factors of class development and organisation, relations of class forces, and extent of contradictions between national bourgeoisies and imperialism or backward oligarchal sectors, deserve close study for working out the independent role of the Communist Party in such countries at this stage of world development.

KENYA: TRYING TO SILENCE THE TRUTH

by **MUHOI WA KIRINYAGA**

On the last day of 1977, a dozen policemen stormed into the home of Ngugi wa Thiong'o, Kenya's most famous writer, and carted him away. For more than a week, his wife and friends could get no word from the Kenyan regime of his whereabouts, nor even an admission that he was in the government's hands: fears grew that he had met the same fate as J.M. Kariuki a few years before. The populist Kenyan MP had been found, half-eaten by lions and showing signs of torture, some months after being taken away by the Kenyan secret police.

A swift international campaign and local Kenyan reaction forced the government to admit that Ngugi was in detention. It is important to understand that his arrest is not merely a random overreaction by a repressive regime against an individual rebellious intellectual: Ngugi's ideas, and the fact that he was *taking them to the people,* made it vital for the Kenyan government to liquidate his influence. For Ngugi was succeeding in linking the national struggles of the

Kenyan people in the past with their present problems — and specifically with the need for class struggle against imperialism and its Kenyan capitalist allies.

The most recent expressions of Ngugi's ideological development were a novel, published last year, *Petals of Blood,* and an experimental play for village people, *Ngaahika Ndenda*. The novel, which was a huge success when published in Nairobi last year, is deeply political: its object is, in a sense, to understand and interpret the impact of neo-colonialism through the experience and transformation of a Kenyan village and Kenyan characters who are also, however, true to vast areas of the imperialist-dominated world. Listen to Ngugi talking about the village and the characters in the novel, in an interview last year:

> Ilmorog is a fictional village, but within that fictional setting, I have tried to be as particular as I can in terms of details. A novelist must always be very, very particular even when he's trying to make a general statement. At the same time I hope Ilmorog is as applicable to Kenya, as it is applicable to East Africa, Africa and the Third World. This is because some of the problems raised in the novel affect not only Kenya but the whole world. For instance, the issues of national identity and foreign domination. I'm thinking, for instance of the exploitation of workers and peasants by a combination of foreign capital and its local allies, and this is something I think is true of most countries in the world which are dominated by imperialism. . . . . .
>
> It is not fair to identify a writer with any one of his characters, since he is trying to make the novel as a whole have an impact. There are one or two characters with whose ideas a writer may be in basic sympathy. But as with the other characters in the novel, I am more interested in their development from the stage of black cultural nationalism to the stage of class consciousness; from a stage when a character sees oppression in terms of culture alone, to the stage when he can see oppression and exploitation as being total, that is, as being economic, political and cultural. From a stage where he can talk about African people *en masse* to a situation where he can see African societies as differentiated between the peasantry and workers on the one hand, and imperialism and its allies on the other.

That development of ideas parallels Ngugi's own ideological progression as well. His earlier novels, beginning with *Weep Not Child* in 1964 followed by *The River Between* and *A Grain of Wheat,* were steeped in the colonial past, and dominated by the theme of the cultural alienness and intrusion of the European colonisers. They

have been called pessimistic: and it is certainly true that at this point, in the 1960s, Ngugi was preoccupied with opposition to colonialism and foreign influences, with a need merely to seek out and assert what was indigenous, (symbolised perhaps by his adoption of his Kikuyu name rather than the Christian James) in order to heal the wounds which colonialism had inflicted on the Kenyan people. The five years it took him to write *Petals of Blood* were therefore ones of constant ideological change in the direction of socialism and Marxism: they were also the years in which Ngugi could see more clearly than ever not only the general consequences of neo-colonial "development", but its concrete expressions in the exploitation of poor peasants, or the violent repression by the regime's armed thugs against students at the University, where he is head of the Literature Department.

Not that he has abandoned the themes of the colonial history and its political and cultural influences: as he has said: "The Kenyan people must know their history in order to face up to the challenges of imperialism". And, of the subject of imperialist-transmitted Christianity, his grasp of its political significance is firm:

> Christianity, in the past, has been used to rationalise imperialist domination and exploitation of peasants and workers. It has been used to blind people to the reality of their exploitation because religion as a whole wants to tell people that their lot is God-given, as opposed to being man-conditioned. So if you see that you are poor because God has willed it, you are more than likely to continue to pray to God to right your condition. But if you know that your poverty is not God-conditioned, but it is socially conditioned, then you are likely to do something about those social conditions that are assuring that you be poor.

These themes were powerfully expressed in the "people's play" which Ngugi wrote with a literacy worker at the community centre near his home in Limuru. The play has in effect been banned by the government, and it seems likely that the centre, for which Ngugi had taken much responsibility under the guidance of a committee, will have to close. It would be a victory for imperialism with ironic historic echoes, for the land on which it stands and the village surrounding it were the creation of the colonial regime during the Mau Mau emergency. Intended as a bastion of colonial security against the freedom fighters, virtually unused during the early years of independence, the centre had been repossessed by the people:

literacy classes were started, and Ngugi and his collaborator wrote *Ngaahika Ndenda* (I'll marry as I want to) for the newly literate *wananchi* to act in.

And what a theme! Small wonder, indeed, that the rotten Kenyan regime was terrified at such messages being broadcast to peasants and workers — especially in the Kikuyu country, where the ruling class is attempting to keep the population in line by chauvinist appeals to Kikuyu "primacy".

The play's central character is a labourer on the farm of a rich Kenyan who is anxious to set up a fertiliser factory in partnership with a foreign company. To do that, however, he needs to get his hands on the 1½ poor acres of his labourer. And so the plot is hatched: the capitalist and his wife persuade the labourer to "cleanse" his long-established marriage — in the church of which the exploiter is an elder. To do so, however, the worker must raise a loan by mortgaging his land . . . . Of course he cannot repay, and is dispossessed. His boss buys the land, and the labourer learns of his own misfortune and also through the experience of his friend, a factory worker in a foreign firm, of the common inhumanity and exploitation of imperialist factory and local-capitalist farm, of neo-colonialism and its local beneficiaries, and of the cement of ideology (in this case religion) and ignorance which holds the system together.

Ngugi wa Thiong'o is an individual who spoke out with bravery and with increasing ideological maturity and relevance about the oppression and exploitation perpetrated by imperialism and its allies in Kenya. But from a Marxist-Leninist point of view, he is of greater significance. His own history of political development and growing class consciousness is the precursor to many other "personal histories" in Kenya and Africa — of the gradual development of a revolutionary intelligentsia which comes to see its objective role as being on the side of the working class and the exploited masses.

The fact that Ngugi was able to transcend the limitations of an angry cultural nationalism, despite its evident attractions to an anti-colonial African intellectual, is a tribute to his personal qualities. It is also, however, a sign of the speed of social and political change in a relatively "advanced" African country, and of the power of Marxist thought, despite its suppression in Kenya, in explaining that change and bringing the most advanced sections of the intelligentsia towards

engagement in struggle on the side of the masses, of authentic national liberation and socialism. That gradual recruitment of the potentially revolutionary intelligentsia to the struggle, as Lenin pointed out, marks a new and advanced stage of the movement against imperialism and capitalism.

Ngugi's play ran to packed houses of *wananchi* for a month before it was suppressed, because it reflected directly what he had learnt from the masses — so directly, for example, that the labourer hero was played by a rural labourer, and his friend the Bata factory worker by a Bata worker! It also showed, however, the great thirst of the Kenyan people for ideas which portray their own reality and experience of exploitation. The campaign for Ngugi's release therefore also inevitably involved a demand for freedom not only for himself but also for others to bring liberating ideas to the people.

U.S. SUBVERSION OF S.A. LABOUR MOVEMENT

by R.S. NYAMEKO

The spider-web in Africa [1]

> **"The Central Intelligence Agency of the U.S.A.was founded for one purpose only — to extend, perpetuate and preserve world monopoly capitalism, obstruct the independence of countries which are attempting to wrest themselves from the yoke of world imperialism, and to act against the socialist countries by covertly carrying out the policies of 'containment' and 'roll back'"[2].**

This evaluation is the same as stated in the first article (see *The African Communist,* First Quarter 1978) and endorsed by many researchers on the C.I.A. and its agencies.

It is a prerequisite for evaluating the C.I.A. to understand the above motives. Because of the growing importance of the working class movement all over the world, the C.I.A. is paying its greatest attention to corrupting, disrupting and disorganising the working class everywhere.

The C.I.A. with the help of AFL-CIO have established the American Institute for Free Labour Development (AIFLD), the African American Labour Centre (AALC) and the Asian-American Free Labour Institute (AAFLI). These have committed many acts of aggression and subversion, among others the promotion of a general strike in Guyana in an effort to defeat Cheddi Jagan; supporting the overthrow of the Bosch government in the Dominican Republic through a satellite union; the planning and carrying out of the overthrow of President Salvador Allende and the installing of Pinochet's junta regime in Chile.

Above all, the CIA has imbued tens of thousands of trade unionists in Asia, Latin America and Africa with anti-communist, anti-socialist, anti-democratic ideas, corrupted trade union leaders with money and with their "experts" and wherever possible supported divisive groups in the trade union movement.

There is a belief in some quarters, because of the recent exposure of the CIA in the USA, that the Carter government is different from previous U.S. governments. But the truth is that the Carter government is a marriage of politics and big capitalism.

Political observers have shown this marriage clearly. "The Trilateral Commission (T.C.) was set up by David Rockefeller and Harvard University, and Carter has been adopted by them since 1972. The one who holds the line is one of the best brains of Harvard University, professor Zbigniew Brzezinski"[3] *(Il Giorno,* 4 November 1976).

"The Trilateral Commission is to work for a U.S., Europe, Japan merger as a step to One World. Its director, Zbigniew Brzezinski, is Carter's chief foreign affairs adviser". (*On Target*, 18 December 1976.)

W.E. Barnes, political analyst for the *San Francisco Examiner*, said: "Mounting evidence suggests that Jimmy Carter is less an Establishment outsider than many people thought, as he himself led voters to believe during his campaign." The Trilateral Commission is a true élite, comprising what many have called America's "shadow government".

Therefore the CIA with all its agencies may have had cosmetic face-lifts, but its role remains essentially the same: to subvert the working class in the service of U.S. monopoly capitalism.

THE RULE OF MONEY

How does the AALC operate? How does the AALC carry out the dictates of the multi-national companies? *The reply is: with U.S. dollars.*

The AALC pokes its snout everywhere and into all spheres of economic and social activities of our people: e.g.

