

The Embattled Africa

The Final Stage of the Collapse of Colonialism

Mankind's complete liberation from colonialism and the eradication of its last enclaves is an important task of today. The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1969 underscored the need to strengthen further the unity and solidarity among the fighters against colonialism. The meeting declared in its final document: "We call on all men of goodwill, on all supporters of democracy, to work together to do away with the vestiges of colonialism and to struggle against neo-colonialism. We urge effective internationalist measures in support of the patriots of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa, in support of all oppressed peoples."*

In all the periods of its history the Soviet Union invariably came out in defence of the peoples of the colonies, semicolonies and dependent countries, and made a tremendous contribution to the abolition of colonialism on earth. From its early days the Soviet Union vigorously and steadfastly fought against all forms of national and racial oppression and inequality, for a recognition of the right of the oppressed and dependent nations to shape their own destinies, for the recognition of the legality of a struggle for freedom and independence, an armed struggle included.

The time has come for the final abolition of colonialism.

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 34.

Dozens of sovereign states have arisen in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It is well known that their emergence was not the result of any voluntary concession of independence to the colonies and semicolonies by the imperialist powers. The liberation struggle of the oppressed nations was bitterly opposed by imperialism. During the last 15 to 20 years, however, it has been developing in a situation extremely favourable for the champions of national independence and social progress. Unable to hold back their offensive, imperialism is dodging, camouflaging itself and retreating. It is forced to abandon its formerly impregnable political and economic positions.

The moral and political debacle suffered by imperialism is evidenced by the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the 15th session of the UN General Assembly on December 14, 1960 on the Soviet Union's initiative and on the basis of the final draft submitted by 43 African and Asian states. The Declaration announced solemnly that it was mandatory to put an end without delay or reservations to colonialism in whatever form or manifestation. It was the first document in the history of international relations which denounced and outlawed colonialism in clear, unequivocal terms.

The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples conformed in content and spirit to the vital interests of the oppressed nations and helped them in their struggle.

The Declaration rejected the attempts of the colonial powers to use the most cynical and threadbare argument of the colonialists concerning the allegedly inadequate political, economic and social maturity of some peoples as a pretext for procrastination in granting them independence. The Declaration stated that an intention to destroy partly or fully the national unity and territorial integrity of a country aspiring towards independence was incompatible with the goals and principles of the UN Charter. This was a well-aimed blow at the imperialists' provocative policy of stirring up tribal feuds and territorial and border disputes, and of sustaining separatist and subversive elements.

And finally, what is particularly important, the Declaration demands an end to any military operations and repressive actions against the dependent peoples. This means the proclamation of such actions as illegal and the recognition of all forms

of resistance to colonial domination without exception as lawful.

Until the adoption of the UN Charter in 1945 international law had contained no universally recognised principles proclaiming the right of nations to self-determination and outlawing colonialism. The destinies of the colonial peoples were regarded as an internal affair of the metropolitan countries. By proclaiming the principle of the equality and sovereignty of nations the UN Charter thereby widened the sphere of application of international law.

It took years of continuous and intense struggle against colonialism on all fronts, however, for the consistently democratic anti-colonialist interpretation which was attached to the UN Charter by the USSR and other socialist countries, by all fighters for national liberation and social progress to be formally recognised in the UN Declaration adopted by the General Assembly in 1960.

The ground for the universal denunciation of colonialism in international law had been prepared by the emergence and development of the world socialist system, the powerful upsurge of the liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America, which had dealt truly devastating blows to imperialism. During the period between the two world wars, after the Great October Socialist Revolution the national liberation movement had given rise to a relatively small group of newly-independent states. After the Second World War this process assumed a widespread character, as it had been caused by the progression of the crisis of the colonial system to its full disintegration.

In the latter half of the 1950s the decolonisation process was greatly influenced by the Egyptian revolution, the debacle suffered by the tripartite imperialist aggression against Egypt in 1956, the victories of the Algerian and the Cuban revolutions, the Vietnamese people's heroic resistance to the aggressors, the Iraqi revolution of 1958, and the victory of the progressive forces in Syria. The peoples of these countries have demonstrated to the world that they are capable of repulsing armed aggression by imperialist interventionists and upholding their chosen path of independent development, leaning in their struggle on the support of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community.

The successes in the liberation struggle of the peoples led to a change in the alignment of forces in the United Nations.

This body was joined by new liberated states which are actively coming out for peace and national liberation and supporting the consistent anti-imperialist policy of the socialist countries.

All these circumstances have created an unprecedented and formerly impossible situation in which an anti-imperialist, anti-colonial declaration was imposed on the colonial imperialist powers at the UN General Assembly, and none of them ventured openly to oppose its adoption. The Declaration was carried by 90 votes. Its opponents — nine imperialist powers — did not dare to vote against it and simply abstained.

The years which elapsed since the Declaration was adopted have witnessed new successes in the process of decolonisation. Since the end of 1960 more than 20 new sovereign states have emerged on the African continent alone. The collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire under the blows of the national liberation movements and the democratic forces in the former metropolitan country was a great victory. New countries and territories have achieved independence in Asia, Latin America and Oceania.

The closing down of a number of foreign military bases in their territories was a substantial achievement of the countries in the process of liberation. These bases — the outposts of imperialism — are widely used to undermine their national independence and are a permanent source of international tensions. The closure and handing over of military bases to national governments was a great accomplishment of the national liberation movement.

Over the past years the liberated countries have made spectacular progress in developing their national economy and culture, in strengthening their economic and political independence, in setting up mutual ties and expanding friendship and cooperation with the socialist world. The orientation of a number of newly-liberated states on remaking society on socialist lines and on taking a non-capitalist path was a crucial factor in undermining the colonial system. It is precisely this new phenomenon that the imperialists regard as the most formidable threat to their interests.

Needless to say, it would be wrong to present the history of the national liberation movement in the 1960s and 1970s as a smooth road, without considerable difficulties, defeats and setbacks.

In the 1960s the policy and practices of neocolonialism took shape as a system of measures to retain the former colonies and semicolonies within the world capitalist system, and to preserve on this basis the imperialist economic exploitation of the young states despite the formal recognition of their political sovereignty. Neocolonialism resorted in the past and is resorting today not only to unequal trade. It knocks together military-political blocs, organises conspiracies and coups d'état, resorts to blackmail and threats, an economic blockade in a variety of forms, military provocations and direct intervention. Neocolonialism makes alliances with internal reaction and takes advantage of any contradiction inside the developing countries to meet its own objectives, in particular, of separatist and tribalist tendencies, which are intensively instigated by the imperialists and have led to great disasters for the peoples of Indonesia, the Congo, Nigeria, and a number of other countries.

Enclaves of colonialism, which is openly battling the liberation forces, have still survived in the world. The racist government of the Republic of South Africa, which is pursuing the inhuman policy of apartheid, and illegal white minority government in Rhodesia are defying the national liberation movement and the United Nations. They are supplied with arms by the United States, Britain and the FRG and are carrying out increasingly cruel punitive operations against the freedom fighters.

New trials and historic victories expect the fighters for national liberation in the future. The last stage of the full and final collapse of colonialism has a number of characteristic features.

In the first place, the armed and political struggle against the enclaves of colonialism and racism in southern and western Africa has intensified, and the opposing forces have further polarised and consolidated, with the result that today not only its direct participants are involved in the conflict on this front of the struggle against colonialism. It is common knowledge that the racist regimes of the Republic of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia could not have existed and pursued their policies without the economic, political and military assistance from the leading imperialist powers having a vested interest in the economic exploitation of southern Africa

and regarding the preservation of the stronghold of colonialism and racialism in this region as an important factor in holding back the national liberation and socialist movements.

The preservation of the racist regimes threatens the existence of the peoples languishing under their yoke, as well as the entire continent. In pursuing their policy of aggression the South African racists increasingly encroach on the independence and sovereignty of the neighbouring countries and are creating a real danger to the peace and security of the African nations. The RSA organised the invasion of Southern Angola by white mercenaries from Namibia, moved its troops into Southern Rhodesia to prop up the racist Smith regime, concentrated large forces on the border with Mozambique; it was one of the initiators of setting up the South African flank of NATO. The anti-colonial movement at the present stage, however, is repulsing the imperialist interventionists and their puppets by military and political means.

The peoples and political leaders of the liberated countries are paying increasing attention to the constructive programme of national development. They have learned from their own experience that a formal proclamation of independence alone does not guarantee genuine national sovereignty, that independence should be accompanied by a systematic advancement of the economy, culture and living standards of the people, and by deep-going social reforms. In the views of many peoples and leaders of the developing countries the ideals of independence and progress are more and more closely associated with socialism. The enemies of social progress were inclined to ascribe the non-capitalist path of development to the whims of some radical national leaders and rejoiced at its temporary setbacks in some countries, such as Ghana and Mali. The latest events, however, the revolutionary reforms in the Southern Yemen, Ethiopia, Benin and Madagascar have conclusively shown how logical, promising and attractive this path is coming to be seen by many developing countries, particularly in Africa. The desire of many African countries to secure for the state the positions of control in the economy and limit the economic influence of imperialism, and the democratic changes which have taken place in the political life of a number of Asian countries are evidence to the effect that in our days the liberation movement cannot be separated from the struggle for democracy and social progress. The champions of apartheid are finding themselves

in increasing isolation. On the African continent they have lost their ally (Salazar's Portugal) and are losing prestige on the international scene even in the eyes of the Western world because of their adherence to reactionary methods of government.

The Organisation of African Unity has pledged to continue its assistance to the newly-liberated countries, which is necessary for their economic development and stepping up the struggle against apartheid. A high degree of efficiency of this assistance will be attained if it is not isolated from international support. The obsolete, moribund economic system in many countries of Africa is in need of radical changes. Africa's struggle for a change in the economic position of the liberated countries is being advanced to the foreground.

Feeling the ground slipping from under their feet, imperialist powers are resorting to dangerous adventures and to methods which have already shown their inability to check and throw back the liberation movement, in particular, the methods of maintaining a long-lasting local tension in international relations or local imperialist aggressions. Historical experience has demonstrated that the peoples who are asserting their freedom and relying on the sympathy and support of the socialist countries, and progressive mankind as a whole cannot be stopped by the imperialists' resistance.

All-round assistance from the USSR and other socialist countries is of prime importance for the national liberation movement. As the CC CPSU General Secretary Brezhnev stated at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1969, "the Soviet Union, together with other socialist countries, holds active positions in the wide and seething front of the national liberation movement, and renders firm political support and moral and material help to the peoples fighting for liberation".*

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 170.

The Characteristics of the Current Stage of the National Liberation Movement

Africa remains one of the most important and complex sectors of the front of the peoples' struggle for their national and social liberation. This struggle is taking place in a fundamentally new situation, where the sphere of the direct political domination of imperialism in Africa has sharply narrowed. It has lost almost all of its colonies on this continent. The shrinkage of the sphere of its political domination in Africa, however, does not solve the whole problem. It should always be borne in mind that the national liberation movement in Africa is developing irregularly and that it is not sufficiently strong and consistent everywhere to prevent a revival of colonialism in new forms. This is expressed, above all, in the fact that the abolition of the direct military and political colonial domination, i.e. foreign occupation, is attended by a considerable increase in the indirect, and at times quite dangerous, neocolonialist pressure against many African countries. Imperialism is retreating to positions placed in advance, from which it would be possible eventually to launch a counter-offensive against the national liberation forces. It expects to attain its objectives relying, on the one hand, on the methods of neocolonialism, which has enmeshed the majority of newly-independent states, mostly in Tropical Africa, and on the other hand, on the preservation and strengthening of the outposts of colonialism and racism in southern Africa.

Taking advantage of the economic difficulties and the shortages of modern equipment and skilled manpower experienced

by the majority of African countries building a new life, the old and new colonial powers are attempting an elastic counter-offensive draped in various forms of "aid" to recapture their lost positions or gain new ones. In the meantime they are seeking to disunite the African countries, to undermine the faith of their peoples in the possibility of independent development, to prevent the transition of new states to the path of social progress, to perpetuate the unequal, dependent position of these countries within the system of the world capitalist economy and to thwart the establishment of strong ties between them and the socialist world.

The policy of imperialism in Africa cannot be considered in isolation from other factors. This is a component of the general struggle waged by the reactionary forces against the progressive forces on an international scale. Imperialism is engaged in a massive effort to strike a blow at one of the young contingents of the national liberation movement, and to thwart the consolidation of national independence, the development of democracy and the spread of socialist ideas. The heightened activity of the imperialist circles in Africa in the last few years has been caused primarily by the important socio-political processes developing here. Suffice it to recall that most of the socialist-oriented countries pursuing a non-capitalist path of development are situated on this continent.

In addition to political goals the African policy of imperialism is motivated by major economic interests. For the Western powers Africa is well-nigh the only supplier of certain kinds of raw materials of crucial importance to modern industry. Africa accounts for one-third of the capitalist world's production of vanadium, copper, lithium, beryllium, niobium, antimony, for one half of manganese and tantalum, for two-thirds of gold and for almost the whole output of cobalt and diamonds.

The colonialists' attempts to preserve their domination in Africa and save their remaining positions there demonstrate the full extent of the imperialist, neocolonialist danger to the young independent states. This danger, the increased activity of imperialism in Africa was pointed out specifically at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1969, which said:

Imperialism "tries to halt the growth of the liberation struggle and preserve and strengthen its positions in that continent. The British and French imperialists, and the imperialists of

the USA, West Germany and Japan are making extensive use of neocolonialist methods of economic, political and ideological infiltration and subjugation. The armed intervention in the Congo (Kinshasa), the reactionary coups in Ghana and some other countries, imperialist moves designed to dismember Nigeria, the political and military support given to reactionary and anti-national cliques, to the fascist and racialist regimes in the Republic of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, the fomenting of inter-state conflicts and inter-tribal strife, economic pressure and monopoly expansion — all serve to further imperialist plans.”*

This is why the struggle against colonialism and racialism makes up the main content of political life in Africa. The struggle to uproot the last colonial and racist regimes has international significance; it is the foundation of the militant unity of the African revolutionary movement with all the revolutionary and democratic forces of today, with the international working-class and communist movement, with the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole.

The US monopolies are taking the lead in the effort to check the progressive development of African revolution, to isolate it from the world revolutionary forces. The latest developments which have caused tensions in many areas of the continent and political instability in a number of African countries are conclusive evidence that US imperialism is a defender of everything that is reactionary and conservative in Africa. The US monopolies have repeatedly resorted to intimidation and blackmail, interfered in the internal affairs of independent African states, and have taken a hand in a series of reactionary military coups. The subversive activities of imperialism against African unity, its policy of active support for the racialist and colonial regimes in southern Africa are a matter of common knowledge.

The military bases of imperialist powers remaining in several countries are causing grave concern in Africa. They are a tool of political pressure against the young independent states, above all those which have taken the path of social progress. The armed forces stationed at these bases may be used at any moment to suppress popular actions, and to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign states. The closing down of mili-

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, pp. 15-16.

tary bases has become a political slogan of the anti-imperialist struggle throughout the continent.

Although the vested interests of US imperialism in the continent are not as great as those of other Western powers (the investments of US monopolies are estimated roughly at 3.5 thousand million dollars out of the total of 22 thousand million), it is precisely the US monopolies that are masterminding the united front of the imperialist powers against the African national liberation movement. They are assisting the racists of the Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia through the NATO machinery. Britain, Belgium and, to a certain extent, France have been compelled to surrender some of their positions in Africa to the United States in exchange for its support. In spite of their differences and contradictions on secondary issues, the imperialist policy-makers are seeking to operate in Africa in a united front. What is more, since the end of the Second World War the range of the capitalist states exploiting the natural resources and labour of the peoples of this continent has widened, in particular, by the accession of the FRG, Japan and Canada.

In view of the difficulties, mostly economic, suffered by many young African states, the old and new colonial powers expect to disunite the African countries, to erode their peoples' trust in the possibility of independent development, to carve up Africa into spheres of influence in line with the new balance of power in the inter-imperialist rivalry, and to prevent the transition of its peoples to a non-capitalist path of development. Relying on the feudal-conservative and bourgeois-reactionary forces, the social basis for imperialism and neocolonialism laid as far back as the period of colonial domination, and trying to strengthen and widen this basis in every way, the international monopolies, primarily those of the United States, are seeking to harness the liberated countries securely to the chariot of the world capitalist economy, to perpetuate and aggravate their unequal status within the system of the capitalist division of labour and to prevent strong regional economic ties between them, pursuing the aim of promoting the economic advance of the African continent, from being established and strengthened.

Africa's long-continued existence as an agrarian and raw materials appendage of the imperialist powers has had a pernicious effect on its economic development. The need to overcome this lag within a historically brief space of time

compels independent African states to request foreign aid, since they are short of capital, skilled manpower and managerial know-how. Cooperation with the socialist world has been a new, favourable factor. Now the liberated African countries are in a position to claim better terms of foreign economic relations, even within the framework of the world capitalist market.

|| The formation of the world system of socialist states and the disintegration of the colonial system have radically changed the conditions for the continued development of the economically backward countries. Having broken free of the chains of colonial slavery they have scored the first, at times quite spectacular, successes in their struggle for economic independence. The economic monopoly of foreign capital both inside these countries and in their relations with other states has largely been undermined. In their relations with imperialist powers they are able to oppose the latter's colonialist ambitions by relying on all-round cooperation with the world socialist system, and the growing anti-colonial solidarity of the Afro-Asian countries, which consolidates substantially the positions of the developing countries in their struggle to strengthen their political independence on the basis of a progressive restructuring of their national economies. Today the after-effects of colonialism are manifest primarily in the fact that the imperialist powers and foreign monopolies still retain strong positions in key economic sectors in the developing countries.

This is precisely the reason why in the economically backward countries, which have gained political but not yet economic independence, imperialism seeks to recapture in whatever form some of its former political positions, opposes fiercely the progressive forces struggling for complete national liberation and economic independence, tries to bring them to their knees or at least to make them retreat. To prop up its positions in these countries foreign capital takes advantage of the backwardness of their agriculture, food shortages, the difficulties of industrialisation, the enormous relative agrarian overpopulation and unemployment, the unfavourable balance of foreign trade, low revenues, the partial or slow implementation of agrarian reforms, and the extremely low living standards of the people consequent on general economic backwardness. Hence the constant need for stubborn and consistent efforts to heal the economic sores caused by colonialism. The recognition of nationalisation as an inalienable right of sover-

eign states and a lawful means of strengthening their independence, the widening of economic cooperation between Asian and African states, renunciation of fettering terms of aid causing harm to national independence and state sovereignty, the striving to pursue an industrialisation policy by building up state industry and implementing socio-economic reforms are evidence to the effect that the progressive forces in the African countries are fully aware of the need to wage a consistent struggle against the economic domination of foreign capital, which is the main factor, constantly felt and renewed, sometimes on an expanded basis, in the foreign exploitation of the natural resources and labour in the developing countries.

The liberated peoples of Africa have realised that the imperialists are unwilling to reconcile themselves to the abolition of their colonial domination and the inevitable downfall of the political regimes they have created. The gradual decline of the economic monopoly of imperialism in Africa, however differently this process may develop in different countries, is historically inevitable and is the logical result of the existence and development of the world system of socialism and the formation of independent national states on the ruins of colonialism.

The need to end economic dependence on the imperialist states and to uproot the feudal and semifeudal survivals causing poverty among the masses objectively requires that the developing countries should begin building up state industry and implement agrarian reforms. The peoples which have attained independence are aware that it is impossible further to strengthen their sovereignty and raise their standards of living not only without a consistent anti-imperialist struggle in the field of political relations with the imperialist countries but also without ending their economic dependence on imperialism. Fully determined to continue their fight against all forms of colonialism and imperialism, they deem it necessary to guarantee complete economic independence of their countries.

The favourable conditions for foreign economic relations which have taken shape under the influence of the socialist countries on international trade contribute to a definite quantitative growth of the exporting branches of the economy but do not by themselves effect qualitative changes in the entire economic structure, without which it is impossible to develop national productive forces and gain economic independence.

It is only a cardinal change of the colonial-communal structure of the economy, the maximum and planned utilisation of

all the internal material and manpower resources that will make it possible to raise the national productivity of labour and on this basis to increase employment and improve the social and material situation of the people considerably. This, however, will be done neither by foreign imperialism nor by African private capital.

For all the variety and specificity of the development of the African countries, particularly in Tropical Africa, they have one feature in common — profound socio-economic backwardness and economic division due to their long-continued colonial domination by the West. The economic structure of the majority of African states, which has taken form as a result of this domination, determines their unequal position on the world capitalist market, their dependence on the imperialist monopolies, economic separatism, the poorly developed social division of labour, the small capacity of the home market, and the vast unemployment of the population with all its corollaries. The fact that the African continent lags far behind Asia and Latin America in development rates speaks for itself.

The economy of Africa, Tropical Africa in the first place, was and remains the most backward in the capitalist world. It makes the basis for the most undeveloped social and class relations.

The economy of Africa continues to develop under its own momentum as the raw materials base of the imperialist powers. Its industrial production in per capita terms is equivalent to one-thirtieth of that of the developed capitalist states, and this gap tends to widen rather than narrow down in time. Simultaneously, the exporting branches of agriculture are growing at a faster rate than internal consumer production. As a result, in the first half of the 1960s food production increased by an annual average of 1.9 per cent, whereas the natural population increase was 2.5 per cent.

In the field of social development some independent African countries have made appreciable progress, whereas in the economic field they are practically in the take-off stage of a difficult and long struggle for economic independence. The growth of their productive forces is inhibited by their economic structure formed as a result of colonial domination and the prevalence of the subsistence economy, but primarily by the fact that they pay for what they buy more than they get for what they sell. Consequently, they are still tributaries to the imperialist super-monopolies.

The economic system of modern Africa is characteristically multistructural, which has left an imprint on the class structure of society as well. For instance, the family-tribal and patriarchal-feudal relations exist in the greater part of the continent, although the subsistence economy based on communal property is being relatively quickly destroyed by the market relations developing in town and country. In addition, the African countries have small-commodity, private capitalist and state capitalist structures. Enterprises belonging not to private foreign monopoly capital but to the state sector have a considerable part to play in the African economy, in such countries as Libya, Algeria, Guinea, the People's Republic of the Congo, the United Republic of Tanzania, and some other countries which have not only anti-imperialist but also certain anti-capitalist features and tendencies.

The present stage of the national liberation movement in Africa is characterised by an accelerated polarisation of the class and political forces. The socio-class structure of the African society is extremely complex and varied.

Since foreign capital has long monopolised the main sources of accumulation, the big and even the middle local bourgeoisie in many African countries is very weak. On the economic plane the national bourgeoisie can so far play only an auxiliary or an intermediary role. Local businessmen have no adequate capital and requisite experience, as a rule, and are incapable of handling the tasks of economic development on a nationwide scale. To cope with these tasks the African countries seek to set up a state sector and attract foreign capital. At the same time, it is a matter of first priority for them to implement correct government regulation of the economy and a thoroughly planned national economic policy. Incidentally, such regulation by no means requires an obligatory and immediate removal of private capital, either local or foreign. It only implies the institution of effective state control over private enterprise and a gradual curtailment and later closure of the colonialist and neocolonialist sources of accumulation, which precisely reflect the economic inequality of countries. Such control in the interest of developing the national productive forces is necessary not only during a transition to non-capitalist development; the young states cannot do without it in general in case they want to exercise their national sovereignty in the economic field.

The petty bourgeoisie has an important role to play in the

social life of the African states. As the main vehicle of nationalism and by virtue of its anti-imperialist sentiments it holds a conspicuous position on the political scene and its slogans enjoy popularity. In Africa, however, just as elsewhere, the petty bourgeoisie is characterised by ideological immaturity and political vacillations.

In many African countries the top echelon of the social structure consists predominantly of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, which is closely linked with the West and does not contemplate any sweeping reforms to improve the life of the people. The foundation of this social structure consists of the peasantry, the relatively small working class and the vast mass of urban semiproletarians, a specific social stratum characteristic of the former colonies. The rapid growth of the urban population (up to 10 per cent a year), which is many times greater than the actual demand for manpower, aggravates the political instability.

The position of the African working class is quite specific. It is numerically small. The mining and manufacturing industries employ roughly 3 million persons. More than one half of the urban workers are employed in the services and one-third in small semiindustrial enterprises. The proportion of permanent skilled industrial workers is small. They are employed mostly in large enterprises owned by foreign capital.

The young working class of the majority of Tropical African countries has not yet realised its historic role in the liberation movement or become a "class for itself". Despite the relatively small size of the African proletariat, however, it has an appreciably growing influence on the political development of different countries on the continent. The working class has come to advance political demands along with economic ones more often. It is gradually gaining prestige among wide sections of the people—the urban poor, handicraftsmen and small traders. The rural youth gravitate towards it also.

The peasants, which make up the bulk of the population, are greatly influenced by the tribal system, the African commune. Based on the indivisible, common property in land, it binds the peasants with a multitude of trammels, backward customs and prejudices. The patriarchal-communal relations, if they are not transformed into cooperative-collectivist relations or regulated by the state in the direction of social progress, may and do retard the transformation of the subsistence economy

into commodity production, generate backwardness and self-containment of the entire tenor of rural life.

In the last few years there has been a fairly rapid process of disintegration of the family-tribal, farmstead-hereditary and neighbourhood commune: a growing number of members, especially young people, break with it and leave for towns in search of jobs in extractive and manufacturing industries. Many peasants set up market-oriented farms. The governments of some African countries attempt to interfere in the communal relations and to "up-date" the system of landownership and land tenure. As demonstrated by experience, however, reliance on the traditional African commune, which is already in a stage of fairly far-advanced disintegration, in an effort to make it the basis for a new social structure, does not always yield positive results.