Women's Seminar on the Role of Women in Economic Development, Health and Nutrition.
Venue: AIFLD training centre, Front Royal, Virginia (May 10 - June 18, 1976).
Sponsored by: AALC.
43 participants — aimed at Latin America and the Caribbean. 3 of the participants from English-speaking Africa (all trade unionists).
Second Pan-African Cooperative Conference
Venue: Cotonou, Benin (March 11 and 12, 1976)
Topic: Guidelines for the future of the Pan-African Cooperative Training Centre (PACTC)
High-level delegations from 11 African countries and representatives of 7 organisations present.
Botswana Railway Workers' Union (BRWU) Seminar
Venue: Botswana Trade Union Education Centre, April 16 - 19, 1976. 14 BRWU branch officials attended. In 1975, 34 one-week seminars, attended by a total of 1,129 unionists.
Institute of Tailoring and Design (ICCM) at Dakar, Senegal.
Seminar (affiliates) of Public Services International
in connection with International Women's Year.
Venue: Legon, Ghana.
50 participants from Ghana, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Kenya and Mauritius.
Mombasa Workshop on Cooperatives.
37 participants — top trade-unionists — canvassing union support for co-op development. AALC involvement — courses run by UNTZA instructors, under K.D.M. Buta, who assists AALC representative in Kinshasa.
ICCM in Dakar
New 6-month programme. 100 tailors from throughout francophone West Africa, the Gambia and Guinea-Bissau.

In 1975 Patrick O'Farrell[4], Director of the AALC, his deputy Jerry Funk, and John Nate Gould its East African Regional representative who is handling AALC liaison work, visited many African States. They met leading trade union members, African cabinet ministers and members of parliament.

The AALC was "pleased" to host an extraordinary number of African officials. The following secretaries-general and high-ranking trade union officials were amongst those who met and consulted at AALC headquarters in New York during 1975: Habib Achour (U.G.T.T./Tunisia); Dennis Akumu (O.A.T.U.U.); Siwa-dio-Benza (U.N.T.Z./Zaîre); Juma Boy (C.O.T.U./Kenya); Monipak Damorou (C.N.T.T./Togo); Sow Moussa Dembe (C.I.O./Liberia); A.M. Issifu and Rose B. Taylor (G.T.U.C./Ghana); Simon Jonathan (L.C.W./Lesotho); A.Y. Kaltungo, E.O.A. Odeyemi and D. Oyeyemi (U.L.C./Nigeria); Goodman King (S.L.L.C./Sierra Leone); J.W. Mpangala (N.U.T.A./Tanzania); Newstead Zimba (Z.C.T.U./Zambia) and Fred Patrice Zemoniako (U.G.T.C./Central African Republic); Jean Rasolondraibe, Confederation of Malagasy Workers/F.M.M. In addition ministers, members of parliament and press have been received.

(*AALC Reporter*, November-December 1975)

At the negotiations between the Lesotho Council of Workers (L.C.W.) and the representatives of the Holiday Inn in Maseru, John Kilhefner of the AALC assisted Mr Simon Jonathan of the L.C.W.

The AALC presented three automobiles to the Organisational Department of the Ghana Trades Union Congress (G.T.U.C.).

A seminar for working women, with 64 participants, in Mali, as part of International Women's Year, was sponsored by the U.N.T.M. and the AALC.

AALC co-ordinates donations of drugs, medical equipment and clothing to countries of the drought-affected areas in the Sahelian region (*AALC Reporter*, October 1975).

The AALC funded the Kenyan Workers' Education Institute. COTU signed a 5-year agreement with the AALC in 1974. COTU runs Workers' Education courses in the Institute for participants.

The unity of African workers throughout the continent is threatened by the AALC. It is paying particular attention to the

mass media, organised conferences of journalists for West and East Africa and in November 1976 sponsored a conference of journalists from South Africa, Botswana and Lesotho in Maseru.

AALC publishes *Labour and Development*, a monthly review of African socio-economic events to trade union leaders, at Lome, Republic of Togo; and *African Trade Union News*, Regional Economic Research and Documentation centre, also at Lome.

AALC PENETRATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA.

The *AALC Reporter* of May, 1973, gives reports of AALC penetration in Southern Africa.

Mbabane, Swaziland, is the site of an important vocational training school in cooperation with the Swazi Government. The AALC has provided a vocations training expert, Charlie Taylor, and will equip the school for technical courses — carpentry, plumbing, electrical work, domestic science, typing and auto mechanics.

In Lesotho the AALC, in cooperation with the Lesotho Government and the Lesotho Council of Workers (LCW), has established a Labour Education and Vocational Training Centre, with John Kilhefner, an AALC trade union education specialist, to conduct a series of eight week-long evening and weekend seminars. Two will be held in Maseru, three in the south and three in the north. A car and one year's operating expenses will be provided for this purpose by the AALC.

The AALC, in cooperation with the Lerotholi Technical Institute and LCW, will offer vocational training in building trades — masonry, bricklaying, carpentry and electrical work. Tools, equipment, educational aids and building materials will be supplied by the AALC, with Charlie Taylor as the AALC's vocational training expert.

Botswana: The Botswana Trade Union Education Centre was inaugurated in 1972. The Government gave the land; money and material was given by the AALC; building workers gave the labour free to build the centre, and the Botswana unions contributed money. The AALC has an education specialist working in partnership with leaders of the Botswana trade unions.

Malawi: The AALC, in collaboration with the Trades Union Council (General Secretary Mr. Justin Liabuna), held in 1972 a labour education seminar with three AALC education specialists – Chuck Ford, previously director of the TUI in Nigeria, Nate Gould, former principal of the Ghana Labour College, and John Kilhefner, AALC adviser to the Botswana Trade Union Education Centre. As from 1st July 1973, the AALC provided the TUC with a full-time labour education specialist. They also provided them with three vehicles and office equipment.

Zimbabwe: A statement issued by the African Trade Union Congress(ATUC) states:

> "AUTC has been advised that the AFL – CIO isattempting to disrupt the existing trade unions so that it may impose another centre which will be used to fight for, or against, foreign ideologies rather than to represent the interests of African workers." (*Rhodesian Financial Gazette*, 18 November 1977)

ATUC referred to secret sponsors for the new body. AFL – CIO – AALC is making an effort to obtain the backing of the trade unions for the Anglo-American sell-out plans in Zimbabwe.

THEY AIM AT SOUTH AFRICA

The AALC held the annual 1973 staff meeting in Gaborone on April 1. To this meeting came Alfred Mahlangu, chairman, and Cecil Penekiso, Acting Secretary of BAWU; Lucy Mvubelo, General Secretary of the National Union of Clothing Workers; David Thebehali, Urban Councillor of Soweto; and Arthur Grobbelaar, General Secretary of TUCSA, from South Africa.

What came out of these talks was essentially:

> "Rather than pull out of South Africa, U.S. and other foreign firms should institute far-reaching changes in terms of wages, benefits and conditions of work for their black employees. Pullout would hurt only blacks, and joblessness would literally amount to starvation and lead to the forced removal of blacks from the urban areas. . .
>
> "The discussions we had in Gaborone have helped define other possible areas of co-operation, notably in South Africa, with TUCSA, for the training of black workers. What we will do is up to TUCSA and to the government. We are ready. But we are not an underground organisation and won't come in if the government says we can't. We would only go in if we were able to carry out our program with a free hand. . .

"Unless responsible black leadership is encouraged rather than isolated, the next series of strikes could be disastrous."

The AFL – CIO – AALC are busy "encouraging responsible black leadership". Fred Sauls of the United Automobile Workers' Union with 3,500 members has been recognised by Ford in Port Elizabeth and S.K.F. at Uitenhage. As a result of representations made by the International Metal Workers' Federation (IMF), General Motors in Port Elizabeth and Volkswagen at Uitenhage agreed to recognise the 1016 Africans in the union and signed a stop-order.

It is alleged that Fred Sauls, working in close collaboration with AFL – CIO – AALC, is organising unions to break away from TUCSA and form a new Federation of Trade Unions as a base for AALC to throttle the growing revolutionary spirit of the African working class.

PROTECTING U.S. INTERESTS

The AALC is dangerous to our liberation movement. It has spread in West, East, and Central Africa, and undermined the radical trade unions in these countries. For the past years it has concentrated on African States in Southern Africa – Swaziland, Botswana, Lesotho, Zimbabwe and Malawi. Its aim is to get a foothold in South Africa so that it can protect and advance US investments in South Africa and torpedo the liberation forces.

Lesotho, Malawi, Botswana and Swaziland are, for them, a gateway to South Africa, but, of course, as shown above, they have found collaborators in South Africa too. Their interest in South Africa is clearly South Africa's wealth and importance to capitalist global planning – it is important to infiltrate their agents (CIA) into the African working class organisation. The AALC is working with the AFL-CIO but is not accountable to any national or international trade union organsiation. It is, primarily, accountable to America's high finance circles that pay for it, as a subversive organisation to undermine ILO and even ICFTU decisions, and of course as a sworn enemy to the WFTU. Its main purpose is to preserve and increase US investments, and ensure higher profits for US investors in Africa.

Their approach is that the US Government and trade unions i.e. ALF-CIO, should become more 'involved' in Africa. They claim that Africa does not know the USA as a colonial power, her record is clear.

They maintain that US trade unions are efficient, have won a high standard of living for their workers and should therefore help African trade unions to become powerful.(6)

They finance seminars and centres, "influence" political and trade union leaders. *Garment Worker* of 21.9.73 reported that the AALC has refunded the expenses of Lucy Mvubelo to the June 1973 Geneva Conference.

Lucy Mvubelo is one of their star collaborators. Accompanied by Arthur Grobbelaar, TUCSA's General Secretary, Harriet Bolton and Norman Daniels, leaders of the Textile Industrial Workers, she attended the annual conference of the AFL-CIO in Miami in 1973, and "there they managed to get altered a key resolution calling on the American labour movement to give full support for the banned SACTU as 'the only trade union movement that is recognised by the Black South Africans and the United Nations.' The resolution passed by the AFL-CIO deleted all reference to SACTU and merely referred to support for trade unionists 'inside and outside South Africa' who oppose apartheid. . . .

Lucy Mvubelo evidently made a clean breakthrough, and it was claimed that if she attended next year's conference of the ILO (i.e. 1974), "she will be allowed to address the organisation."(7) (In June, 1973, she was prevented from addressing the Worker's Group at the ILO in 1974 and 1975. She did not try again.)

At the Conference of thirty Africa, Latin American and Asian countries organised by the AALC held in Washington, however she obtained recognition, and the Nigerian delegates invited her to visit Nigeria in 1974. She also persuaded 26 major US industrialists with interests in the Republic at a meeting in New York to continue investing in South Africa.(8)

Mrs. Jane Hlongwane of the Black Engineering and Allied Workers' Union and Ben Nicholson of the Electrical Workers' Association prevented Third World delegates at the International Metalworkers' Federation (IMF) Congress held in October 1977 at Munich, from carrying a resolution attacking South Africa, referring to the massacres and suffering, maintaining that the time for peaceful change in South Africa is past, and calling for the I.M.F.'s declared policy of peaceful dialogue to be dropped.