The main content of social life in Tropical Africa today is the struggle between different classes and social groups, some of which are still in a formative stage. However thickly veiled outwardly, this class struggle is developing mostly over the issue of the ways of strengthening the foundations of the national state and the prospects for its development. The gradual transformation of the tribal system into national communities, which is in evidence, is of immense importance. As is well known from history, this process has invariably run a slow and extremely painful course. What is more, in Africa it is taking place after a great historical delay and is aggravated by an active intervention of reactionary and imperialist forces.

Another of Tropical Africa's specific conditions is that the socio-class and political structure providing direct support for state authority has not yet attained maturity in all of the newly-independent states. For the time being, there are no relatively strong common national, socio-economic and production internal connections, a common national language and literature are often absent, and the language of the former metropolitan country often serves as a means of communication between different ethnic groups. All this complicates the formation of a single national-state and socio-economic organism, largely explains why in Africa's political life one observes almost everywhere the extreme instability of existing regimes and outbreaks of tribal and national feuds, and why the army so readily and often intrudes upon the sphere of government affairs in pursuance of goals which are far from always democratic and progressive.

The political instability, frequent coups and tribal strife leave a specific imprint on the situation in Africa. At times they create favourable opportunities for the imperialists to export counter-revolution covertly or overtly (armed intervention, conspiracies, terrorism), to set up subservient neocolonialist regimes or at least to plant in the government apparatus stooges of the neocolonialist circles bred and trained by former colonialists.

* * *

A theoretical and political analysis of the process of liberation of the African peoples which has been especially intensive since the early sixties suggests at least one important conclusion. The process of struggle for self-determination and the formation of an independent national state in Africa was much faster than the process of combination of all the main objective attributes of a nation, above all its characteristic national-bourgeois economy, which markedly differed from what had been experienced by Europe, North America and even Asia and Latin America.

The anti-imperialist struggle for the national self-determination of the African peoples was waged in the conditions of a pre-capitalist and largely a pre-feudal social structure thinly veiled in bourgeois relations developed mostly in the fields of commodity and money circulation. Imperialism was opposed by peoples most of whom were still living under a tribal system. If such actions of the African peoples had taken place in the 19th century, when the continent had already been carved up by the European colonial powers, they would have been brutally suppressed. Suffice it to recall the revolts of the Zulus, the Matabeles and the Mashonas, and other peoples. Nothing of the kind could have happened after the Second World War and the formation of the world socialist system. Imperialism was forced to take up a defensive posture, and the progressive sections of the African peoples and the African national-revolutionaries took advantage of that. Without waiting for a bourgeois nation to take shape they took the reins of power in the conditions of the tribal system still prevalent.

This gave the African peoples and their leaders an opportunity to choose their own way of socio-economic development and form a nation on a non-capitalist basis. It was up to the leaders and political groups to decide on this matter. Many of them took the path of establishing a national state, seeking to

free themselves from capitalism as a social system, while others unfortunately took the capitalist path paved by the former colonialists. This path, however, leads to a new variety of foreign domination — neocolonialism.

In a large number of African countries the pro-imperialist forces often turned out to be more consolidated than those coming out for genuine national independence and social progress. And small wonder, since the former have power and long-standing ties with the colonialists going back to the time of their direct political rule. In the majority of African countries the government machinery was not seriously purged and reorganised after the abolition of the colonial administration. When the imperialists were forced to grant political independence to their African colonies they, as a rule, left the administrative apparatus, which had been formed during their domination, intact.

It is not accidental, therefore, that in many African countries quite a few statesmen and politicians, who are placemen of the old and particularly of the new colonialists, have remained to this day. To their mind, the revolution ended as soon as they found themselves in power and the ways to personal enrichment opened before them.

All this sheds light on the nature of coups in a number of African countries. Some of them were motivated by a desire to preserve the privileges of the foreign monopolies, as well as the local exploiter groups accreted with foreign capital, and to safeguard the interests of the bureaucratic and military bourgeoisie infected with a lust of accumulation, enrichment and personal gain. International imperialism stops at nothing to reduce the independence of African countries to mere formality.

It is a historical reality that at the present stage no class in the majority of African countries is capable of spearheading a massive effort to transform the fabric of society. The weak African capitalism functioning mostly in the primitive forms of commercial and usurious capital is not in a position to accomplish this. As evidenced by experience, this task can be fulfilled only by an alliance of all genuinely anti-imperialist, progressive forces capable of setting up a national-democratic state and guiding the country along a path of independence and social progress.

As a result of the successes scored in the first stage of the anti-imperialist revolution, which has abolished the direct

political domination of imperialism in the greater part of the continent, favourable conditions have been created in Africa for a number of countries to switch over to non-capitalist development and implement sweeping socio-economic changes. The logic of revolutionary struggle in the interests of the people, the inability of the local bourgeoisie to cope with the cardinal problems of development lead many African statesmen, public and political leaders to conclude that Africa will be able to overcome its difficulties only by a socialist remaking of its social life and economy. Among the African peoples capitalism has long and quite reasonably been associated with the hateful colonialism. Such progressive tendencies serve as a major prerequisite for the independent countries of the continent to draw closer to world socialism and the international working-class movement.

The sweeping socio-economic reforms being implemented by the national-revolutionary, democratic forces, which are in power in such African countries as Tanzania, the People's Republic of the Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Benin, Ethiopia and others, may advance them to a frontier beyond which socialist horizons open. In the present epoch the objective necessity for the liberated African countries to change over to socialism can prevail under certain conditions and bring success. This is a cause for the peoples themselves, for the progressive socialist and anti-imperialist forces in each country to decide. Its success depends on their ability to struggle exactly for this path of development. Enjoying political and economic support from world socialism and taking advantage of the contradictions between the imperialist powers, the African states in which the national-democratic regimes rely on the masses can advance successfully along a non-capitalist path.

The masses repose in socialism their hopes for an early abolition of poverty and backwardness. Not only the young working class of Africa but also the wide sections of the petty bourgeoisie and the toiling peasantry, which constitute the massive basis for African revolution, are interested in a radical transformation of the African society on socialist principles.

The reforms carried out in the countries pursuing a non-capitalist path have already produced a favourable impact on the social situation of the people who have been given an opportunity to enjoy the first fruits of education, labour legislation and public health. The successes of these countries would have

indisputably been even more substantial if it were not for the resistance of domestic reaction, and the intrigues of the imperialist forces which stop at nothing in an effort to undermine the economy and discredit the progressive regimes in every way.

Difficulties connected with subjective factors are also in evidence. They are caused by the unavailability of adequate experience in statesmanship to many national-democratic leaders, as well as by their errors manifest in their predilection for a rule by administrative decree and in their certain isolation from the masses and their daily interests. Not infrequently such political and government leaders are oblivious of the need to conduct ideological, educational and explanatory work in the midst of the masses, confine themselves to verbal declarations and fail to live up to their promises, which naturally causes disillusionment among the people. Domestic reaction and imperialism are quick to turn these failings to their advantage.

As demonstrated by experience, for success in the struggle against the intrigues of domestic and foreign reaction the national democrats should be able to mobilise the masses to the building of a new society, to explain to them the essence of the national goals and tasks, to enhance their role in the government of the country and to give them material incentives to better work performance. It is imperative to strengthen the unity of all progressive forces for this purpose. It is also necessary to form a progressive party capable of leading the masses, of educating them politically and ideologically for an effective rebuff to imperialism and its local minions. Another urgent problem is a gradual reorganisation of the old government apparatus and, under definite conditions, a determined effort to break it up and purge it from dangerous corrupt elements, and to convert the army into a dependable stronghold of the national-democratic regime.

The need for cooperation and cohesion of all revolutionary forces in the name of a radiant future for the peoples of the continent is the guiding principle for the African Marxists-Leninists, whose ranks are widening and growing stronger. The Communists do not stand aloof from the progressive movements in modern Africa. They are closely following African social thought and everything new that the activity of the national-democratic forces introduces into the forms and methods of social reconstruction in conformity with the specific conditions of each African country. The successes of the

revolutionary democrats are largely dependent on how firmly and confidently they rely on the growing working class and other progressive sections of the working people.

A favourable situation is developing in Africa for close collaboration of the Communists and the revolutionary democrats in the struggle against imperialism, for socio-economic reforms and an improvement in the living conditions of the masses. In our day only hopeless dogmatists and sectarians can insist on the so-called "revolutionary intransigence" to the non-proletarian national-democratic forces. The Communists are active in disseminating the ideas of scientific socialism in Africa and combining it with the working-class movement, helping the ideological education of national-revolutionaries from among the intelligentsia and the peasantry, and primarily from the ranks of the organised working-class movement. At the same time, they collaborate with the vanguard socialist-oriented parties. They deem it their duty to levy criticism on the right wing of the national parties gravitating to capitalism.

The Communists also support measures directed to strengthening national independence and oppose with determination everything that may weaken the national regimes confronted by foreign and domestic reaction. By their ideological and organising work the Communists facilitate the adoption of the ideology of scientific socialism by the progressive sections of the working class, the peasants and the intelligentsia of the African countries. By applying creatively in conformity with the principles of scientific socialism the new forms of struggle and the slogans advanced by the movement for the national and social liberation of the African peoples, the Communists make a substantial contribution to the cause of revolutionary remaking of the continent.

The Struggle Against Colonialism and Racism

The tide of the national liberation movement which swept Africa in the postwar period temporarily stopped on the threshold of the countries where the colonialists and racists had entrenched themselves especially firmly. The ruling quarters of the Republic of South Africa, Salazar's Portugal and Southern Rhodesia took every measure to block the road to eradicating the last strongpoints of colonialism and racism in Africa. Without confining themselves to unilateral measures, they knocked together a covert military-political alliance in pursuit of the goal of preserving the racist and colonialist regimes and preventing new countries from taking the road of social progress, of building up in southern Africa a military-industrial base of imperialism, a bridgehead for a counter-offensive against the independent states of the continent. The imperialists are staking primarily on the preservation and consolidation of the last strongholds of colonialism and racism in southern Africa. The South African bloc of colonialists and racists set up for suppressing by force of arms the liberation struggle of the indigenous population of this area was directed against all African countries and threatened their independence and sovereignty.

The struggle against colonialism and neocolonialism, as well as against racism, is the linchpin of modern Africa's political life and the main direction of the activities of the anti-imperialist states in the Organisation of African Unity. The grave danger of counter-attacks of imperialism in Africa

had confronted its liberation movement with an all-important problem of strengthening the unity of the democratic forces for a rebuff to the colonialists and for rendering effective assistance to the peoples which are still waging a difficult fight for their national self-determination, at times against overwhelming odds. Effective support for these peoples is one of the factors uniting the independent African countries in their anti-imperialist struggle and laying the groundwork for a militant unity of the African revolutionary movement with the socialist world, with all revolutionary and democratic forces.

The stepped up activity of the colonialist and racist regimes in southern Africa, their unending intrigues against the movement for the freedom and independence of the African peoples are yet another evidence of the correctness of the conclusion made in the final document of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties to the effect that "of great importance for the future of Africa and the cause of peace is the liberation of southern Africa, one of the last areas of colonial domination".*

At the same time, to overthrow the racist-colonialist regimes in southern Africa is part of the struggle of the world's progressive forces against racism, this monstrous heritage of the epoch of colonialism, imperialism, social exploitation and oppression of small and socially and economically backward peoples.

Racism is guilty of many an atrocious crime against humanity. The extermination of whole peoples, the slave trade and the merciless colonial oppression of the aboriginal inhabitants of Asia, Africa and Latin America—all these and many other heinous crimes which capitalism has on its conscience were justified by all sorts of racist fabrications. Imperialism readily resorts to various "theories" intended to justify the conception of "superior" and "inferior" races.

The origins of racism go back in time to the slave trade and the colonial wars and are thus directly linked with the evolution of the capitalist mode of production. In the imperialist era racism assumed an especially cynical character as a tool in the hands of the exploiter classes by which they try to preserve their positions of privilege. Quite indicative is the fact

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 27.

that racism comes to full bloom where monopoly capital establishes the most reactionary forms of its domination—open dictatorship and fascism.

In our day the ruling quarters of the racist-colonialist regimes in southern Africa alone venture openly to declare their commitment to racism, which has been repeatedly denounced at the United Nations and other international forums. The overwhelming majority of other imperialist states have officially condemned racial discrimination. Legislation against racial discrimination, however, is ineffective since the socio-economic and political conditions generating racist conceptions and views remain unchanged in these countries.

The most striking example of this is the situation in the United States, which likes to call itself “the freest country in the world”. The century which has elapsed since the abolition of slavery has brought the 25 million American Blacks neither equality nor genuine freedom. Racism is linked organically with the deepest foundations of the US social system to this day.

In the southern part of the African continent a solid conglomeration of colonial territories and racist states, in which the indigenous population was oppressed, had existed until some time ago. The downfall of the Portuguese colonial empire caused the collapse of this “southern stronghold” of African reaction.

The racist reign of terror is continuing in its most violent forms in the RSA. In the hands of the ruling classes of the South African society racism is a weapon called upon to keep the non-European population in colonial bondage, to preserve a situation in which 3.7 million Europeans could maintain a high standard of life by a ruthless exploitation of the 16 million non-European population.

The policy pursued by the South African racists is based on the doctrine of apartheid, which implies a segregated existence and development of different races and national groups living in the RSA. The nationalist leaders are insistently brainwashing the population of European descent with the idea that the whites in South Africa are the “master race” whereas Africans are alleged to be “an inferior race”.

Any protest against the existing situation, and any attempt on the part of South African freedom champions to struggle for the restoration of their flouted human dignity entail reprisals. The political parties and organisations of the indigenous

population have been disbanded, the organs of the press which raised their voice in defence of the rights of the Africans have been banned. Tens of thousands of progressive-minded South Africans have been thrown into jails and concentration camps. The indigenous population is deprived of the vote in the elections to Parliament, provincial councils and other government bodies of the country.

In 1959 the RSA Parliament adopted the Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act. The Africans were promised broad autonomy in the areas of Bantu settlement—Bantustans. The racist rulers of the RSA hypocritically declare that the establishment of the Bantustans is a sign of the “wind of change” that has swept Africa during the last 10 to 15 years. Actually, however, Bantu “self-government” is nothing but a mockery of the freedom aspirations of the African population. This “self-government” is purely fictitious. The racists deny 13 million Africans the right of citizenship in the whole of the RSA territory, restricting their domicile to the limits of the Bantustans in the areas of the present-day reservations which account for only one-eighth of the country’s territory, with the rest of the territory occupied by the 6 million of the RSA population. The situation of the indigenous inhabitants herded in the reservations—arid lands of little agricultural value—is continually going from bad to worse and becoming intolerable. The white minority seeks to preserve its rule by a cruel reign of terror. A special Bureau of State Security (BOSS), subordinated directly to the Prime Minister and accountable neither to Parliament nor to the judiciary agencies, has been set up to direct operations against the liberation movement. Repression against the freedom champions is assuming an ever wider scale. The RSA leads the world for the number of death verdicts. The cruelty of the RSA’s racist punitive machinery reached an apogee on March 21, 1960, in the bloody massacre of peaceful demonstrations of the African population in the settlements of Sharpeville and Lang, in protest against the enforcement of a new law on passes for Africans which sharply restricted their freedom of movement already curtailed as it was. Scores of dead and about 200 wounded was the result of this slaughter. The echo of the Sharpeville shootings rang out throughout the world. It attracted attention to the violence of racism in the RSA and the rightlessness of its non-European population. At the appeal of the UN General Assembly the day of the Sharpeville massacre—

March 21 — began to be commemorated each year as the day of struggle against racial discrimination throughout the world.

Their “brethren in spirit” in Rhodesia are following in the footsteps of the racists of the Republic of South Africa. In November 1965 the racist government of Ian Smith, which expresses the interests of 250,000 European colonists, proclaimed Rhodesia “an independent state”. This action undertaken by the Rhodesian racists with the direct connivance of Great Britain denied, in effect, the 5 million indigenous inhabitants participation in the administration of the country and doomed them to a vegetative existence in conditions of poverty and humiliation.

Just as in the RSA, the racist Smith regime in Rhodesia does not scruple to use the foulest means to perpetuate the supremacy of the white minority over the African majority. Taking advantage of the connivance of the imperialist powers, Britain first and foremost, in June 1969 the racists held a so-called referendum to secure approval of the proposal for proclaiming Rhodesia an independent republic. In fact, it was a question of setting up another racist state modelled on the RSA, where apartheid makes the foundation of the entire life of society. The freedom fighters of Zimbabwe are waging an armed struggle for their rights.

* * *

The overthrow of fascism in Portugal and the beginning of decolonisation of Angola and Mozambique seriously changed the situation in southern Africa. The fundamental element in the RSA’s African policy—the line towards preserving the vast southern region under the direct control of the colonialists and racists—has suffered a fiasco. The strategic position of the apartheid regime has markedly deteriorated.

In spite of the changed situation, the immediate goal of the Vorster government in Africa remained the same. It consisted in legalising the regime and isolating the South African liberation movement from the independent states of the continent. The struggle to attain this goal claimed more flexibility and concessions from the RSA. One of them was its consent to recognise the African governments in the former Portuguese colonies and even collaborate with them on condition that they are stable and do not support the South African “terrorists”. Favourable changes were promised in the RSA and

Namibia. The Vorster government hinted that it would bring pressure to bear on Smith for a "just" settlement of the Rhodesian problem.

As for the promises concerning the RSA and Namibia, the RSA initiatives contained nothing new from the start. It was a question, in effect, of a certain acceleration in the programme of Bantustanisation, which the regime depicted as a means of solving the national question and guaranteeing the right to self-determination to the Africans of the RSA and Namibia. In Rhodesia the racists seemed at first to be prepared to go further than that. In the course of secret talks between Pretoria and Lusaka agreement was reached on facilitating the release of political prisoners, lifting the ban on political parties, widening the rights of the Africans, etc.

This was attributable to several causes. The international positions of the racist regime were quite weak: no country in the world had granted it formal recognition. With the beginning of the decolonisation of the Portuguese colonies Rhodesia had found itself exposed on the flanks, its importance for the RSA as a buffer state had declined and its strategic vulnerability had increased. Britain's Labour government took more vigorous steps to resolve the Rhodesian crisis than the Conservatives. The majority of African states, particularly Zambia, whose position had a great bearing on the policy of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) towards the RSA, insisted on the settlement of precisely this problem as a matter of first priority. Finally, Pretoria was less concerned with the interests of Salisbury than with its own. Hence the RSA and its Western allies took a decision to try and appease independent Africa primarily at the expense of the Rhodesian racists.

The RSA hoped to gain time by means of such concessions, intending for a start to prevent an escalation of confrontation between the OAU and the racist South, and to interfere with the African states taking advantage of the favourable situation to step up pressure on the regimes and increase support for the liberation movements. The racists concentrated on an effort to thwart the freedom fighters' armed struggle, and declared the need for a peaceful settlement of disputes between the "white" and "black" Africa and a relaxation of tensions in the south of the continent. Hence the racists' main counter-proposal was for a "ceasefire", which practically meant a demand for the guerillas' withdrawal to their mustering-up areas.

The RSA and its imperialist patrons sought to attain their goals by a recourse to the time-tested tactics of splitting the ranks of the Organisation of African Unity. This time, along with such traditional advocates of a "dialogue" as the Ivory Coast, they largely succeeded in securing support for their plans from Zambia. Among the circumstances which induced Zambia to give in on this issue one may refer to its weariness from confrontation, its growing economic difficulties and political instability, and the pressure from the imperialist powers accompanied by promises of support in exchange for a reversal of its policy. Another factor was indisputably the fear of Zambia's ruling circles lest the left forces consolidate their positions in the liberation movements and the prestige of socialism, the countries of the socialist community increase along with the aggravation of the conflict over the South. The activities of Zambia's ruling circles were supported by Tanzania and a few other countries. The situation which has developed seems paradoxical. The victory over the Portuguese colonialists has not on the face of it stimulated the anti-imperialist tendencies within the OAU but has entailed, as it were, a shift to the right in its political orientation. This gave birth to the OAU's new strategy.

The new strategy was formulated in the Dar-es-Salaam Declaration on Southern Africa and a number of other resolutions adopted by the Liberation Committee in January, and the 9th Extraordinary Session of the OAU Council of Ministers in April 1975. The Kampala Summit Meeting of the African Heads of State and Government approved these documents.

As a result of pressure from the left, in which Algeria was particularly active, as well as of the political circumspection of Zambia and Tanzania, the declaration looks almost impeccable outwardly. It describes Vorster's initiatives as new manoeuvres for the purpose of reducing if not neutralising the results of the revolutionary changes in the region. Having reaffirmed without reservations the OAU's commitment to the cause of complete liberation of the continent, the declaration proclaims the RSA Enemy No.1 of Africa. The African states reject apartheid and all its manifestations, including the so-called independent homelands (Bantustans), and appeal for a stepped up economic, political and cultural boycott of the RSA.

The OAU decision to regard the liberation of Rhodesia

and Namibia as a task of first priority also appears logical. They are considered to be the weakest links in the system of racist domination. The OAU demands independence for Rhodesia "on the basis of majority rule", the RSA's withdrawal from Namibia and the preservation of the unity and territorial integrity of this country, and recognises SWAPO as a lawful representative of the Namibian people.

Nevertheless, according to a unanimous assessment of the national liberation movements, the changeover of the OAU to a new strategy was a step backward.

In 1969 the so-called Lusaka Manifesto for the first time in the OAU's history allowed for the possibility of a peaceful settlement of the problem of the South provided the regimes agree to recognise the right of the enslaved peoples to equality and self-determination, and to open talks with leaders of the liberation movements concerned on translating this right into reality. In the event of fulfilling the OAU conditions by the regimes, the African states assumed a commitment to persuade the patriotic forces to abstain from demands for an immediate liberation and armed struggle and agree to a gradual peaceful takeover of government. The OAU warned at the same time that in case of a refusal to accept the manifesto as the basis for a settlement the armed struggle would be stepped up.

After the racist regimes had rejected the Lusaka Manifesto the emphasis was laid on an intensification of the armed struggle (Mogadishu Declaration of 1971). Now the Dar-es-Salaam Declaration again put in the foreground the "quests of opportunities for a peaceful change" although it recommended combining them with full preparedness for an intensified armed struggle. It meant Rhodesia in the first place, regarding which the declaration proceeded from the possibility of winning independence by peaceful means, in particular by means of a constitutional conference, with the liberation forces and the Smith regime taking part. The Dar-es-Salaam Declaration thereby fell back from the Lusaka Manifesto by sanctioning "a peaceful settlement" without a preliminary recognition by the Rhodesian regime of the right of the Zimbabwe peoples to self-determination.

In itself the desire of independent Africa to achieve its goals without bloodshed, avoiding unnecessary sacrifices and suffering, did and does deserve full support. At the same time, nobody expected the racists to act on the decolonisation issues

in the same way as the new authorities in Lisbon. In contrast to Portugal the character of the government regimes in the RSA and Rhodesia remained unchanged. Their situation had deteriorated but not to a point of surrender. To achieve practical results it seemed necessary for Africa to support its diplomatic and political steps with strong military pressure. This, however, failed to occur.

Once they had sensed the lack of determination in the Organisation of African Unity, the racists immediately took a harder line on the Rhodesian problem. Only a small part of the political prisoners were released, the state of emergency was not lifted, the activities of the liberation organisations were obstructed in various ways, and the calling of a constitutional conference was delayed under various pretexts.

As a result of the racists' manoeuvres the positions of the liberation movement on the eve of the constitutional conference deteriorated on the whole. This was aggravated by the contradictions between the parties which had united under the aegis of the African National Council in December 1974. Conciliatory elements in the African population, particularly among the intellectuals, became more active. For his part, Smith behaved defiantly, declaring publicly that majority rule was out of the question in the lifetime of the present generation.

The declaration contains no specific proposals for the mechanism of a peaceful takeover of power in Namibia. "If South Africa has no intention to end its illegal occupation of Namibia," it says, "the OAU should help the national liberation movement in Namibia, SWAPO, and intensify the armed struggle."

The RSA's actions demonstrate clearly the racists' unwillingness to withdraw from Namibia. The RSA government's position explained to Kurt Waldheim and his special envoy in the course of the consultations in 1972 and 1973 sanctioned by the Security Council has not changed. The racists continue to deny recognition to SWAPO as the sole lawful representative of the Namibian people, are stepping up reprisals against the freedom champions and going ahead with the policy of Bantustanisation.

In January 1975 a repeated election to the puppet Parliament of Ovamboland was held. The first attempt to organise such an election in August 1973 failed ignominiously: 97.5 per cent of the electorate responded to SWAPO's appeal for its boycott.

This time the racists, resorting to threats and deception, succeeded in forcing slightly over half of the voters to go to the polls.

As is known, by a decision of the United Nations, South West Africa (Namibia) is to be granted independence. This decision is opposed by the RSA and its fulfilment is systematically obstructed. After the rigged elections in the Ovambo zone the racist regime stubbornly continues its manoeuvres with the object of breaking up Namibia into Bantustans. As a result of the reign of terror and oppression on the part of the racist regime, there is a massive exodus of the country's inhabitants to Zambia, which aggravates the situation of the refugees grave as it is. These refugees, mostly members of SWAPO, describe the cruel and humiliating treatment of the indigenous population by the racist regime. Flogging of those who call for the freedom and unity of Namibia, particularly members of SWAPO, has become a matter of routine. Arrests and arbitrary detention are a common thing.

The deadline set by the Security Council for the withdrawal of the South African administration from Namibia was May 30, 1973. Pretoria ignored this demand. In the prevailing situation the SWAPO leadership deems it necessary to step up armed actions. In this matter the party is coming up against an overt and covert opposition from some leaders in Zambia's ruling circles.

The "new strategy" is causing the greatest damage to the liberation movement in the Republic of South Africa. Although the Dar-es-Salaam Declaration not only appeals for a boycott of the RSA but also comes out in "support of the struggle of the South African liberation movements in whatever form", the anti-RSA orientation of the policies of a number of neighbouring countries has practically lessened.