The resolution was redrafted – the new version merely condemns

apartheid and calls for all metalworkers to make a special effort in the struggle to find a peaceful solution to the South African problem. It condemns the denial of full trade union rights for Black workers, but welcomes the appointment of the Wiehahn Commission . . ."this will eliminate discriminatory labour practices". (GW 28.10.77)

TUCSA's monthly magazine, *Labour Mirror*, announced in its January/February 1976 issue that:

"The way has been cleared for the American Labour movement to send a fact-finding delegation to South Africa, by a suggestion made by Professor of Industrial Relations at the University of California, John Hutchinson, to Mr. George Meany."

Mr. Vorster and Mr. Viljoen at first objected to it, but they approved after Hutchinson convinced them that the purpose would be "friendly and fact-finding and not at all designed to stir up trouble."

Hutchinson's views on South Africa and Africa as a whole are set out in a letter he wrote to the *Los Angeles Times*:

> "South Africa", he said, "is a White autocracy, while most of Africa is governed by Black autocrats. However, South Africa is an amateur in oppression compared with some of its continental counterparts. . .
> "It is also changing internally. . . including the first steps towards African trade unionism, an unprosperous institution elsewhere on the continent."

His defence of South Africa's barbaric racist system (50 Africans killed in detention are nothing to him) speaks for itself; and to him liaison and works committees are the first steps towards African trade unions.

His insults to African States and their trade unions show his white arrogance. He is an enemy of our people, of independent African states and African trade unions.

THE U.S.A.'S WITHDRAWAL FROM THE I.L.O.

AFL – CIO warned the ILO that "support by the ILO governing body of the PLO application and the eventual acceptance of the PLO to observer status by the Annual Conference in Geneva should cause the United States to weigh the usefulness of the International Labour Organisation in the future". (*AALC Reporter*, February 1975.)

In June 1975 at the 60th session of the International Labour Conference, Irving Brown as the USA's workers' delegate declared that the intention of their delegation was to withdraw from any

participation in the 60th session if the PLO was given observer status.

The 60th session decision granted the PLO and all UN-recognised liberation movements including our own African National Congress observer status in the International Labour Conference (Provisional Record, 60th Session, Geneva 1975, 14th Sitting, 12.6.75, page 14/8).

The U.S.A. Government under pressure from George Meany decided to leave the ILO; this was described by the UN Secretary-General as a "retrograde step".

The ILO is the oldest and major inter-governmental specialised agency of the UN. Each national delegation to the ILO is composed of representatives of labour, government and industry – i.e. has a tripartite character. Article 62 – 3 of the UN Charter gives the Economic and Social Council (EOC SOC) the power to "prepare draft conventions for submission to the General Assembly" and Article 63 – 1 gives EOC SOC the power to make arrangements with members of the UN and its specialised agencies to obtain reports on the steps taken to give effect to its own recommendations. Thus ILO recommendations channelled through EOCSOC become "conventions" and "treaties". When approved by member nations, the recommendations of the ILO become law in those nations and govern labour relations.

The ILO has since its inception become a standard-setter for labour conditions for workers all over the world.

The multinational corporations have consistently attempted to control the ILO and the US government and industry representatives together with the CIO – AFL labour representatives in the ILO have been their main spokesmen.

The US government's decision to withdraw from the ILO was deeply regretted by international labour organisations – the WFTU, the ICFTU, the OATUU, the WCL and the ICATU.

The WFTU said that the decision "endangers the universality of the ILO and its repercussions will certainly make themselves felt both in the programme of activities and in the situation of its personnel. It will harm international cooperation, and (the WFTU) undertakes to do everything possible through united coordinated action. . . to help the democratic functioning of the ILO . . . in order to make the organisation an effective tool to promote . . . international cooperation, to defend trade union and human rights. . ." (Prague,

3.11.1977).

The USA's decision to withdraw shows its contempt for the world labour movement and for the UN.

The USA has withdrawn from the ILO because it depends on the CIA-directed AIFLD,AALC and AAFLI, none of which are accountable to any trade union members in Asia, America, Europe or Africa.

At the Eleventh Biennial Constitutional Convention of the AFL – CIO held in San Francisco, California, 2 – 7 October 1975, they reaffirmed "America's role in world trade unionism and that the USA must seek the leadership and policies requisite for human progress at home and abroad." The AALC hosted 22 African brethren, among them Denis Akuma of the AUO ATUU and Habib Achour of Tunisia, Juma Boy and Raphael Zuma, Assistant Secretary-General, COTU, Kenya, Newstead Zimba, Chitalu Sampa and Reuben S. Muchimba of ZCTU – Zambia etc. (*AALC Reporter*, October 1975)

THE RULE OF GEORGE MEANY

For the past 50 years, the US labour movement has been attacked by a malignant tumour, which weakened, divided and diverted it from the class struggle.

When the American Federation of Labour – AFL merged with the Congress of Industrial Organisations to form the AFL – CIO, Meany and his clique imposed their reactionary views on the labour movement. Meany and Lovestone, the chiefs of the AFL – CIO International Affairs Department, are amongst the most reactionary trade union leaders in the world. Under their leadership, the AFL – CIO has received financial backing from the government and from the CIA to promote counter-revolutionary tendencies in the trade union movements of Asia, Europe, Latin America and Africa. While pursuing their cold war objectives, they neglected civil rights and economic and social needs for the millions of American workers. (*CIA and American Labour* by George Morris, International Publishing Co, 1967 and "Walter Reuther" in Detroit Free Press, 23.5.66.

Meany was a backer of Yankee aggression against Cuba and Vietnam. He is a rabid anti-communist, an enemy of détente, the

USSR and all other socialist and progressive states.

He even sponsored Alexander Solzhenitsyn to address AFL – CIO meetings in Washington and New York and was photographed with him. (*AALC Reporter* September 1975.)

Meany led the AFL – CIO to leave the WFTU and to break relations with the ICFTU and it was he who urged the Carter administration to leave the ILO. This reactionary American labour leadership is throwing its full weight behind attempts to divide, disrupt and corrupt the African trade union movement. In January 1977 AALC and OATUU signed a joint communique under which OATUU will assume the Regional Economic Research and Documentation Centre in Lome, Togo and OATUU/AALC will co-ordinate efforts in the area of credit and saving unions. (*AALC Reporter* Jan.1977)

The AALC is organising study tours and visitors' programmes in which hundreds of African trade union leaders attend AFL – CIO conventions and visit AALC offices. Some are given three and six-month courses at Harvard and other universities. After attending conventions and universities they are given grants to travel through the United States.

Why does the CIA – AALC spend so much money on trade unionists?

Why does it want a "labour mask"?

First of all for the past ten or more years there has developed a popular revulsion to the CIA because of its activities amongst students, in the mass media and trade unions, and its involvement in the coups in Africa, the murder of Lumumba, military intervention in Latin America, Asia and Africa.

It has adopted the line put forward by the British government in 1959, when it stated: –

> "Since it is difficult to accuse unions of serving colonial ends with their aid it should be possible to establish harmonious relations with the new social and political institutions in Africa. . . . trade union help will be needed to check irresponsible nationalisation and to maintain control of the key sectors of the economy in the newly created African states". (Annex to British Cabinet Paper on Policy in Africa, 1959)

If any African trade union leaders who are hobnobbing with the AALC claim ignorance of the AALC's role as an agent of

American imperialism, let them study the INSPECTION REPORT of May 27, 1977 on AID LABOUR SUPPORT PROGRAMS IN AFRICA issued by the Department of State, the Inspector General of Foreign Assistance, Washington, D.C. 20520 which states:

> "Section 601 of the FAA directs that the United States should '. . .encourage the efforts of other countries to strengthen free labour movements.' The African American Labour Center (AALC). . . . is the principal instrument employed in Africa by AID to meet this legislative mandate. For FY 1977, AID regional programs in Africa totalled 19.4 million US dollars. . . . We recommend that the program be strengthened through a concerted effort by STATE, AID and AALC to improve their channels of communication". (p.1)
>
> . . . . We recommend that State/AID ensure maximum utilisation of the AALC activities by devoting additional resources in Washington as well as in the field to the management of the labour support program". (p.2)

Under the heading SCOPE of INSPECTION it states:

> "The analysis of the relationship between AID and AALC included a series of contacts and coordination with the State Department's Bureau of African Affairs and the Office of Labor Affairs, the AID Office of African Regional Affairs (AA/AFR/RE), and the AFL – CIO International Affairs Office of the National Headquarters in Washington, D.C." (pp.4&5)

The above quotations and many others make it quite clear that the AFL – CIO International Affairs Department and the AALC are adjuncts of the State Department. Earlier we have proved that the AALC is one of the CIA agencies – in fact they are not controlled or directed by or accountable to the American workers, nor the African workers, whose destinies are decided by the CIA and the American State Department.

We have earlier drawn attention to the "educational" work etc. undertaken by the AALC in Africa. This report states:
"We found that the educational and social aspects of the AALC programs impact beyond the trade unions themselves," and goes on further to say: – "It was obvious that the extent of the AALC influence, fostered by the grassroots organisation and practical accomplishment of the activities, had a positive effect on the US Government's relationship with the host country. Although great care was taken to divorce the AALC undertakings from all political overtone". . . . (page 6)

The AALC and AFL – CIO get academics to help them in their

educational activities – this makes them appear more prestigious. Academics who have recently visited South Africa urged "the emergence of Black trade unions as a way of safeguarding harmonious relations between labour and capital".

It is in pursuit of this ideology that the AALC is recruiting African trade union leaders to undergo studies in the USA. At the end of last year 4 African trade union leaders from the Transvaal left Johannesburg for such studies.

A task force from the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured Peoples recently visited Southern Africa. They went to South Africa and Namibia, and had special meetings with African trade union leader Lucy Mvubelo and others (*AALC Reporter*, April – May 1977).

The CIA has undertaken the training of BOSS agents (*The Star* 16/8/77)

Why this concentration on SA? It is to defend the interests of the multinational companies like Chrysler, I.T.T., Ford, Coca – Cola, Mobil, I.B.M., Firestone and others. There are about 350 American companies which invest in and trade with South Africa. Until recently, the return on investments was at least 19 per cent, compared with a world average of 11 per cent. The fact is that America's biggest corporations are not only resisting pulling up their stakes in SA but are planning to invest more and stay on – like Caltex, General Motors, Chase Manhattan, General Electric etc.

The AALC and their collaborators in Africa like Lucy Mvubelo are a challenge not only to our movement, but to the OAU, the United Nations, the ILO and the international labour movement who have passed numerous resolutions to isolate South Africa.

The AALC's penetration of independent African states, including its massive penetration in Southern Africa, must be exposed. They must be told to get out of Africa and stop corrupting, dividing and undermining the African trade union movement in the interests of monopoly-capitalism – for this is basically what the CIA, AALC and all other agencies are doing.

They are not only subverting the African trade union movement but through them they are subverting African Governments and thus undermining Africa's determination to free Southern Africa from white racist domination, colonialism and imperialism.

A campaign of exposure and of isolating and clearing them out of Africa must be started *now* before it is too late!

We appeal to our friends in the American Labour movement to help combat the Meany reactionary gang for their sake as well as ours.

(I am indebted to *Counter-Spy* and particularly to my friend J.B. Jabe for supplying me with material for this article. R.S.N.)