While giving lip service to a peaceful settlement, the RSA government has boosted its preparations for war. The country's military budget for 1973/74 was increased by 480 million rands, and in 1974/75 by another 700 million. The arms appropriations were raised simultaneously from 117 to 311 million rands. "Detente" did not stop Vorster from intervention in the Angolan events, where the RSA backed up the FNLA and UNITA.

As for the situation in the RSA itself, signs of another upsurge in the popular movement have been in evidence here during the last few years. The strike movement continues

unabated. In 1972 and 1973 the country was swept by a wave of strikes involving up to 200,000 people. The resistance of the non-white groups to the resettlement programmes has increased. There is discontent among the peasants, and the young people, and a growing tendency towards unity between the coloured and the Indian population. At the same time, the contradictions within the ruling class itself have exacerbated, which is evidenced, in particular, by the division within the opposition United Party.

It has evidently been realised in Pretoria that the attempts to deal with the situation exclusively by means of a reign of terror will not yield the desired result this time. Therefore, while continuing the reprisals against the freedom champions, the regime has undertaken certain "reforms". The wages have been slightly raised, concessions were made in the questions concerning the right of the African workers to organisations and to strikes, the law on criminal prosecution of Africans quitting their jobs was abrogated and the system of passes mitigated. The regime concentrated its efforts on accelerated Bantustanisation. In 1976 "independence" was granted to Transkei.

* * *

Racism was also an inalienable attribute of the policy pursued by fascist Portugal in its colonies — Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau. Here it took somewhat different forms. While the RSA openly proclaimed the doctrine of apartheid, racial segregation, i.e. separate existence of different racial and ethnic groups, the Portuguese colonialists advocated "assimilation" of Africans. In an effort to deceive world opinion they declared their colonies "overseas provinces" and formally granted Portuguese citizenship to all indigenous inhabitants, but the change in name did not change the colonialist essence of their policy. The indigenous inhabitants were prevented from participating in socio-political life by insurmountable barriers. For instance, the right to vote and to election was granted only to "assimilated" Africans meeting a number of qualifications: they have to speak and write in Portuguese, to adhere to the Christian faith, to have permanent income sufficient to maintain one's family, to pay regular taxes, not to evade conscription and lead a "Portuguese way of life".

These requirements were a mockery of common sense, the natural rights and aspirations of the indigenous inhabitants, and their national dignity. The number of "assimilated" persons in Angola was only about 1 per cent of the total number of Africans, and less than 0.5 per cent in Mozambique.

Why did Portuguese colonialism turn out to be more long-lived than its stronger British, French, Belgian and other accomplices in plundering the peoples of the colonies? An explanation of this fact should be sought in the socio-economic system of Portugal, its relations with the biggest imperialist powers.

The fascist regime which reigned supreme in this country for almost half a century was the basis for the most barbaric colonialism, a tool for oppressing the Portuguese people, of suppressing its rights and interests. Thirty-five per cent of the population of Portugal was illiterate, the press and all mass media were subjected to severe censorship, and only 15 per cent of the country's population enjoyed the suffrage rights. All the other adult population, including women, lacked, as the Portuguese authorities alleged, "adequate civic maturity". This level of "democracy" in Portugal was concurrent with an extremely backward structure of the economy entirely dependent on foreign capital.

Prime Minister Dr. Marcelo Caetano who headed the Portuguese government since September 26, 1968 at first stinted no promises to "liberalise" the regime. Contrary to his "liberal" promises, however, his government continued the policy of the former dictator Salazar.

The policy of enslaving the colonies did not change either. If Salazar had set himself the task of "enduring" the war against the peoples of the colonies, Caetano laid claim to winning it.

The successes of the African patriotic insurgent organisations compelled the Portuguese colonialists to resort to new tactics intended to undermine the national liberation movement from within. One example of the tactical manoeuvres of imperialism was the intention of the Portuguese government to grant Angola and Mozambique a measure of autonomy (with the metropolitan country retaining decision-making powers in the key fields of defence, foreign affairs, economics and foreign trade).

The demagogic manoeuvres of the Portuguese ruling quarters were intended to cultivate among the African population

collaborationist elements ready to make a deal with the Portuguese colonialists. The granting of limited autonomy to the "overseas provinces" in the politico-legal aspect looked as an attempt at "Africanisation" which fascist Portugal sought to implement in its colonial policy after the fashion of the US policy of "Vietnamisation". This "Africanisation" assumed definite forms in the military field. A military training centre for Africans was set up in Mozambique. The local residents trained there were enlisted in the Portuguese colonial army and engaged to form special task units for anti-guerilla warfare. The inhabitants of "local population centres" set up around economically important areas were issued with arms "for self-defence" in the event of a guerilla attack. This served the same object of "making Africans fight Africans". All these manoeuvres intended to set African civilians on the national liberation armies or to isolate them from the popular masses interfered with the armed struggle of the freedom fighters and created additional difficulties for the enlistment of new members in the insurgent army.

Along with the use of neocolonialist methods and attempts to split the local population the Portuguese colonialists were building up their military power and sought to step up operations against the national liberation forces.

Portugal kept a large army under arms and spent on its upkeep and the war in Africa sums which were enormous for such a small and backward country. According to the London International Institute for Strategic Studies, in 1969 Portugal kept 122,000 officers and men in its African territories (55,000 in Angola, 40,000 in Mozambique and 27,000 in Guinea). Portugal's military spending in 1969 was 321 million dollars. This was a 630 per cent increase over 1949. By the end of the colonial period the strength of the Portuguese forces in Africa had reached 170,000.

The intensified operations of the Portuguese authorities in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau met with the growing resistance of the national liberation forces. Whereas on the moral-political plane the national liberation forces possessed considerable reserves and advantages both inside the country and on the international scene, in the military field the insurgent movement came up against many difficulties in organising armed struggle.

Taking advantage of these difficulties, which are encountered by the national liberation movement, imperialist propa-

ganda went out of its way to “convince” the Africans of the “futility” of their struggle, to stir defeatist sentiments among them and to bribe some bourgeois elements prone to make a deal with imperialism.

The fanatical urge of the Portuguese ruling circles now overthrown by the democratic revolution to hold their African colonies was motivated by their fear of losing a source of enrichment of exceptional importance to the ruling classes of fascist Portugal, which brought them an annual income of over 250 million dollars.

An important factor which prolonged the life of Portuguese colonialism was the coordination of its efforts with the actions of the South African racists. Both sides had long recognised the community of their destinies and interests and backward Portugal received all-round assistance from the rulers of the RSA and Southern Rhodesia, who felt themselves in a safer position and for whom the Portuguese colonies were in turn a territorial obstacle to the liberation movement which had spread throughout the continent.

The bloc of fascist Portugal and the South African racists operated in an extremely active and well-coordinated way. In the RSA, Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies aided by other imperialist powers the armed forces were being built up, though they were already much larger than the armies of the majority of the independent countries of Tropical Africa put together. Special attention was given to training units for anti-guerilla warfare. The RSA formed “invasion forces”—well-trained units equipped with modern weapons, which could be quickly moved to any district both inside the country and abroad.

Facts indicate that the colonialists coordinated their military operations aimed at suppressing the liberation movement. For instance, over 2,000 South African troops took part in fighting the guerilla movement in Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) and jointly with South Rhodesian troops provoked armed incidents on the Zambian border.

It will be no exaggeration to say that the Portuguese colonies, as well as the oppressed peoples of the RSA, Southern Rhodesia and Namibia, would have long won freedom if the imperialist member-countries of NATO had not acted as vehement supporters of colonialism and racism. The biggest multinational monopolies had practically unlimited opportunities for their activities in the Portuguese colonies. This is

why for their part they spared no funds or effort to support the rule of the colonialists.

Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau in the politico-economic sense might be called colonies of international monopoly capital, colonies of the bloc of the member-states of NATO. Foreign capital dominated all the key branches of the economy. The diamond fields were controlled by Anglo-Belgian-American capital, the production of iron and manganese by West German and American capital, and the oil-fields by American and Belgian trusts.

The NATO military-political alliance attached great importance in its plans to the strategic position not only of fascist Portugal itself but also its colonies. Under an agreement with the government of fascist Portugal the United States built air bases on the Azores. These bases handle up to 80 per cent of the flights of US military aircraft across the Atlantic. The islands are also used by American nuclear submarines. West Germany also had military training bases in Portugal. In 1967 the Special Command of the NATO Allied Forces in the Iberian Atlantic set up its headquarters in Portugal. Its task was to ensure ocean communications and safeguard the sea approaches to the Mediterranean. In fact all or nearly all of what the Portuguese armed forces had at their disposal, in Africa in particular, had been supplied by Portugal's NATO allies.

On the international scene the imperialist powers more and more frankly resort to open support for the South African reactionary regimes. This is evidenced by the repeated visits of official representatives of the former British Conservative government and emissaries of monopoly capital in Salisbury. The collusion between the British Tories and the Rhodesian racists was directed to legalising the Smith regime and handing over to it "on legal grounds" the power which the regime had usurped in 1965. Simultaneously the collusion between the then ruling circles of Britain and Rhodesia served their common goal of reinforcing racist Rhodesia, which is a stronghold of imperialism fighting the liberation movement of the peoples of southern Africa.

This is attested by the British Conservative government's decision to resume arms supplies to the South African racists. Another evidence is the decision of the US Congress to lift the embargo on chromium imports from Rhodesia. Representatives of the Western powers in the UN agencies sys-

tematically thwart the implementation of effective measures against the colonial-racist regimes and, in particular, a hardening of sanctions against Rhodesia and their extension to the RSA, which is openly violating the ban on trade with Rhodesia.

Relying on all-round support from the imperialist powers the reactionary forces are attempting to extend the economic and political expansion of the RSA both to the South African region and to a number of independent African countries. The West-inspired idea of a "dialogue" with the RSA was proclaimed by President Houphouët-Boigny of the Ivory Coast. Although the majority of African countries, as pointed out above, rejected this idea, it was also supported by representatives of Lesotho, Malawi, Madagascar, Gabon and Mauritius. The RSA and Malawi have established diplomatic relations. The idea has not yet petered out, and the "dialogue" is already in progress. Time will show what it will lead to. One thing is clear: the racist regimes will not give up their positions by way of a "dialogue". They will reckon only with real force and the unity of the African peoples and states fighting against racism.

In future, in view of the economic difficulties and the political instability of some African states and the great economic potential of the RSA, one cannot rule out a manifestation of tendencies towards rapprochement with the RSA regime on the part of individual states, which may produce an unfavourable impact on the alignment of forces on the African continent and the development of the national liberation movement in the South African region. The growth of the economic and military ties between the RSA and Israel graphically demonstrates that they are supposed to play a more or less similar role in the African strategy of imperialism, one of undermining the unity of independent Africa.

In spite of definite differences in the policies of the leading imperialist powers in the south of the African continent, all of them operate in the final analysis as conspirators in a reactionary bloc. The multinational monopolies make enormous profits on capital invested in the economy of the RSA, Rhodesia and the former Portuguese colonies. The stability of the racist regimes and the conversion of the former Portuguese colonies into neocolonialist states, obeying the orders of the monopolies, give them the most secure guarantees of waxing fat on the exploitation of the enslaved African peoples.

However, it is not only a question of the RSA and Rhodesia being assigned a highly important role in implementing the far-reaching political plans of imperialism. According to the designs of the imperialist strategists, these countries are called upon not only to step up the rising tide of national liberation revolution in southern Africa, but to become a kind of bridgehead for neocolonisation of the continent. Hence the active economic, political and military support given by the West to the RSA and Rhodesia.

Notwithstanding the cruel tyranny of the colonialists and racists relying on the military and economic power and support of world imperialism, the will of the indigenous population was not subdued, its freedom aspirations only grew as its exploitation and the racist reign of terror were intensified, and its struggle assumed an increasingly determined character.

In contrast to the majority of the now independent African countries where the national liberation revolution was implemented mostly by peaceful means, the national liberation movement in the Portuguese colonies, Rhodesia and the RSA culminated eventually in an open armed uprising against its oppressors.

The armed struggle was started in Angola in 1961, in Portuguese Guinea in 1962, in Mozambique in 1964, in South West Africa in 1966, in Rhodesia in 1967. "The armed struggle which is being waged in this area by the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa is inflicting heavy blows on the coalition of fascist and racialist regimes, which are supported by the imperialists, and is opening up prospects for fresh big victories of the African revolution,"* said the final document of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties.

The struggle of the African peoples for their liberation was headed by the national-revolutionary parties: the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) in Angola, the Front for the Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO) in Mozambique, the African Party for Independence in Guinea and Cape Verde Islands (PAIGC) in Guinea-Bissau, the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) in Rhodesia, the African National Congress (ANC) in the RSA and the

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 27.

South-West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO) in South West Africa.

As regards the class composition of all these parties the ANC alone has a membership consisting mostly of workers and semiproletarian sections of the population. The bulk of the membership of the MPLA, PAIGC, FRELIMO and ZAPU are peasants (about 90 per cent). These parties regard the national petty bourgeoisie as their ally. The working-class stratum within these parties is small; the role of the trade union organisations following them is unimportant. Since the vast majority of the rank-and-file party members are illiterate or uneducated, the policy of these parties is determined by the national-revolutionary intelligentsia, which constitutes the core of their governing bodies.

All these revolutionary-democratic organisations regard the abolition of the colonial and racist regimes, the conquest and consolidation of national independence and the establishment of a democratic state as a task of first priority. As for their long-range goals, they are now being planned in detail with a view to social progress, restructuring the economy, control over foreign capital, developing national industry and agriculture, establishing a state sector in the economy, implementing an agrarian reform, intensive training of research and engineering personnel, raising their own intelligentsia, reorganising the government apparatus, etc.

Of great importance is the programme of the African National Congress—the Freedom Charter—which contains a list of contemplated sweeping socio-economic reforms: the establishment of a democratic multiracial state, nationalisation of mineral wealth, the banks and industrial monopolies, distribution of the land among those who till it, etc.

Many leaders of the national-revolutionary parties of Africa hold political views close to socialism. In the former Portuguese colonies they matured ideologically under the influence of the Portuguese Communist Party, and in the former French colonies, under the influence of the French Communist Party. The ANC leaders are closely collaborating with the South African Communists.

The level of political maturity of the FRELIMO, MPLA, PAIGC, ZAPU and SWAPO is steadily rising. These organisations consistently adhere to anti-imperialist positions, seek to develop cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and denounce the splitting activities in the

national liberation movement. This does not rule out occasional manifestations of Utopian socialism and nationalism among their members.

The imperialist circles, which are keenly interested in fragmenting the forces of the national liberation movement, encourage the formation of groups opposed to the revolutionary parties, give these groups financial aid and plant agents within them.

The liberation movement of the peoples of southern Africa and the former Portuguese colonies gained strength in the face of formidable difficulties. Broad sections of the local population united under the slogan of the struggle for independence. The freedom fighters stubbornly fought Portuguese punitive troops, for the satisfaction of their lawful demands. The liberation movement in the Portuguese colonies, which had grown into a war of national liberation by the mid-sixties, had an important distinctive feature: without waiting for complete liberation from the colonialists the revolutionary forces solved some important tasks of socio-economic development in the areas placed under their control. The revolutionary parties set up a number of institutions of popular government: military, economic and administrative, which directed activities in the liberated areas, organised agricultural production and trade, facilitated the development of public health and education. In this way the foundations of the future state were laid. The leadership of the revolutionary forces paid close attention to social problems, improving the conditions of life of the local population. This testifies to the profoundly national character of the policy they pursued and correct understanding of their tasks and duty to the people.

The leaders of the patriotic organisations repeatedly offered the government of fascist Portugal to settle the problem of granting independence to its colonies through negotiation. The Portuguese fascist government, however, ignored these proposals, thereby assuming full responsibility for the war which was flaming up with growing intensity in these areas.

Defying brazenly the UN decisions and world opinion the Portuguese colonialists were determined to drown the popular struggle in blood.

The agreement concluded by the ANC and ZAPU in the summer of 1967 on joint military operations against the racist regimes of the RSA and Rhodesia was a milestone in the development of the national liberation movement in southern

Africa. Since the autumn of 1967 joint guerilla units of these parties carried out in Rhodesian territory a few daring raids against local security forces and police contingents urgently moved in from the RSA to reinforce them. However, the insurgent liberation movement has not yet assumed a wide scale here.

Without relaxing their efforts to prepare armed resistance to the racist regimes the freedom fighters in the RSA and Rhodesia have actively used other methods of liberation struggle.

The breach in the united front of the colonialists and racists of South Africa at its most vulnerable point—the Portuguese territories—was a historic victory for the democratic forces heralding complete deliverance of the entire African continent from the most cynical forms of racial oppression and imperialist exploitation in the near future.

After the thirteen years of the colonial war it became obvious that fascist Portugal was unable to suppress the armed struggle for national liberation by military means. For all the financial and military aid from the NATO countries, which enabled Portugal to keep in Africa a 170,000-strong army equipped with modern weapons, and despite the internal difficulties in the national liberation movement itself, the national-democratic parties widened and perfected the forms of armed struggle against the enemy and dealt him shattering blows. During their long struggle against the Portuguese colonialists the national-democratic parties formed numerically small but battleworthy armed forces. They expelled the Portuguese from a number of areas in Mozambique and Angola, and the Republic of Guinea-Bissau was proclaimed in Guinea-Bissau in September 1973.

The diverse military aid, political and moral support from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries enabled the freedom fighters of Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique to change over to a fundamentally new stage in their armed struggle—offensive operations in capturing heavily fortified enemy strongholds.

The anti-popular policy of the fascist regime, its military setbacks, the growth of self-awareness in the Portuguese army, its unwillingness to continue the colonial war, the exorbitant military expenditures exhausting the country's economy, inflation, the exodus of skilled manpower abroad, as well as the increased political isolation of Portugal on the

international scene inevitably created a crisis in the country, led to an upsurge of the democratic movement, a growth of the anti-fascist and anti-war sentiments within the army and among the people.

While admitting the exceptional importance of the armed struggle which was waged by the peoples of Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau for independence, against the Portuguese colonial army and the fascist colonial regime, as well as the influence of this struggle on the situation in the metropolitan country, it should be pointed out, however, that the crisis of fascism in Portugal and its downfall were triggered off by a combination of factors: the stubborn and long-continued struggle of the democratic forces, above all, the Portuguese Communists, the political isolation of Portugal on the international scene, the massive armed national liberation movement, the support and assistance rendered to this movement by all progressive forces and the socialist countries, the Soviet Union first and foremost, Portugal's defeat in its colonial war, the revolt of the democratic elements in the army and the active struggle of the working class under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party of Portugal.

The combination of the democratic revolution in Portugal with an upsurge of the liberation movement in the colonies, the relations of mutual understanding and support between the progressive and democratic forces in the metropolitan country and in the colonies brilliantly bore out Lenin's idea of an alliance between the working class in the developed countries and the exploited masses in the colonial world.

After the overthrow of the fascist regime in Portugal in April 1974 the national liberation struggle in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau entered its final stage. Portugal's democratic forces in the face of active opposition from Spínola and his followers expressed their willingness to begin decolonisation, and Portugal recognised the right to independence of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and the Cape Verde Islands.

Pursuing a policy of democratisation of their country, the Armed Forces Movement of Portugal and the Provisional Government appealed to the national liberation movements for a ceasefire and the opening of talks on a peaceful solution to the problem of the colonies.

The process of decolonisation was the most successful and

the speediest in Guinea-Bissau. Portugal recognised the Republic of Guinea-Bissau as a sovereign state. Under an agreement signed in Algiers on August 26, 1974, Portugal pulled out its armed forces and administration from the Republic of Guinea-Bissau in October of the same year.

As admitted by the leadership of PAIGC, its victory was made possible by the long years' stubborn armed struggle of the people of that country, the assistance of many African states, primarily the neighbouring Democratic Republic of Guinea, the Organisation of African Unity (Liberation Committee) and the steady, all-round aid from the socialist countries, primarily the Soviet Union.

At present the leadership of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau is confronted by complicated problems connected with the formative period of the young state. In the foreign policy field the Republic's government is pursuing a policy of non-alignment, operating within the framework of the OAU and in compliance with its Charter and developing friendly relations and cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Integration with the Cape Verde Islands is the most crucial aspect of the foreign policy of PAIGC.

In the economic field the first priority task before the government of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau is to advance, expand and modernise agricultural production. Because of its economic backwardness Guinea-Bissau, which has a potential for building up an independent economic base, will need economic aid during the coming years.

As a result of FRELIMO's successful struggle and the developments in Portugal its democratic government recognised Mozambique's right to independence. The talks in Lusaka from September 5 to 7, 1974 culminated in an agreement on the proclamation of Mozambique's independence on June 25, 1975, the termination of hostilities and the formation of an interim government, which came into office on September 20, 1974.

The Republic put down attempts at armed struggle on the part of right extremist elements of the white minority and steadily replaced Portuguese forces with FRELIMO units. On November 1, 1974 there were over 14,000 FRELIMO troops in Mozambique.

Under the Lusaka agreement four to five thousand Portuguese troops (of the total 70,000) were evacuated from Mozambique monthly. The FRELIMO leadership took prompt steps

to form a regular army, which was necessary for maintaining law and order, and for national defence.

Despite some difficulties the process of decolonisation of Mozambique was on the whole successful, and the complete independence of the Republic of Mozambique was proclaimed in the summer of 1975. The Republic is led by the FRELIMO party steered in the national liberation struggle, which is guiding the people along the path of social progress. The party is implementing the principle of non-alignment in its foreign policy.

The decolonisation of Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Angola gave rise to a series of new social, economic, political and ideological problems involved in the development of statehood. The imperialist forces have stepped up their efforts to interfere actively in the internal affairs of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Angola, making use of their difficulties, to influence their political orientation and gain advantageous economic positions for themselves.

The victory of the national liberation forces in Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Angola is of great importance in the general context of struggle against international imperialism and colonialism, particularly on the African continent. Independent Mozambique and Angola are changing the military-political situation in southern Africa and lending urgency to the problem of decolonisation of Namibia, Rhodesia and the RSA. A decisive contribution to the struggle against the remnants of racism and colonialism is being made by the peoples of southern Africa themselves. Their actions, however, would not have been so effective without support from the democratic forces of the whole world in a variety of forms.

The United Nations has been turned into a rostrum for denouncing racism and colonialism by the consistent policies of the Soviet Union, other socialist countries, and the young developing states. At the 7th session of the UN General Assembly as far back as 1952, the Soviet Union urged the UN members to put an end to the violations of the fundamental principles of the UN Charter by the government of the Union of South Africa.

The Declaration on the eradication of all kinds of racial discrimination, adopted by the 18th session of the UN General Assembly in 1963, makes it incumbent on all states to repeal the laws and regulations generating and perpetuating racial discrimination and calls for an end to be put to the policy of racial segregation, particularly the policy of apartheid, pursued

by some states and authorities. Soviet representatives have repeatedly tabled proposals at the United Nations for applying the harshest sanctions to the RSA which is refusing to comply with these principles. The Soviet Union came out against the unilateral proclamation of Rhodesia's "independence" by the racist minority in November 1965.

On the Soviet Union's initiative the United Nations proclaimed the year 1971 International Year of Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

In all its activities on the international scene the Soviet Union abides by the spirit of the UN resolutions declaring the equality of all races and peoples and asserting their right to struggle for their freedom and independence. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries consistently act as loyal friends and allies of the oppressed peoples and are invariably prepared to give them support and aid in their struggle for political and economic independence.

The Soviet people have profound feelings of solidarity with the courageous struggle for national and social liberation being waged by the freedom fighters of Africa. The attitude of Soviet people to the activities of the progressive forces on the African continent is determined by the principles of the Leninist policy on the national question and by a realisation of the important contribution the national liberation movement in Africa is making to the world revolutionary process.

The CPSU and the Soviet Government, loyal as they are to their internationalist duty, invariably take a determined and consistent stand against colonialism and racism, and in support of the peoples struggling for their freedom and independence. The forms of such support and cooperation with different contingents of the national liberation movement are quite varied, ranging from statements by Soviet delegates at the United Nations to all-round economic and military aid.

This broad and multilateral cooperation is exemplified by the relations which have taken shape between the CPSU and the national-revolutionary parties of Africa, particularly the MPLA, FRELIMO, PAIGC and ANC. The establishment of such relations was made possible by the consistent anti-colonial and anti-imperialist policies of the national-revolutionary parties, their striving to develop ties with the socialist community of nations, the Soviet Union first and foremost, and by the ideological proximity of the leaders of these parties to socialism. The CPSU regards the national-revolutionary par-

ties as genuine representatives of the peoples of these countries and recognises the revolutionary character of their armed struggle.

The CPSU's cooperation with the national-revolutionary parties of Africa is exerting an appreciable influence on their policy planning, contributes to the enhancement of the Soviet Union's prestige and to bringing them closer to the ideology of scientific socialism. It stimulates more active anti-imperialist and anti-colonial struggle and is a major revolutionising factor in the political development of the entire African continent.

World socialism and the international working-class movement are powerful and reliable allies of the national liberation movement in Africa. This is an encouragement to the African fighters for freedom and independence and is the guarantee that the long-suffering people of Africa will wipe out the vestiges of colonialism in their lands and take a wide road of economic and social progress.

The year 1974 in Africa was marked by a political event of international significance: the revolution in Ethiopia which toppled one of the world's most ancient monarchies. The revolution is led by the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, democratic section of the army, which no efforts of the US special services and military and political advisers could turn into obedient tools for suppression of the people.

The new revolutionary-democratic regime has grown out of a national-democratic revolution which has for its aim to build a socialist society. Already the Declaration No. 1 published on September 12, 1974 stated the need for radical changes in the social system in the interests of the people, above all the peasants, who account for 90 per cent of Ethiopia's population.