NOTES

(1) The Nazi swastika in the 30's was referred to as the spiderweb in Europe.

(2) John Gilman, *New Perspectives* Vol.7 6/1977

(3) Well known to us South Africans for his role in the Treason Trial 1956 – 1961, as Verwoerd's main anti – communist expert.

(4) O'Farrell is a graduate of Kent State University, worked with U.S. Department of Labour and with the United Steel Workers of America, but above all is a graduate of AALC Executive Director, Irving Brown.

(5) Irving Brown in *AALC Reporter*, May 1973, page 7.

(6) Speech by Irving Brown, 6.6.71.

(7) *Rand Daily Mail*, 14.11.73. (Lucy Mvubelo was not allowed to address the 1974 ILO Conference.)

(8) *Rand Daily Mail*, 15.1.74.

AFRICA: NOTES & COMMENT

by VUKANI MAWETHU

ANGOLA: MPLA SETS THE PACE

One of the most trying times in the history of the African people's forward march to freedom was the so-called "Angolan crisis" of 1975 – 76. The future of Angola, and indeed of the whole continent, seemed dark but the MPLA remained optimistic and continued to tell the world that "vittore é certa" – victory is certain.

This slogan expressed the feelings of the masses and the aspirations of those who formed the MPLA on December 10, 1956. In his report of the Central Committee to the First Congress of the MPLA, which took place in Luanda, the undefeated capital of Angola, from December 4 – 10, 1977, and was attended by delegates from Angola's 16 provinces, comrade Agostinho Neto stated that the formation of the MPLA was the "greatest achievement of the Angolan people." It was formed in clandestinity, harassed and persecuted by the Portuguese colonialists, its cadres and leaders were murdered by the imperialists and FNLA and Zairean puppets, especially after the MPLA had

moved its HQ from Conakry to Leopoldville during the turbulent days in Congo following the death of Patrice Lumumba. Comrades Benedito and Deolinda de Almeida are only two examples of the martyrdom of many cadres during this period.

It was in 1960, in the House of Commons in London, that the MPLA announced to the world that it had decided to go over to direct action, and on February 4, 1961 the Angolan people "burst into the international arena to state, with the indelible print of bullets, their firm determination to start to direct their own destiny themselves and to show their political maturity in the most unequivocal way." Armed struggle had started in Angola. Portuguese colonialism erected a wall of silence around the political struggle inside the country.

The MPLA grew, as comrade Neto states in his report, to become "the indispensable and sole representative of the Angolan people within the national liberation movements in Africa. There were internal problems: tribalism, regionalism, factionalism, left and right opportunism, adventurism etc., but these were solved through discussion especially at the First National Conference of the MPLA of December 1962, the Conference of Cadres of 1964 and the 1974 Inter – Regional Conference of Militants. These conferences were accompanied by concrete political and military action. The opening of the Cabinda Front presented the MPLA with insurmountable problems, with the result that the headquarters had to be moved. "The reactionary attitude of the government and some Zairean and African political forces led the OAU to take the decision which served as a basis for banning the MPLA headquarters in Leopoldville, and in 1963 it was transferred to Brazzaville".

The Eastern Front was opened on May 18, 1966. MPLA had by now learnt many lessons from the Cabinda Front: "Cabinda taught us just how powerful tribalist activity can be." The new emphasis in the Eastern Front was on mass mobilisation.

The second lesson learnt in Cabinda "was that in the east we should be more radical in fighting action." There were problems of logistics "imposed from abroad" and inside Angola "during a long march through a scorched earth area, the squadron lost its way, and hunger decimated many of our combatants, especially the cadres Deolinda and her four companions, all OMA leaders (who) were returning through Zaire when they were imprisoned by the FNLA and

murdered, The day of their imprisonment is commemorated as Angolan Women's Day."

The history of the MPLA is a history of glory and the Central Committee report to the First Congress is testimony to this. This report is indeed a text book on the history of the struggle of the Angolan people against colonialism; a struggle which lasted for more than 500 years until the racist hordes of South Africa were routed by FAPLA, the military wing of MPLA, and driven out of Angola by March 27, 1976.

The report states: "Gathering the experience of the national liberation struggle and of the revolutionary struggles of other peoples, and guided by Marxism – Leninism, the party will be the leading force in the State and the Angolan Society." This is based on the conviction, as the Draft Programme stated, that:

> "The final objective of our struggle was not only national independence. The objective was to establish in Angola a juster society, where there should be no exploitation of man by man."

PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM

One of the inspiring features of the Congress was its internationalist character. There were delegates from all over the world, but there was more to it than their mere physical presence. The spirit of the Congress was permeated with this belief in the identity of interest of those who are genuinely fighting against imperialism, colonialism, capitalism and racism. Indeed the Angolan revolution – especially during the invasion by the racist forces of Vorster – shows clearly that proletarian internationalism is not outdated and is not just a term to be found in the political dictionaries but a living weapon in the struggle against imperialism. The Soviet Union and Cuba proved this in Angola. Comrade Neto is open about this:

> "The volume of arms and diverse equipment was really impressive, arms which came principally from the Soviet Union, but also from Cuba, Guinea Bissau, Mozambique, Guinea Conakry and Algeria. . . .
>
> "Cuba not only supplied us with equipment which we were not able to use at that time owing to the limited technical preparation of FAPLA. It sent us officers. . . Some of them lost their lives in Angola for the cause of the Revolution, for the cause of Angola in defence of a people trampled upon during centuries of slavery."

Today there are thousands of Cuban military instructors, doctors, technicians and teachers in Angola. They are performing their internationalist duty. Cuba has opened 2000 scholarships for 1977 alone to Angolan students. It is not only Cuba, but other socialist countries as well; GDR, PDR of Korea, Hungary, Romania and Yugoslavia are all mentioned. African countries too: People's Republic of Congo, "the fraternal base of the MPLA in two liberation wars", Guinea Conakry, Zambia, Algeria and Tanzania.

This is internationalism in action. Raul Castro hit the nail on the head in an address delivered at a rally held in Luanda on September 12, 1977 when he said:

> "And when that moment arrives, when we Cubans withdraw from Angola, we are not taking with us oil, diamonds, coffee or anything else. We will only take the indestructible friendship of this great people, and the remains of our dead."

We South African Communists wish the MPLA success in the implementation of the "Guidelines up to 1980" which will lay the basis for a socialist Angola and communist society in our continent.

SENEGAL: DANSOKHO WRITES TO SENGHOR

A letter calling for the return of the African Independence Party of Senegal to legality has been written to President Senghor of Senegal by comrade Anath Dansokho on behalf of the Central Committee and Political Bureau of the AIP.

The letter states (in part):

As you know, the African Independence Party (AIP) has the unique distinction that it has been fighting uninterruptedly for twenty years for the national independence of Senegal, for democracy and for socialism. But, as you also know, for seventeen of these years, the AIP has been forced to develop its political activity underground. For the whole of its underground activity, its leading organs (Central Committee and Political Bureau) take full responsibility.

Our Party has a right to a legal existence and to the unhindered development of its political activities. The twenty years of its existence, of its activity in the service of the workers by hand and brain in Senegal testify that our Party is above all that of the struggle for independence, for national unity, for patriotic and democratic discipline – the Party

of a true socialist future for our society.

None of the stormy developments of Senegalese political life during these last twenty years has invalidated the firm class position of our Marxist – Leninist Party or its broad and profound vision of the national interest.

The fourth session of our Central Committee, in November 1975, gave a complete explanation of the basic reasons for the ban which struck our Party in 1960. It also clearly stated our wish to return to legality and the significance of such a return for the Senegalese nation and all the forces working for change in the people's interest. In spite of pitiless repression, our Party has incessantly struggled for the defence and extension of individual and public freedoms.

Mr. President, in demanding the return of our Party to legality, our Central Committee is well aware of the constitutional problem which has been imposed upon the country. We are also well aware of the underhand manoeuvres of a group of individuals who have had the impudence to associate the name of our Party with an operation directed against all the patriotic and democratic forces of Senegal.

THE REPLY

So far as the Constitution and the law governing political parties are concerned, we have three points to make:

a) Our Central Committee regards the present Constitution as a complete retreat from democracy. The system of three parties, as experience confirms, is a straitjacket on the social and political body of Senegal. We have complete confidence in the experience and the political maturity of the Sengalese people. For this among other reasons, our Central Committee believes that the number and size of political parties should be determined by the citizens of Senegal acting in full freedom of choice. Our objection on this point is shared by other forces, tendencies and personalities in Senegal.

b) Your Excellency has made statements which imply that the Constitution is to be reconsidered. You have yourself envisaged the revision of the Constitution and an increase in the number of political parties to four. You thus partially admit the justice of our objections to the artificial limitations established in November 1975 upon the number of parties and tendencies. The refusal to legalise the AIP in violation of the former Constitution, invalidates, both in Senegal and

abroad, the "opening to democracy" of which you claim to be the pioneer on the Continent.

c) In demanding, by this letter, the return to legality of the AIP, the Central Committee, while affirming the need for a revision of the Constitution in a democratic direction, is not doing anything illegal. One cannot speak of democracy in any meaningful sense if citizens cannot propose constitutional alternatives, differing from those of the authorities, and above all if they cannot appeal to the democratic judgement of the people.

The repression and political ostracism to which our Party has been and is subjected, were soon extended to other political forces and social organisations. This in no way serves the interests, properly understood, of the Senegalese people, but on the contrary it serves the interests of imperialism. The independent and progressive development of our country has suffered greatly as a result.

We are convinced that we reflect the profound convictions of broad sections of Senegalese opinion when we affirm that the credibility of the "opening to democracy" depends upon the return to legality of the AIP and the recognition of all political parties and social organisations who demand it.

In any event, our Party will remain true to its tradition of anti – imperialist struggle, to its role as a unifier of the patriotic and democratic forces in Senegal, against the forces of neo – colonialism and for progressive change, for the solution of the painful problems being experienced by the urban and rural workers by hand and brain.

(Signed) Anath Dansokho

We S.A. communists have always supported the struggle of the Senegalese working people under the leadership of the AIP. We ask all the democratic forces of the world to support – not only in words but in deeds – the struggle for the legalisation of the AIP because it is a struggle for genuine democratic reforms in Senegal.

ZAMBIA – WILLY BRANDT LECTURES AFRICA

On December 30, 1977, *The Times of Zambia* announced Willy Brandt's visit to Zambia in the following words:

> "That famous world statesman, former star of Europe's political scene, former rough-shod Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany and a close friend of Zambia – Mr. Willy Brandt – is here for a ten day visit, his first ever to this country."

The paper went on to say:

> "Mr. Brandt can boast of a local name in Zambia. It is in Zambia that he is jokingly and warmly referred to as 'Mr. William Banda'. During his hey-day as West German Chancellor, one of our local Members of Parliament referred to him in his speech in Parliament as 'Mr. Banda'. Because the name Willy Brandt sounded foreign, a Hansard shorthand typist took it to mean 'William Banda'. And so the name stuck. To us he is Mr. William Banda."