As it might be expected, the national-democratic revolution did not stop half-way. The elite of the monarchic and bourgeois-bureaucratic aristocracy, guilty of active resistance to the revolution, of stirring counter-revolution against the popular masses, of attempts to restore the old regime and of a criminal disregard for the famished population, was put to death. The revolution defended itself and the people. Only a revolution which can defend itself is a genuine revolution.

The programme of the Ethiopian Government went far beyond the limits of anti-feudal reforms. Already its first decisions put forward demands of an anti-capitalist charac-

ter. Among them was restriction on the activities of private capital and on its exploitation of the working people.

The Ethiopian villages lived under medieval conditions and the peasants were subjected to ruthless exploitation. Their standards of life could hardly be compared even to those of the peasants in any other Asian or African country. Suffice it to mention that the Ethiopian villages had never had the privilege of even half-hearted agrarian reforms, not to speak of anything like the radical anti-feudal reforms carried out in many Afro-Asian countries after the Second World War.

On the eve of the revolution Ethiopia had been hit by a nationwide disaster — a devastating drought which brought a famine in its wake. Hundreds of thousands of indigent people starved to death. The aftermath of this disaster is still to be felt in the young developing state.

On March 4, 1975 the government announced the nationalisation of all farm land, which was made the property of the whole people. Individuals and families are allowed to have plots of up to 10 hectares on condition they till them themselves. Hired labour in agriculture is banned. Large landed estates and farms have been either made the property of the state or of peasant associations (primary cooperatives). The Ethiopian revolution has done away with the system of large, middle and small parasitic landownership, this foundation of the monarchy which prevailed in the country for centuries and which enabled the landlords to appropriate through enslaving feudal rent from 50 to 70 and even 80 per cent of the harvest.

The peasants have displayed a high level of revolutionary awareness and activity. Significantly, the peasants themselves seized the land from the landlords and shared it out among landless and land-starved families. Aided by the state and revolutionary-democratic activists and tens of thousands of students, the peasants have set up agricultural production associations.

The Ethiopian villages are taking a new path of development. There are still many difficulties ahead but there is every evidence that the peasants of Ethiopia with the aid of revolutionary democracy will choose the right road, one of social progress.

Large industrial enterprises, insurance companies and banks and, what is particularly important, the land in towns have been nationalised, too. High officials and the feudal aris-

toocracy will no longer be in a position to engage in land speculation in towns and exact high rents. Housing rent has been reduced, and housing cooperatives are being set up for the working people in towns.

In northern Ethiopia the revolutionary government is confronted by the extremely complicated national problem of Eritrea which is its most developed province economically. Not without encouragement from abroad the Eritrean nationalists are waging armed struggle against the central government for complete secession of Eritrea from Ethiopia.

Whatever solution will be found to this problem, one thing is clear: this is an internal affair of the Ethiopian national-democratic state, and no other state for whatever motives has a right to interfere in the settlement of this intra-national issue. If this sine qua non is observed, another alternative is perfectly obvious: to reach a political settlement of this problem without recourse to arms and bogging down in a civil war, which is bound to play into the hands of Ethiopian domestic reaction, as well as Arab reaction, and imperialism.

An entirely new political climate has been created in the country. Marxist-Leninist ideology and literature have been given legal status and are winning influence and popularity within broad sections of the intelligentsia.

The Programme of the National-Democratic Revolution of Ethiopia published on April 21, 1976, which formulated clearly and in detail the ideological and political credo of the leadership of the Provisional Military Administration Council of Ethiopia (PMAC), was a significant event in its political life.

The programme proclaims as its central objectives the complete eradication of feudalism, neocolonial dependence and bureaucratic capitalism, the unity of all anti-feudal and anti-imperialist forces in the struggle to build a new Ethiopia and lay a dependable foundation of its transition to socialism.

The programme outlines radical measures to advance the standards of agriculture, develop industry and the national resources, promote public education, public health and social security, and thus to improve as much as possible the welfare and cultural standards of the mass of the people.

The programme sets forth for the first time the stand of the Ethiopian leaders on the national question, which is of crucial importance in the situation prevailing in multinational Ethiopia. The programme states that no nationality shall dominate

another, since the culture, language and religion of each nationality will be recognised as equal. The unity of Ethiopia will be based on the unity of its people in the struggle against feudalism, imperialism and bureaucratic capitalism, against all reactionary forces. The programme sets the task of advancing the development of different nationalities to a common level, first priority being attached to the political, economic and cultural progress of the nationalities and tribes which were formerly subjected to particularly hard exploitation and are lagging in their development.

The programme says that under present conditions the only solution to the national question can be provided on the basis of a right to self-government granted to each nationality. Within the limits of regional autonomy, each nationality of Ethiopia has the right to shape the pattern of its political, economic and social life, to use its native tongue and to elect its representatives to the local government bodies. The right to self-government will be granted in compliance with democratic standards and principles.

In the opinion of the leaders of the PMAC the political education, organisation and mobilisation of broad sections of the working people and of the country's progressive forces is a sine qua non of success in implementing the programme. It says that the national-democratic revolution in Ethiopia will triumph if all anti-feudal and anti-imperialist forces unite in a popular front cemented and guided by the working-class party. This will be followed by an election to the national assembly (Parliament) carried out on democratic principles and by secret ballot. In accordance with the Constitution adopted by the assembly, Ethiopia will be a people's democratic republic under the political guidance of the working-class party. To this end the PMAC has set up the Provisional Office for Mass Organisational Affairs. It is invested with the duties of organising and mobilising the working people, of propaganda of the ideas of scientific socialism and the Programme of the National-Democratic Revolution, and of preparations for forming the working-class party and public organisations which will make up the revolutionary popular front.

The programme formulates the main principles of Ethiopia's foreign policy: non-alignment, respect for the cause of peace, justice and equality; close cooperation with the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and with all national liberation

movements and organisations struggling against imperialism, neocolonialism and racism; non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, support for their policies of preserving national unity and sovereignty; and respect for the Charters of the United Nations and the Organisation of African Unity.

The Programme of the National-Democratic Revolution of Ethiopia is a logical extension and development of the theoretical analysis of the PMAC's home and foreign policy problems. This is another step forward along the path of the country's progressive development attesting to the strong determination of the PMAC leaders to build a socialist society in the future.

The Ethiopian revolution is a graphic practical corroboration of the Marxist-Leninist theoretical propositions on the national-democratic state, the national-democratic stage of the revolution ranging beyond the limits of classical bourgeois revolutions, on the anti-feudal, anti-imperialist and to a certain extent anti-capitalist orientation of such a revolution, and finally on the fact that, given correct guidance, this revolution opens the way towards non-capitalist development.

Angola's Concerns and Hopes

The process of decolonisation came up against the most formidable obstacles in Angola. This was largely attributable to discord among the national forces consequent primarily on the subversive activity of international imperialism within the Angolan national liberation movement. Besides, the Portuguese colons were bent on preserving their positions of privilege and sought support among various nationalistic factions. And last but not least, such enemies of democratic Africa as the RSA and NATO opposed the establishment of a truly independent state in Angola, which has an important location strategically.

Let us turn to the history of the liberation movement in Angola. At a time when in the majority of African countries developments were in full swing which led eventually to the disintegration of the colonial empires of the leading imperialist powers, the national liberation movement in Angola was just gaining momentum. This was primarily due to the fact that backward Portugal had no means of pursuing a neocolonialist policy, had adhered for a long time to a line of conserving the traditional forms of colonial exploitation and used on a broad scale its fascist repressive machinery to put down any manifestation of discontent among the indigenous population.

The Portuguese colonialists preferred to plunder Angola by the "old" methods, making wide use of other than economic coercion, which introduced no essential changes in the

traditional way of life of the indigenous population. Therefore the forces capable of leading the struggle for national liberation matured slowly in Angola. The overwhelming proportion of the peasantry still lived in the conditions of a family-tribal commune. The broad application of a system of compulsory labour, which supplied 60 per cent of industrial manpower, hindered the formation of the working class and tended to distort its self-awareness. The process of the economic, political and cultural consolidation of the population into a single nation was extremely slow. For a long time the anti-colonial movement was confined to the limits of a passive spontaneous boycott, which at times took on a religious colouring. This became manifest, for instance, in the spread in Angola of a peculiar heresy—"Tokoism"—which had an anti-Catholic and anti-Portuguese orientation.

A new stage of the national liberation struggle in Angola began in the fifties under the impact of the deep-going changes which were in evidence in Africa and on the international scene. The national petty-bourgeois strata—administration officials, traders, intellectuals, etc.—became increasingly involved in the anti-colonial movement in Angola in that period. Due to their position in the African society, their proximity to the mechanism of colonial exploitation and sources of information, they objectively became an important factor of the struggle against colonialism. In 1950-1954 attempts were made to set up small groups consisting of members of the middle classes, who took a stand against the colonial policy of "Portugalisation" of the local population. Many members of these groups had been educated in the metropolitan country, where they had got in touch with the democratic forces of the Portuguese people. As far back as 1948 students from Angola, the future President of the MPLA Antonio Agostinho Neto among them, took an active part in setting up in Lisbon the Centre of African Studies to do research into the socio-economic and cultural problems of the peoples of the Portuguese colonies.

For a long time the patriotic movement in Angola had existed as various enlightenment organisations. The cultural associations of local intellectuals had a great role to play in awakening the national self-awareness of the Angolan people. As far back as 1956 political underground groups appeared in the country. These groups had no common opinion on the forms, methods and ultimate goals of their struggle. Many

of them limited their demands to one for granting autonomy to Angola and failed to go further than distributing pamphlets criticising colonialism.

The Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) which was founded on December 10, 1956 became the nucleus round which advocates of a determined fight for freedom and independence began to unite gradually. The MPLA Manifesto to the Angolan people declared that Portuguese colonialism could not be defeated without revolutionary struggle. This struggle could be carried by the people to success if a united front incorporating all the anti-imperialist forces of Angola was set up. The consolidation of the positions of the revolutionary-democratic elements within the MPLA leadership contributed to the organisation soon assuming a clearcut structure and setting up contacts with the popular masses.

Originally the young revolutionaries did not raise the question of violent means of struggle and expected to gain independence by peaceful means. However, they gradually became aware of the need to change their tactics and to widen the front of struggle and its composition by involving broad peasant masses. The MPLA leadership arrived at the conclusion that peaceful demonstrations of working people in towns were not an effective weapon against the fascist colonial regime. On March 29, 1959 the police arrested a group of patriots. On July 8, 1960 Agostinho Neto was arrested in Luanda, and his countrymen from the villages of Ikolo and Bengue who had come out for a demonstration of protest were fired on.

The stepping up of repressions by the colonialists compelled the MPLA leadership to revise their point of view on the ways and means of developing the liberation struggle. The party started intensive preparations for armed struggle, and the first armed units had been formed by 1960. The freedom fighters planned their strategy with an eye to using the territory of the neighbouring Belgian Congo as the basis for developing armed struggle in Angola. In May 1960 a conference of the MPLA leadership took a decision to set up the party's temporary headquarters at Konakry and to prepare an armed uprising by the time when operational opportunities opened up in the north of the country after the Congo had been granted independence.

The Angolan population was trained for armed struggle in

an extremely difficult situation, because the underground fighters had to carry out their work in the midst of the backward peasants who were under a strong influence of the traditional tribal chieftains and village headmen supporting the colonialists. Another hindrance was the tribal strife which had its roots in history and survived both as a result of the geographical separation of the population and of the policy of the colonialists who were constantly inciting one ethnic group against another. In particular, the colonialists succeeded in cultivating strained relations between the main nationalities of Angola—the Ovimbundu and Mbundu, on the one hand, and the northern Bacongo tribes, on the other. Everywhere the peasants expressed their distrust of agitators from towns, many of whom were Mulattoes.

The uniting of the patriotic forces was hampered by the appearance in the African countries neighbouring Angola of numerous emigré groups opposed to the MPLA and preventing the establishment of a united front. The tribalism that was at the core of these organisations made them a convenient tool for fighting revolutionary-democratic elements. It was not accidental, therefore, that the dissenters soon began to receive support from the imperialist powers of the West, which were entrenching themselves in Angola “for future contingencies” and set up contacts with conservative forces in the neighbouring African countries.

The patriots were given a lot of trouble by the activities of the Bacongo tribal elite who had long dreamt of resurrecting the erstwhile “great Kingdom” of Bacongo, later divided by the colonialists between Angola, the Belgian and the French Congo. Such a programme was advanced by the tribalist organisation known as the Union of the Peoples of Northern Angola (UPNA), which nominated for the role of the unifier King a certain Holden Roberto, a member of the tribal elite by birth, who had left Angola for the Belgian Congo as a child. Having realised, however, that in a situation of growing democratic sentiments a monarchistic and tribalist programme might fail to get support from the population, Holden Roberto expressed himself in favour of a republic. When he became President of the organisation he renamed it the Union of the Peoples of Angola (UPA) in 1958 in an effort to camouflage its tribalist character. Raised by American missionaries Holden Roberto never concealed his sympathies for the United States. He constantly enjoyed support from the CIA, which kept

him in the reserve in case Portugal was forced to get out of Angola.