Who is this Willy Brandt? Willy Brandt is a man with many titles. He is chairman of the West German Social Democratic Party – a party which has "special relationships" with some African governments and movements. In November 1976 he was elected President of the Socialist International and, besides, Willy Brandt is also chairman of the 16 member North and South Independent Commission on International Development Issues, a commission which was established in early 1977 at the initiative of the World Bank President, Robert McNamara.

This commission comprises 7 representatives from "developing" countries including Tanzania's Minister for Communications and Transport, Amir Jamal; Upper Volta's former Planning Minister Antoine Dakoure and Vice President of Algeria's Popular Assembly and Minister of Commerce, Layachi Yaker. It includes former heads of State – Edward Heath of Britain, Olaf Palme of Sweden, Pierre Mendes-France of France and Erduado Frei of Chile. Willy Brandt is a powerful man; a "Big Man" as the ordinary African would say – a man who has political backing and money behind him.

Five days later the Zambian *Daily Mail* reported that Mr. Brandt had "attacked the super-powers' wastage on arms build up." He was speaking at the Lusaka Press Club luncheon held in his honour at Hotel Intercontinental on January 3, 1978. He spoke on "Peace" and his guests included President Kaunda and his wife Betty; Party

Secretary-General Mr. Grey Zulu; Prime Minister Mainza Chona and other Party and government officials.

It is said he categorised the "areas of conflict" as follows:

- The East-West conflict
- The regional conflicts
- The arms race
- The North-South conflict. On Southern Africa he "apologised on behalf of his countrymen and members of the German Bundestag (Parliament) who, during last year, might have expressed views on Rhodesia and South Africa which might have done harm to the process of change." A humble apology!

All this nonsense would not have worried us had it not been for the fact that the Zambian papers quoted Mr. Milimo Punabantu, President Kaunda's Special Assistant (Press), as describing Mr. Brandt as a "freedom fighter and revolutionary." He went on to say that if Herr Brandt had been born in Shabani, Gwelo or Umtali he would today have been in the jungle fighting for the liberation of the oppressed masses!

For the sake of the poor masses of the African people who might not know all the facts about the Social Democrats and the Socialist International, let us put the record straight. The history of the Socialist International is a history of betrayal of the interests of the working class and people of the "developed" countries and the colonial peoples. We refer here not only to the "old and traditional" Socialist International of the inter-war period, but to the "modern" one of our times. The recent history of the African people's struggle has enough evidence of this betrayal – be it during the "Suez crisis" of 1956 or the French Socialist Party's participation on the side of the government during the "Algerian crisis" or the role of the Belgian Socialists during the "Congo crisis" or the British Labour Government's policy towards the "Rhodesia crisis" or the lukewarm attitude of the West European "socialists" during the "Angolan crisis" – betrayal all the way.

A SCANDAL

The scandal which took place at the Tenth Congress of the Socialist International in Stockholm in 1966, when the Africans were refused the floor under pressure of the British Labour Party, which feared criticism on the Rhodesian question, is still fresh in our minds. And

the Eleventh Congress of the Socialist International at Eastbourne in 1969 said and did nothing that showed their commitment to the cause of African liberation except to complain about "negative anti-imperialism". Nor did the July 1975 Conference of the 26 African countries held in Tunis on "Planned Liberalism and the African Road to Socialism" – whose behind-the-scenes patron was the Socialist International – say anything except to attempt to spread anti-communism under the guise of "African socialism".

It is true that some Social Democratic Parties of Western Europe did give some material and moral aid to the liberation movements of the former Portuguese colonies. But equally true is the fact that the defeat of Portuguese colonialism in Africa "shocked" the Socialist International and "activated" some of its sections, with the result that at its Congress held in Geneva in November 1976 the Socialist International decided that "neutrality towards the existing and coming struggles in Southern Africa is impossible."

This did not by any means signify any revision of previous positions. But it did mean a "new approach". Later on in March 1977 in London, the Socialist International Bureau meeting decided to send a delegation to the front-line states from September 2-11, 1977. The report of this mission to Southern Africa does show a shift of position on some points e.g. recognition of ANC of South Africa, Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe and SWAPO of Namibia as the sole representatives and spokesmen of their people. But a closer look at the report raises some doubts as to the real intentions of these "socialists". Let us take as an example the following paragraph:

> "African countries do not want to be used as pawns in a power game. We must work to prevent a modern scramble for Africa stemming from super-power rivalry and from the profit interests of multinational companies."

We agree with them no African wants to be used as "pawns in a power game." But why do they associate the "modern scramble for Africa" with the so-called "super-power rivalry"? Why do they not identify the enemy of the African people clearly as imperialism, colonialism, racism and capitalism? Have the socialist countries ever colonised Africa or attempted to involve themselves in a "modern scramble for Africa"? Such clichés and jargon make us wary about the real meaning and intentions of the Social Democrats' new resolve to "prevent a modern scramble for Africa".

It is this "new approach", cynical and "subtle" as it is, that has dangers for Africa. We warn the African people against these "new friends" and their allies in Africa.

CENTRAL AFRICAN EMPIRE: BOKASSA LOOKS FORWARD TO THE PAST

On Sunday December 4, 1977, the former Central African Republic became an empire and President Jean Bedel Bokassa became Emperor and Catherine, one of his three wives, became Empress. On that day Bokassa was wearing a heavy gold crown which was studded with 2,000 diamonds.

Even before the event, thorough preparations had to be made: 2 dozen committees planned the reception and accommodation for 3,500 foreign guests who were present. (A striking feature of this occasion was the absence of most African states). It is said that a French foundry in Gisors built the imperial throne which measures 4 metres and weighs 2 tons and the 8 pale grey horses which pulled the royal throne to the stadium where the coronation took place were trained in France. So were the 6 horses which pulled the Emperor's son, the 2-year-old Jean Bedel Georges, the heir to the throne. The French artists decorated the Bangui Cathedral. The ceremonial uniforms of the 3000 Imperial Guard were designed and tailored by French specialists. At a ball that followed, 20,000 bottles of champagne and 40,000 bottles of wine were consumed. In all, the whole affair cost 30 million dollars – over 20 per cent of the national income.

What was actually happening? Was this simply a question of thirst for power or an attempt to impress the outside world? Where does this new "emperor" come from?

Born on February 22, 1921 Bokassa has not contributed positively to the African revolution. All we know about his past is his active participation in the French army since 1939. In 1950 he rose to the rank of company sergeant and at 37 he became a lieutenant. He fought in Indo-China on the side of the French colonialists and left a child there who, 2 decades later, had to be fetched by his Foreign Minister.

The little that is known about his political life is that his uncle Bartholomey Boganda founded the Social Evolution Movement of Black Africa (MESAN) which led the colony of Ubangi-Chari to independence in August, 1960. Boganda's nephew, David Dacho, became the first president and Bokassa set up the country's army. This perhaps gave him the opportunity to prepare for the coup which took place on December 31, 1965, after which Bokassa dissolved the National Assembly and abolished the Constitution. He became "President for life" and "Secretary General for life" of MESAN and in 1974 he became Field Marshal.

Nothing spectacular was heard of him until the sensational news when he broke down and wept at the Paris airport when he attended the funeral of former French President Charles de Gaulle whom he affectionately called "Papa". The same performance was repeated at the graveside in the churchyard at Colomby-les-Deux Eglises.

Bokassa made news again when he broke into prison in Bangui, the capital, accompanied by troops and thrashed the prisoners who had broken into and robbed the presidential palace. The last time we heard of him was when the Libyan leader Moammar Gadaffi paid him a visit in 1976. Bokassa decided to be a Moslem and adopted the name of Salah Addin Ahmed. But later this had to be renounced "because of his new functions as emperor".

This empire is a very poor country – it is one of the 25 world's poorest countries – and has a population of 2 million. It is landlocked and is 900 miles from the Atlantic Ocean bounded by Chad to the north, Cameroon to the west, Congo and Zaire to the south and Sudan to the east. It has no railroads. Waterways are the main means of communication and commerce. Manufacturing in the capital is still in its infancy employing only 25,000 Africans and 2000 expatriots. The peasants are victims of merciless exploitation by foreign investors and EEC countries. Even the "Operation Bokassa" which was meant to bring about agrarian reforms could not be implemented, for the simple reason that it was unpopular amongst the peasants.

The irony about the Central African Empire is that it is rich in mineral and natural resources (diamonds, uranium, mercury, limestone, chalk, maganese, copper, hardwood etc.)

One of the disturbing features of the Central African Empire's

toreign policy is its close economic and political links with apartheid South Africa – a fact which makes this country in the heart of Africa a launching pad against progressive forces on the continent.

The coronation of Bokassa was no mere joke. It was meant to strengthen the powers of international imperialism in Africa, especially at this juncture of the African revolution—which has abolished a number of monarchies—in Egypt (1952), Burundi (1966), Libya (1969) and Ethiopia (1973).

Let Bokassa look forward to the past but the masses of the Central African Empire are learning from their brothers in the neighbouring countries how to abolish empires.

SOUTH AFRICA AND THE ANGOLAN REVOLUTION

The following is the message delivered by a member of the Central Committee of the South African Communist Party to the first congress of MPLA in Luanda in December 1977:

Comrade President Agosthino Neto, comrade delegates; on behalf of the Central Committee of the South African Communist Party we greet the delegates to this historic Congress and, through them, the whole Angolan people. We greet you also on behalf of the scores of our Party leaders and members who can no longer greet you because they have died in action or have been murdered by Vorster's police. We greet you also on behalf of those many communists who are languishing in Robben Island and the other racist prisons. We greet you also on behalf of our great working class whose victory, in the words of your President, will be one of the most important achievements on our continent.

What is happening here today is of immeasurable importance not only for every Angolan but also for the whole of our continent, and beyond. In the 60th year of the greatest single event in the modern history of mankind, the October Socialist Revolution, Angola has begun to raise the glorious flag of the working masses. For Africa this event marks a giant step forward in the continuing struggle against imperialism, for peace and socialism. By this act clear notice has been given that imperialism will not pass, that Africa is beginning in earnest to reject its role as the hand-maiden of world capitalism, and that its working people are at last finding a way to take control of their own destiny.

The first Congress of MPLA is a stirring climax of your past battles and it is the starting point of a new one. You are beginning your third war of liberation – a war which still demands the vigilance of arms, but whose final victory, as your President has said, will be assured at the point of production in the factories and on the land and by the principal force of your continuing revolution, the working people.

Every one of your victories advanced not only the cause of the Angolan people but also reinforced the cause of progress outside your borders.

In your first war of liberation, together with your brothers in Mocambique and Guinea–Bissau, you helped pave the way for democratic advance within Portugal itself.

In your second war of liberation you taught that the independence struggle is not just a search for government office, but a striving for real People's Power. You did not pause, as others have done, with the raising of your flag and the singing of your anthem. You showed in the fire of struggle, that the fruits of your people's sacrifices are not up for auction to the local exploiters and other representatives of neo-colonialism. You have learnt the lesson of history that the independence celebration becomes the signal for world imperialism to make a come-back through its local puppets. And you dealt properly with the whole gang – UNITA, FNLA, FLEC and the careerists and demagogues who infiltrated your own ranks as part of the impure load which every revolution carries.

You taught also, in your second war of liberation, that imperialism and its dogs of war no longer have a monopoly of force in our plundered continent and that aggression by world reaction can be

defeated by a people's determined struggle supported by the forces of world progress, at the head of which stands the socialist community of nations. Together with your firm allies, notably the Soviet Union and Socialist Cuba, you reaffirmed the meaning of proletarian internationalism. Those who came uninvited, who occupied and plundered Africa for more than five centuries now have the audacity to scream "foreign interference" when a sovereign state requests the fraternal support of its close allies in order to repel and defend its independence against imperialist invasion.

Your defeat of Vorster's racist forces was a source of the greatest inspiration to the struggling masses of our own country. You showed, in practice, that it could be done. And your triumph was celebrated not only in Angola but in the streets of Soweto, and by the growing resistance throughout the land which the enemy's terror has been unable to put down.

THE CUBA OF AFRICA

But it is not only your example of struggle which fired the imagination of South Africa's oppressed. In his truly outstanding address comrade Agosthino Neto spoke movingly about the ravages of colonialism and the frantic efforts to destroy you at the very moment of your birth. You were left with so little on which to build. Yet the little that you had you did not hoard. You gave comradely shelter to liberation fighters. You did all in your power, morally and materially, to strengthen their resolve and capacity to intensify their struggles. And you did this with the full knowledge that you are risking further imperialist subversion and further aggressive blows against your young republic. This, dear comrades, is proletarian internationalism of the highest order. And that is why, amongst ourselves, we often speak of Angola as the Cuba of Africa.

We know that the scourge of inequality and racism, the ravages of colonialism and neo-colonialism, the legacy of backwardness and distorted development, everywhere have their roots in class exploitation. And until class exploitation is eliminated there can be no leap into a future of real independence, real national liberation, real democracy and real social justice. In short it is socialism, and only socialism, which can complete the unfinished African revolution. This is so for Angola and it is so for the whole of our continent.

The tasks you have set yourselves in your third war of liberation – to create conditions for the building of socialism – begins in earnest at this Congress. For it is here that you are creating the instrument, the vanguard Marxist – Leninist Party. Without such a Party, general proclamations about the socialist road have little, if any, lasting meaning. Without a vanguard Party of the workers there can be no real talk of worker's power. Without worker's power there can be no meaningful talk of building the foundations on which to proceed to socialism. Without the guiding ideology of Marxism – Leninism there can be no strategy for the ending of exploitation of man by man. Africa is not outside history. Here, as elsewhere, it is the class struggle, conducted as it is always conducted under specific conditions, which is the motor-force of social change.

FASCISM IN SOUTH AFRICA

Our country still faces its first war of liberation. It is a war against a ruling class which, unique in history, has created within a single border an imperialist – colonialist relationship whose dividing line is colour. Perhaps more clearly than anywhere in the world, the corrupt ideology of the ruling class – its extreme racism and fascist super-structures – is designed to serve the profits of the local capitalist class and its partners in Europe and North America. The slogan on which the present regime came to power 29 years ago was "Keep the native in his place". The recent so-called election in South Africa was a reaffirmation of this very same aim. By its overwhelming vote for fascism the privileged minority has taken a further step on the road to disaster.

In South Africa, comrades, the national struggle cannot be brought to its victorious end without the destruction of the system of economic exploitation and the whole racist state apparatus which serves it. At the same time, the class struggle has as its main immediate content, the destruction of racist tyranny. This aim serves the best interests not only of the main contingent of our revolution – the large and experienced working class – but also all classes and groups who face the discrimination and humiliation of continuing minority domination and racism. Our liberation aims serve also the long-term interests of the majority of the white group whose future in South Africa can only be secured through complete equality and democracy. The issue in

South Africa, Zimbabwe and Namibia is not, as the imperialists would have it, the protection of minority rights but the absolute destruction of minority privileges.

South Africa is the home of two political organisations, the African National Congress and the South African Communist Party, which pioneered working class and national movements on the African continent. The ANC's history goes back to 1912 and our Party became the first Marxist – Leninist Party in Africa when it was founded in 1921 just four years after the Great October Socialist Revolution, directly inspired by it. These two streams of revolutionary consciousness and organisation reflect the interplay of class and national factors in our struggle. And today, our liberation front, headed by the African National Congress, is moving with increasing momentum towards national liberation and eventual social emancipation.

Comrade President and comrade delegates, what you achieve in Angola is part of that momentum. What SWAPO achieves in Namibia, and what the Patriotic Front achieves in Zimbabwe is also part of that momentum. What we achieve in South Africa will, without a doubt, remove the biggest single obstacle to a free and independent Africa.

Viva O MPLA!
Viva O Internationalismo Proletario!
Viva O Marxismo – Leninismo!
A Luta da Classe Continua!
A Vitoria dos Operarios e Certa!

SAD LOSSES TO THE LIBERATION MOVEMENT

It is our sad duty to record the deaths of three outstanding leaders of the South African liberation movement – Dr. G.M. (Monty) Naicker, Duma Nokwe and Jack Hodgson. The three were comrades-in-arms in the liberation struggle, and their lives are an enduring testimony to the principles of brotherhood and co-operation which were embodied in the Freedom Charter and which guided and inspired the members of the Congress Alliance during stormy decades of resistance to white domination and apartheid tyranny.

Space prevents our giving them the full biographical treatment they deserve, but the story of their lives will repay study, for it shows how members of different race groups and very different backgrounds were brought together in the fight for national liberation and a free South Africa. Their story is in microcosm the story of the growth and development of the mighty liberation movement which has transformed the South African political scene and laid the foundations for the radical social change which is beginning to shape the future and from which coming generations will benefit.

MONTY NAICKER was descended from indentured labourers who had been brought from India to work in the Natal sugar plantations. Born in 1910, he was educated at Edinburgh University where he qualified as a doctor in 1934. Returning to South Africa, he established a successful practice in Durban – and that might have been the end of his story as it has been for so many professional men who put their careers before their principles and social conscience.

But Monty Naicker was a man of a different mould. A staunch nationalist, he soon came to realise that an exclusive nationalism was not the answer to South Africa's problems, but found his way forward barred by the reactionary clique then dominating the Natal Indian Congress led by Kajee and Pather. Monty placed himself at the head of the young militants who were working for a change, and after a long struggle and a Supreme Court action forced the Kajee – Pather clique to call a long-delayed meeting of the NIC. Fearing the outcome, the old guard did not even turn up to face their critics – and no wonder, for 12,000 people had gathered to attend this meeting in November 1945 at Curries Fountain in Durban, and they unanimously voted Monty Naicker into the leadership as NIC President. One month later a similar movement in the Transvaal ousted the reactionaries and in December 1945 Dr. Yusuf Dadoo was elected President of the Transvaal Indian Congress. The way was cleared for the transformation of the South African Indian Congress into a militant instrument for the promotion of the cause of liberation and in due course Monty Naicker was elected its President.

The Naicker – Dadoo combination was irresistible in Indian politics, and they held the stage without serious challenge until vicious banning orders all but smashed the Congress itself. Monty Naicker was involved in every campaign from the 1946 passive resistance against Smuts' Ghetto Act onwards. He was jailed twice in that campaign, he was jailed again during the 1952 Defiance campaign, he was a leading campaigner for the 1955 Congress of the People, one of the 156 accused in the 1956 treason trial. In the 1960 state of emergency he spent five months underground disguised as a Muslim priest. Towards the end of his life he was forced out of action by a combination of banning orders and illness, but his spirit was never dimmed. His reappearance on the political scene in 1977 to head the Anti-South African Indian Council was an inspiration to his community and to all

progressive South Africans.

But perhaps the most enduring monument to Monty Naicker was that, together with Dr. Dadoo and their young lieutenants, he brought the Indian people into action side by side with other groups of black oppressed peoples, and helped cement a firm alliance between the Indian and African people which is one of the corner-stones of the liberation movement today. The Naicker-Dadoo-Xuma Pact of 1947 proclaimed "the urgency of co-operation between the Non-European peoples and other democratic forces for the attainment of basic human rights and full citizenship for all sections of the South African people" and called for universal franchise rights for all South Africans and the abolition of all discriminatory and repressive laws. In 1954 Monty Naicker was called to open the ANC's 42nd conference in Durban, where he pledged the full solidarity of the Indian people with the Africans in their freedom fight. He was a close personal friend and confidant of Chief A. J. Lutuli, and over the years many joint statements of policy were issued by the two men in the name of their people. In 1976 he supported the students of Durban-Westville in their protest against the police massacre in Soweto.

Monty Naicker suffered for his cause. In 1966 he was even forced by the Group Areas Act to leave the home in Percy Street where he had lived for 20 years. But he never became embittered or disillusioned, retaining his cheerfulness and optimism to the end. As he lay dying in hospital, barely able to speak, he gave the clenched fist salute to a visiting friend. He died on January 11, 1978.

DUMA NOKWE was one of the most brilliant and courageous talents of his generation. Born at South Evaton, just outside Johannesburg, on May 13, 1927, he was educated at the famous St. Peter's school in Johannesburg and Fort Hare University in the days before it was wrecked by the Nationalist Government. After graduating with a B.Sc. degree and a diploma in education, he took up a teaching post at Krugersdorp High School.

Active in the ANC Youth League from his university days (he was its secretary from 1953 to 1958) Duma was inevitably drawn into political action and served a sentence for entering Germiston location without a permit during the 1952 Defiance Campaign. On leaving prison he was summarily dismissed by the Transvaal Education

Department, which would not even allow a farewell party to be organised for him by his students. Undismayed, possibly even relieved, by this setback to his career, Duma went as a member of the South African delegation to the 1953 World Youth Festival in Bucharest, and afterwards toured the Soviet Union, China and Britain. On his return to S. Africa, he wrote and spoke extensively about his experiences until silenced by a banning and restriction order served on him in July 1954.

Shut out from the teaching profession, Duma studied law, probably strongly influenced by the example of his ANC colleagues Mandela and Tambo. When he qualified in 1956 he became the first African barrister to be admitted to the Transvaal Supreme Court, but he was effectively prevented from practising his profession by a Native Affairs Department directive debarring him from taking chambers with his white colleagues in the centre of Johannesburg and ordering him to find an office in an African township. Duma contested the order, which conflicted with a Supreme Court rule that the offices of a barrister must be within reach of the court, but the issue was largely academic. By this time he had decided to devote his life to the liberation of his people, and his decision was effectively reinforced when he was arrested in December 1956 in the notorious treason trial. He was one of the small batch of accused who were persecuted to the very end of the trial, and his acquittal was only handed down in April 1961.

In the interim much water had flowed under the bridge. Neither the trial nor his banning orders stopped him from carrying out his political tasks in the service of the ANC, of which he was elected secretary general at its 46th annual conference in Durban in 1958. He was continually harassed, arrested on trivial charges and once brutally assaulted by the police, but his spirit remained undaunted and his cheerful smile and good humour in all circumstances made him one of the most accessible and popular of ANC leaders. He was at the organisational centre of every campaign, every stay-at-home, every mass demonstration of the 1950's and early 1960's which brought the ANC its mass membership and placed it securely at the head of the liberation movement. Jailed for five months during the 1960 state of emergency, he was no sooner released than he was busy at the task of reorganisation, and was one of the leaders of the multi-party commit-

tee which laid the foundations for the all-in African conference at Maritzburg in 1961 which marked the reappearance on a public platform of Nelson Mandela after years of banning and restriction. Duma Nokwe's political work was not confined to organisational and committee activity. A stream of articles flowed from his pen, and he wrote statement after statement setting out the ANC's policy on various issues, national and international. The police persecution intensified. He was repeatedly arrested and charged, his home was raided and he was placed under house arrest. Facing a long period of imprisonment under the Unlawful Organisations Act for promoting the aims of the banned ANC, Nokwe was ordered by the underground leadership to leave the country and crossed into Bechuanaland in January 1963, together with Moses Kotane.

Duma Nokwe's work in exile in the spheres of diplomacy and propaganda helped to win for the ANC the recognition and respect of the international community, and he was a well-known figure at meetings of the OAU and the UN and the many conferences on South Africa called by various anti-apartheid organisations. He was also one of the indefatigable team who presented the voice of the ANC over the radio by courtesy of friendly countries, helping to win for the movement a widening audience in the heart of apartheid South Aftrica itself. Slowly, however, his health began to deteriorate, and his death in Lusaka on January 12, 1978, at the early age of 50 was the climax of many years of struggle to overcome the effects of serious illness.

Duma Nokwe was not only a staunch nationalist but an equally staunch internationalist, a firm friend of the Soviet Union who welcomed the support for the cause of liberation of the international communist movement and the progressive forces in all countries. Though small in stature, in spirit he was a giant whose political perspective embraced all humanity, and who linked the fight of the ANC with the anti-imperialist struggle throughout the world.

JACK HODGSON came into the movement from the ranks of the white working class, and the class struggle was at the core of his thinking throughout his political life. He learnt his politics the hard way, as a young man seeking work in the grim years of the depression in the 1930's. His first job was as a digger on the alluvial diamond

fields in Lichtenburg, in the Eastern Transvaal, and from there he moved to the copper mines of Northern Rhodesia, now Zambia.

Jack was a born fighter, but he soon realised that for a worker to fight alone was to court defeat, and he became a staunch trade unionist and a socialist. On the Copperbelt he also helped to defend the rights of his African fellow-workers, and won a commendation for his part in securing the right of compensation for African mineworkers who contracted silicosis.

One of Jack's colleagues as a trade unionist on the Copperbelt was none other than Roy Welensky, a professed "socialist" but one who, unlike Jack, soon deserted his class and followed the road of opportunism. In 1938 when the white copper miners went on strike it was Welensky who headed the government which deported the union president Frank Maybank and declared Hodgson a prohibited immigrant when he tried to return after a brief holiday in South Africa.

Welensky's desertion taught Jack Hodgson that trade union action alone could never secure for the workers the rights and opportunities they were demanding. The experiences of life demonstrated the shortcomings of syndicalism and economism. So long as the bosses controlled state power, the workers would always be outmanoeuvred. The workers' struggle must be carried over into the political field so that they, the overwhelming majority of the population, could exercise power in the interests of the whole people.

On the outbreak of World War 2 Jack Hodgson joined the South African army and served in the North African campaign in the long-range strike force known as the Desert Rats. The future of South Africa was widely debated in the army and a survey conducted by the Army Information Service showed that under the influence of the anti-nazi struggle, thinking amongst white soldiers shifted appreciably to the left. The war-time alliance between the western nations and the USSR also made a tremendous impact.

In 1941 Jack Hodgson joined the Communist Party of South Africa and he also played a leading role in the formulation of the Springbok Legion, a militant union of soldiers and ex-servicement which was launched in the same year in a bid to ensure that the ex-soldiers of this war were not betrayed like their predecessors after World War I, that the noble aims of the anti-fascist struggle were carried out over into

civilian life in post-war South Africa.

Jack went through some terrible experiences while under fire in the desert war and his health was so severely damaged that, after a long spell in military hospital, he was invalided out with a pension. He became the first general secretary of the Springbok Legion, and from this time onwards his life was devoted to the task of mobilising and organising his fellow citizens for political action.

The Springbok Legion played a big role during the war and in the immediate post-war period in mobilising, not only soldiers and ex-servicemen, but wider sections of the population, black and white, against the Nationalist Party. But the victory of the Nationalist Party at the polls in 1948, followed by the failure of the Legion to halt the march to fascism which began under Premier Malan, led to a shift in the political centre of gravity and an upsurge of resistance by the black masses to the inhuman apartheid measures which were inflicted on them by the new regime. In response to an appeal by the ANC and the SAIC, Jack Hodgson played a leading part in the formation of the Congress of Democrats whose aim was to bring whites into the struggle side by side with the Congresses, at that stage engaged in the historic Defiance Campaign. Later in the '50s he was one of the 156 arrested for treason because of the part they had played in organising the Congress of the People in 1955 which adopted the Freedom Charter. Jack's subsequent career followed precisely all the vicissitudes of the movement in the ensuing years. The strikes and stay-at-homes, the boycotts and demonstrations – where the action was, Jack was to be found. Perhaps the most crucial role of all he was called on to perform was that of helping to organise and train the cadres of Umkhonto we Sizwe, the militant wing of the liberation movement – a task which absorbed all his attention and devotion not only in South Africa but also abroad when he and his wife Rica were forced to leave the country after being placed under house arrest.

Despite incessant persecution by the authorities at home, as well as the ravages of ill-health which dogged him throughout the post-war period, Jack stuck at his post, defiant and courageous to the end. His faith in his cause, his confidence in the final victory of the working class and the world-wide socialist revolution were never dimmed. His infectious enthusiasm was an inspiration to all who were privileged to work with him.

The African Communist, together with all South African freedom fighters, mourns the passing of these outstanding leaders of the liberation movement. In extending to their families our heartfelt condolences, we assure them that their lives and work will never be forgotten. Already a new generation of fighters has sprung forward to take up the weapons that have dropped from their hands.

BOOK REVIEWS

SELF – DEFEATING PROPAGANDA

The Communist Challenge to Africa by Ian Greig, Foreign Affairs Publishing Co. £3.

The purpose of this book is clear. It is to convince the major imperialist powers that their position in Africa is threatened and that in order to meet the threat, they must throw themselves wholeheartedly into the task of upholding white supremacy in Southern Africa.

In places, this aim is spelled out with complete frankness, and in his eagerness to advertise the usefulness of South Africa to world imperialism, Mr. Greig provides some very interesting information. For instance:

"The best known South African asset as regards the defence of allied shipping routes is undoubtedly the Simonstown naval base. . . . When all the extensions have been completed the base will be able to accommodate 50 warships under emergency conditions.

"The base will thus continue to be able to cater for very much more than just the needs of the South African Navy. Government spokesmen have made it known that it will still be available to ships of navies of friendly countries. . . .

"Six miles north of Simonstown at Silvermine lies one of the most elaborately equipped underground naval communication centres in the world. . . (It) is linked to the British Admiralty in London and to the United States. . . A system of video screens covering the entire area from the east coast of South Africa to Bangladesh and southwards from the bulge of the coastline of West Africa to the Antarctic enables the position of all known shipping in the area . . . to be displayed at will.

"A mass of information stored in computers enables the duty officer . . . to bring before him on the screen all relevant details . . . . The centre has space reserved for officers of allied navies for use in wartime or emergency."

Mr. Greig goes on to advertise South Africa's armaments industry, the size and quality of the South African armed forces and the large quantities of strategic raw materials produced in South Africa and occupied Namibia. The notorious Rossing uranium contract receives honourable mention.

That is the one side of his argument. The other is his description of the "Russian threat". He endeavours to build up his picture in a variety of ways. One chapter is devoted to the repetition of standard CIA material about the alleged espionage activities of Soviet diplomats and other citizens of socialist countries.

Other chapters, however, contain painstaking catalogues of perfectly normal events of a kind which nobody would dream of denying or concealing – the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and African countries, the existence of the African Institute in Moscow and the Soviet Afro – Asia Solidarity Committee, the purchase of arms from the Soviet Union by a wide variety of countries, the existence of liberation movements in colonial territories and the pursuit by those movements of their avowed aims, the expansion of solidarity with liberation movements by socialist leaders, the existence of the Anti – Apartheid Movement and the fact it enjoys support from the Labour, Liberal and Communist Parties and the World Council of Churches, etc., etc., etc.

For Mr. Greig and the sort of reader at whom his book is aimed, this is all evidence of a vast and sinister conspiracy, because they make the basic assumptions that the Soviet Union has no right to cultivate friendly relations with anybody, that colonial peoples have no right to struggle for their independence, and above all that nobody has any right to assist or sympathise with the liberation struggle.

But of course, it is not mere eccentricity or paranoia which leads Mr. Greig to present events in this way. His central thesis is, after all, perfectly correct. The position of the imperialists in Africa *is* threatened. The friendship of the Soviet people and the African people *is* an important element in that threat. Even the most ordinary, routine kind of contact between socialist countries and former colonial territories *does* weaken the neo-colonialist grip on Africa. The purchase of arms by Africans from socialist countries *is* contrary to the interests of imperialism. So is the existence of movements like the Anti-Apartheid Movement. There is no shortage at all of material to support the proposition that things are going very badly for imperialism in Africa.

Mr. Greig clearly hopes that the imperialists will react to this proposition by uniting in a last ditch stand with apartheid South Africa. If his hope is realised, he will bear his share of responsibility for the bloodshed which will result. It may be however, that propaganda of this kind will prove counter-productive. To the perceptive reader, Mr. Greig's book demonstrates how strongly the tide of history is now flowing against imperialism in Africa. There is already a formidable body of opinion throughout the Western world which repudiates the idea of restoring domination over Africa. By showing how difficult such a restoration would be, Mr. Greig may find that on balance he has strengthened that body of opinion.

P.M.

FACT OR FICTION IN ZIMBABWE

Black Fire: Accounts of the Guerrilla War in Rhodesia, by Michael Raeburn. Julian Friedmann Publishers Ltd. £6.95 casebound £2.95 paperback.

The author says in a preface that this book emerged as a result of his involvement in Rhodesia, first growing up in that country and then as a film-maker looking at its political situation and the military struggle taking place there. Over the years he had collected a good deal of "fresh and exciting" information about the guerrilla war. He had spoken to many people who were involved in one way or another in the war.

"I wanted to give the reader an impression of what it is like to be a guerrilla fighter — what it *feels* like to fight in the wilds of Rhodesia", he says. "Through my conversations I began to understand how the guerrilla sees Rhodesia, why he is prepared to risk his life, what personal agonies he goes through, what difficulties he encounters and what are his aspirations".

How to put it across? Mr Raeburn decided not to write a scientific ocumentary, which would be dull and lifeless, but to present his

capacity of the freedom fighters, of their level of political understanding and commitment, of the quality of their leadership and the thoroughness of their training etc. One man sums up his experiences while undergoing training in the Soviet Union; another tells of China; a third discusses the quarrels and conflicts between ZAPU and ZANU; another describes a mini-revolt in Tanzania. Are these happenings and opinions widespread? Or has Mr Raeburn only heard the views of malcontents and drop-outs?

Mr Raeburn himself says of one episode that "although (it) is about one man's experience of certain events in a widespread offensive, the story still provides an invaluable personal view of what went wrong not only with the Victoria Falls Campaign as a whole, but with the entire ZAPU military strategy between 1967 and 1970". His words have been carefully chosen. The episode represents the views of one man, yet the unwary reader may accept it as the definitive verdict on the whole campaign and on ZAPU military strategy over three long years. This could be not only dangerously misleading but damaging to the cause of liberation.

Mr Raeburn, of course, bears no responsibility for the conduct of the liberation struggle, and he has not written his book to promote the

A VERY MIXED BAG

African Social Studies: A Radical Reader
Edited by Peter Gutkind and Peter Waterman. Heinemann, £2.90 paperback.

This is a large (470 pages) collection of work by some 40 Africanist scholars, some of them African but mostly foreign and Western. It is a difficult book to assess. Firstly, it is rather dated — I could not find any piece originally published later than about 1973, while some go back to the mid-60s. Secondly, what is its objective? If it is to indicate to students and others that there exists a body of scholarship which questions imperialist views of African problems, it does that after a fashion, but it does so with much geographical unevenness and western bias in the authors. There are only ten scholars from independent Africa among the authors, and a further five expatriate South Africans — none of them writing about their own country, and none of them with a history of involvement in

would be fine if there were then a coherent body of theory set out in order to uncover the roots and find the truth. But the theoretical section is exiguous and weak, and the concrete studies very uneven in quality — though to be fair to their authors, the selections from their work are often so brief that judgement is impossible. The problem can be simply stated: it is virtually impossible to put together a reader of this breadth without imposing a severe organizational framework, preferably using only purpose-written pieces, and either having a broadly unified theoretical position, *or* showing with great clarity and precision how pieces written from very different positions still throw light on the central issues the book addresses. The editors of this reader have failed to observe these conditions. The result is a book which contains a number of interesting pieces (e.g. by Catherine Coquery-Vidrovitch on the question of a pre-colonial "Africa mode of production", Giovanni Arrighi on patterns of foreign investment, Samir Amin on "privileged" African workers), but which ends up being rather less than the sum of its

intellectual imperialism, and to give scientific content to the anti-imperialist and revolutionary sympathies which many students have, it is important to show how the Marxist method of political economy transcends capitalist economics and social analysis, both theoretically and in its ability to explain what is happening in the students' own societies.

Michael Sefali has addressed himself primarily to the theoretical task in his 56-page pamphlet. It is designed to give African students an elementary grounding in Marxist political economy, and it uses examples from Lesotho and other African countries to illustrate the theoretical points. The reader is introduced to some of the key concepts — mode of production, accumulation, surplus, class struggle, and so on — and then taken through Marxist approaches to questions of production, price, money, planning, trade, etc. The work concludes with a brief chapter on "Paths of Economic Development in Africa", which discusses capitalist and state-capitalist strategies of development, as well as the "non-capitalist path" being followed in countries such as Mozambique, Angola and Congo. This is a pioneering effort to provide Lesotho's students with an introduction to the Marxist approach, and with the means to

becomes doubly difficult to establish one's *own* argument as powerfully as possible. Finally, very careful attention must be paid to sources of further reading and study. The students need to be told where they should look for further detail or more advanced analysis of particular themes, and these references (checked for local availability, as they will often be foreign) need to be included in text or appendices.

Lesotho's students will have their perspective greatly broadened by this booklet. A number of scholars in other African countries are doing a similar revolutionary service to their people, often in typed or photocopied form, and often in ignorance of efforts elsewhere. There is need here for an exchange of materials and experience — perhaps through the *African Communist* among other means.

A. Langa

THE PARLIAMENTARY ROAD

Allende's Chile: An Inside View

by Edward Boorstein. International Publishers, New York

win full power, eliminate the bourgeois state and carry out the building of socialism.

Boorstein outlines in detail the problems that ensued. Although the national income grew from 54% in 1970 to 59% in 1971, and the

the armed forces began a series of searches for arms. With the danger of a coup looming, Allende called for a dialogue between the Christian Democrats and the Government in order to avoid a confrontation. Following this the opposition invited Allende to submit to a legal coup by calling for "A Ministry with the institutional participation of the Armed Forces". Allende resolutely rejected these terms.

By this time the military conspirators, having gotten rid of the constitutionalists in the Armed Forces, now controlled the leading commands of the army, navy and air force. There seemed to be no stopping a military takeover. On 4 September the UP held a gigantic demonstration, in which Boorstein took part, to celebrate Allende's election victory three years earlier. Seven days later the military conspirators struck. President Allende and many others fought in the Moneda Palace and died to keep the banners of revolution high for the future struggle.

In conclusion, Boorstein discusses a number of fundamental issues. Many people, for example, have argued that the revolution in Chile was

unsuccessful because the UP did not arm the people. Boorstein points out that it was not a matter of driving a truck through the streets and distributing weapons. Arming the people requires the appropriate circumstances and the force to be able to face the consequences of such action. Under the circumstances which held throughout the UP's tenure, any serious attempt at arming the people would immediately have brought the armed forces into action against it.

Boorstein directs his readers to one of the greatest lessons of the Chilean struggle – the need for unity. At the same time he draws the lesson of the Chilean experience of the "electoral road to socialism". Some 'revolutionaries' hold that armed struggle is the only way to socialism. Boorstein rejects this theory and argues that the problem is not whether a socialist revolution can be made by electoral means alone, but whether electoral means can play a part in the revolutionary process, whether it is possible to carry through to a successful conclusion a revolutionary process started with an election. His book has important lessons for revolutionaries everywhere.

R.M.

A SOVIET VIEW OF THE LIBERATION MOVEMENT

National Liberation Revolutions Today (Part 1) by K.N. Brutents, Moscow Progress Publishers, 1977.

This timely book by a Soviet historian, Professor K.N. Brutents, will be welcomed by both students of and activists in the developing countries. After the initial euphoria which the progressive world experienced in witnessing the national liberation of colony after colony in the late 1950s and early '60s, a period of disillusionment seemed to set in. With the exception of a few newly independent states, conservative and often reactionary forces took power and the material lot of the mass of the people barely improved. Social science literature on the third world grew prolifically, abounding in studies of ruling elites, ruling parties, mismanagement of economies, corrupt bureaucracies, maladministration.

Studies which concentrated on the peasantry or sections of the working class rarely considered these forces as politically significant,

regarding them almost exclusively in the light of manipulated and oppressed subjects. With the growth of Marxist studies on the developing countries, this balance has been increasingly rectified, but the tendency to underrate the revolutionary potential of such forces has continued, and has frequently been complemented by an ultra-left and nationalist romanticism. Professor Brutents' book is a refreshing counterbalance to all these weaknesses.

Introducing the first section of this work, Professor Brutents distinguishes two phases in the historical development of national liberation revolutions, the first belonging to the dying days of colonialism in which nationalism was the dominant ideology, and political freedom from foreign control the overriding aim. As the new phase begins, national liberation movements continue to develop in changing social structures, incorporating a changed balance of class forces. This theoretical distinction provides an important analytical approach for the study of these class forces and it is this study in particular which provides the book's most valuable contribution.

National liberation revolutions are firmly situated in the context of the primary struggle between capitalism and socialism, and hence in terms of an alliance between the socialist community and third world anti-imperialist forces in the confrontation with the international capitalist division of labour and neo-colonialism. This conception of the balance of forces enables Professor Brutents to reject a mechanistic transposition of class positions from the classic West European model to third world countries, and to develop instead a subtle and sophisticated approach to the configuration of class forces in these developing states.

Because of their role in the world revolutionary process, as forces against imperialism, national liberation revolutions are frequently in a position to take advantage of alliances which may even include sections of, if not the entire, local national bourgeoisie. Although the increased penetration of capitalism, under neo-colonial conditions, intensifies the social aspect — in which national liberation revolutions lose some of their 'national' while acquiring more 'class' characteristics — a denigration of the national aspect of the revolution leads to ultra left and destructive policies.

Professor Brutents warns against "mechanically regarding the national factor in any revolution as being a subordinate one and no

more." The political role of nationalism was of primary importance in the pre-independence era, and it continues to exert a driving influence in the current era of imperialist domination. Hence Professor Brutents stresses its present-day importance:

> "The national aspect, while appearing as secondary with respect to the purely class aspect in the general historical and socio-economic plane, is not subordinate when one deals with the political aspects of national liberation. What is more, it is even capable of playing the leading role in such revolutions."

The particularly warped form which capitalist relations evolve in colonial and subsequently neo-colonial states has had widely varying effects on the socio-economic basis of emergent classes, giving them a 'transitional' character and, in a historical sense, an occasionally unique one. Furthermore, the firmly-established socialist community and its unfailing support for anti-imperialist forces has meant that the revolutionary process in third world countries can advance further than the objective economic and social basis would 'normally' allow. These factors — of the specific form of capitalist development and consequent class formation, and of the alternative offered by the socialist world — are the consistent guidelines Professor Brutents

wrongly? In the last two decades, capitalist relations of production and circulation have penetrated the peripheral areas and backward populations of the underdeveloped world with unprecedented speed. The implication of this fact is two-fold: on the one hand, the rate and scale of social differentiation and class formation is greater than Professor Brutents' formulation implies, with consequences for the class composition of the national liberation movement. Secondly, and as a result of the dialectical process, the development of the national liberation movement calls into being enormous ideological, political and military counter-offensives on the part of imperialism. It is true, of course as the author points out, that direct intervention by the imperialist powers has become increasingly difficult, as the war in Angola illustrated all too clearly. Nevertheless, the military build-up of reactionary forces within the third world continues at a significant rate — vide the recent French guarantee to provide full support, including the most sophisticated arsenal, to African forces against national democratic struggles. Aided too by ideological control of the media and political repression of opposition forces, the allies of imperialism add full force to the intensified struggle, as a response to the growing demands of the exploited peoples of their countries.

National Liberation Revolutions Today is presented as Part 1 of the author's study. No indication is given of the substance of Part 2. It is to be hoped that when it appears, one deficiency of Part 1 will be remedied — by the inclusion of a bibliography.

Kiendeleo.

Typesetting and Artwork by IRAT Services Ltd, 44 Earlham Street, London WC2

Printed by Interdruck Leipzig