In the face of great difficulties the MPLA succeeded gradually in widening its ties with the rural population. In 1960 the National Union of Angolan Workers (NUAW) was set up on the MPLA's initiative, which was an underground professional organisation and had a great role to play in mobilising the population of towns to struggle. Some time later other mass organisations were formed, which supported the MPLA. The MPLA leadership gave keen attention to developing a campaign of international solidarity with the Angolan people. Towards 1960 the patriots had set up contacts with the governments of many independent African states. In the summer of 1960 a MPLA delegation visited the Soviet Union.

Early in 1961 the MPLA took a decision to begin military operations against the colonialists who had rejected its repeated proposals for a peaceful solution to the problem of Angola's independence. In the opinion of the MPLA leadership an opportune moment for this action presented itself in early February when a large group of foreign journalists arrived in Luanda to meet the Portuguese liner *Santa Maria* which had been seized by a group of anti-fascists shortly before. Their presence could help towards broad coverage of the developments in Angola in the world press.

On February 4, 1961 armed groups of the MPLA in Luanda attacked the São Paulo jail, a radio station and a municipal police station. The attack itself was a failure because the freedom fighters had committed grave mistakes in preparing the armed uprising. However, this gave a signal for the uprising and the party's underground groups in the rural areas began to stir the people to armed struggle. The Angolan people regard this day as a turning-point in their liberation struggle.

The difficulties in preparing a nationwide armed uprising, the lack of experience and certain miscalculations had the result that the active operations of MPLA groups in that period were limited to the northwestern districts of Luanda and Northern Cuanza. The mass actions of the people were, as a rule, spontaneous, which eased the task of the command of the Portuguese colonial army. On February 5 almost 3,000 Africans who supported the military groups of the MPLA

were killed in the capital. About 5,000 cotton plantation workers were killed in the Kassanji district.*

The patriots' operations were complicated by the fact that on March 15, 1961 the armed units of the Union of the Peoples of Angola which had infiltrated from the territory of the Congo (Leopoldville) began massacring white colonists in the Zaire and Uíge districts. According to Holden Roberto himself, in that period his units killed more than 4,000 white settlers.** Whipping up the racist and tribalist sentiments within the ranks of the UPA to fanaticism, he appealed to the Bacongo peasants to intimidate and kill members of other tribes. Before long the units of Holden Roberto, which avoided clashes with the Portuguese army, openly turned their arms against the MPLA.

The clamour raised in the Western press about the UPA and its leader pursued the objective of covering up their true goals—to interfere in every way with the consolidation of the revolutionary-democratic wing within the leadership of the national liberation movement.

In that situation it was, of course, difficult for the MPLA to develop an organised armed struggle. Although until August 1961 the Portuguese army had failed to stabilise the situation in northern Angola it held the military initiative. Punitive troops supported by volunteer units of white colonists infiltrated insurgent areas and burned down whole villages. The cruel reprisals which according to some estimate took a toll of 80,000 African lives, the scarcity of weapons and military experience, the treacherous tactics of Holden Roberto—all this led to a drastic curtailment of the military operations of the guerilla groups of the MPLA against the colonial army at the end of 1961.

The setbacks of the first few months of armed struggle compelled the MPLA to revise its plans of developing the nationwide movement. As far back as August 1961 the MPLA leadership ordered its armed forces to scatter so as to muster up forces for a new offensive. During 1962 the freedom fighters succeeded in transporting a few large consignments of weapons and ammunition into the hinterland of Angola. A large group of members of the MPLA were sent to some independent African states for military training. Throughout 1962 the

* *Angola em armas* (número especial), Dar es Salaam, 1968, p. 2.

** *Afrique-actuelle*, juin 1967, Paris.

party's armed units carried out no operations against the colonialists on any considerable scale, concentrating on explanatory work among the local population.

The 1st National Conference of the MPLA held in Leopoldville in December 1962, which drew up and adopted the programme, charting the political line and outlining the tasks of the movement, was of major importance for further developing the armed struggle. Measures were worked out to convert the guerilla zones into the basis for further developing military operations, and important decisions were taken to strengthen the organisational structure of the MPLA, widen contacts with independent African states and the democratic forces of the world. The conference elected to the post of MPLA President Agostinho Neto, who had managed to escape the surveillance of the Portuguese political police in June 1962.

In that period Holden Roberto's organisation, which relied mostly on the community of Bacongo emigrants in the Congo (Leopoldville), was stepping up its splitting activities. In March 1962 the UPA united with the Democratic Party of Angola (DPA). On this basis the National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA) was set up, in which the separatists refused to include the MPLA. On April 5, 1962 Holden Roberto attempted to usurp the right to represent the embattled Angolan people. He proclaimed the formation of the Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile (GRAE), almost half of which consisted of his near relatives. The armed units of the FNLA, which made sallies from the territory of the Congo (Leopoldville) into the northern districts of Angola, stepped up their armed provocations against the genuine fighters for independence. Having arrogated police functions on the Angolan-Congolese border, they went out of their way to prevent the movement of the MPLA's insurgent units to Angolan territory.

The separatists' activities were particularly dangerous in the light of the fact that the FNLA received support from the reactionary forces in certain African countries, as well as from the imperialist powers pursuing neocolonialist policies. American arms were supplied to the Kinkosi camp, the FNLA's main base in the Congo, and military training there was conducted under the direction of American instructors. Holden Roberto received substantial financial aid from the American Committee on Africa. Simultaneously the

conservative forces in the Congo (Leopoldville) went out of their way to interfere with the activities of the MPLA which supplied the guerilla areas across the border of this neighbouring state.

Taking advantage of the grave crisis within the MPLA, the Congolese authorities at the OAU Foreign Ministers' Conference in Dakar in August 1963 secured the recognition of the GRAE as the sole representative of the embattled people of Angola and in November of the same year banned the MPLA's activities in Congolese territory and arrested a number of officials of the MPLA's bureau in Leopoldville.

In January 1964 a conference of the MPLA's leading cadres was held in Brazzaville, which again revised the plans of developing the armed struggle. The MPLA took a decision to leave part of its forces in the country's central areas (Dembos and Nambuanguo) and temporarily shift the main emphasis on developing the armed struggle in the territory of Cabinda, drawing on the fraternal assistance of the democratic forces of the Congo (Brazzaville) which had overthrown the reactionary government of Fulbert Youlou. The conference stressed at the same time that the strengthening of organisation inside the country was the only way of stepping up the struggle, while the operations in Cabinda were preparatory to a further expansion of the armed struggle within Angola.

The military operations in Cabinda, which had begun in the summer of 1964, became a school in which the MPLA trained battle-toughened military officers, tested in practice the forms and methods of conducting military operations, political and economic work among the population. Simultaneously, relying on cooperation with the friendly governments of Zambia and Tanzania, the MPLA leadership started preparations for military operations against the colonial army in the eastern areas of Angola. In May 1966 a new front of MPLA military operations was opened in the Moxiko and Cuando-Cubango districts. This was a major triumph for the patriots who had fought their way into a wider battlefield in spite of great difficulties. Having bypassed the garrisons of the Portuguese army the MPLA armed units drove a wedge into the hinterland of Angola over a brief space of time. In October 1966 and March 1967, for the first time after a long interval, MPLA convoys brought a large quantity of arms to the guerillas of the Nambuanguo district.

The Portuguese command openly voiced its concern about

the situation in Angola, and Portugal's Defence Minister, General Manuel Gómez de Araujo, admitted that the MPLA had succeeded in making the conflict more complicated militarily. Formerly Portuguese regular troops had not been stationed in Angola's inner areas, whereas now the Portuguese command had to demarcate special "intervention zones" with a network of bases and garrisons. The Portuguese colonial army in Angola had 50,000 officers and men in 1967.* The zone of operations of the MPLA, however, continued to widen. To aggravate the economic difficulties of the colonialists the guerillas attacked plantations of colonial companies and trade centres, and carried out operations along railway lines.

The socio-economic reforms implemented by the MPLA in the liberated areas greatly contributed to the growing popularity of the armed struggle. The peasants were helped to increase the production of food. Government in the villages was handed over to elected "action committees", and self-defence units were formed. A network of "people's shops" was set up to supply the population with prime necessities. Medical posts and mobile "health teams" functioning in the liberated areas carried out prophylactic examination of the population. Primary schools were opened in the villages, and political cadres and business managers were trained at the Revolutionary Training Centre set up in 1968.

In 1967 the MPLA leadership set a new task: to extend the armed struggle to the whole territory of Angola so as to force the enemy to scatter its forces, to immobilise them and make them unable to carry on offensive operations. Implementing the decision of the leadership guerilla units soon infiltrated the areas of Lunda, Malanje, Bié and other districts. MPLA units stepped up their operations in direct proximity to Luanda. In all by the end of 1968, 10 of the 16 districts with a population of about one million were involved in the armed struggle. Since January 1968 the MPLA headquarters was officially located in Angola's inner areas. The revolutionary armed forces grew stronger and gained experience in fighting. Towards 1969 the MPLA had 4,000 guerilla troops in the north and 7,000 in the east of the country.**

The MPLA's successes aggravated the contradictions in

* *Evolution du rapport des forces en Angola*, février 1968.

** *Vitoria ou morte*, juillet et août 1969, p. 3.

the separatists' camp. Holden Roberto was deserted by his "Minister of Foreign Affairs" Jonas Savimbi, who established an independent organisation, the National Union for Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), in the summer of 1964. Soon after his unsuccessful attempts to form armed units of members of his native Bailundo tribe in southern Angola, Savimbi was exposed as having direct ties with the Portuguese political police.

FNLA units continued their raids on Angola's border areas and brutally massacred the MPLA's supporters. News of the massacre of a large group of MPLA members in the Kinkosi camp in Zaire territory aroused wrath and indignation of world opinion. Faced with incontrovertible facts, the OAU Council of Ministers in February 1968 took a decision to recommend the governments of the African countries to revise the question of recognition of the GRAE. Soon, in September 1968, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU in Algiers refused to recognise it as the sole representative of the embattled forces of the Angolan people.

The claims to leadership of the national liberation struggle on the part of another separatist organisation—the Front for the Liberation of the Enclave of Cabinda (FLEC) set up on the initiative and with direct participation of Fulbert Youlou in 1962—turned out to be equally groundless. The FLEC failed to win support among the local population and the MPLA was constantly the only recognised leader of the liberation struggle in this part of Angolan territory.

The international movement of solidarity with the freedom fighters of Angola grew wider and stronger. Progressive international organisations, many African countries, the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community assisted the MPLA. In 1971 the MPLA President Agostinho Neto declared at the 24th CPSU Congress: "Our people, the fighters representing the vanguard of the anti-colonialist struggle in Angola, feel the friendship and support of the Soviet people. We regard the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as one of the main forces we rely upon in developing our liberation struggle."*

The further expansion of the anti-colonialist struggle in Angola and other Portuguese possessions, which merged into a common revolutionary torrent with the anti-fascist move-

* *Pravda*, April 7, 1971.

ment in Portugal, the development of detente, which contributed to the isolation of the fascist regime, tended to exacerbate considerably the crisis of the system of social relations in the "Portuguese space", as apologists of capitalism liked to call Portugal and its "overseas provinces". Portuguese fascism was compelled to take emergency measures to forestall the disintegration of its colonial empire. This was precisely the objective of the so-called "development plans" aimed essentially at implementing some elements of neocolonialist policy jointly with the international imperialist circles. By attracting vast foreign capital to the colonies the fascist regime attempted to create definite conditions for galvanising economic life, increasing employment, and raising the standards of living, if only slightly. Measures were taken to widen the privileged stratum of the local population. A number of the most notorious political institutions were abolished.

The "open doors" policy pursued by fascist Portugal during the last years of its existence made Angola increasingly open to plunder by the imperialist monopolies. The Portuguese colonialists and international imperialism accompanied their neocolonialist manoeuvres and demagoguery with an escalation of the criminal colonial war, and intensified their subversive activities to divide and discredit the patriotic forces.

Such policies cleared the way for traitors to the liberation struggle. Holden Roberto flagrantly violated the agreement reached in December 1972 on coordination of the operations of the MPLA and the FNLA, and was hastily arming Bacongo emigrants in Zaire for another offensive against the revolutionary-democratic wing of the Angolan liberation movement. In the summer of 1973 the reactionary forces launched a campaign to discredit the MPLA, which was alleged to be on the verge of disbandment.

The democratic coup in Portugal on April 25, 1974 frustrated the plans of the colonialists and international reaction. Overcoming the resistance of the conservative forces which sought to delay the process of decolonisation and searched for some neocolonialist variant, Portugal's democratic forces took determined steps for its government to set a seal on the five centuries of enslavement of other peoples. The anti-colonialist position of Portugal's provisional government and the Armed Forces Movement largely contributed to the process of decolonisation, in Angola in particular.

At the same time, the international imperialist forces,

apprehensive for their positions in this area of Africa famed for its natural wealth and assigned an important role to play in the policy of neocolonialist offensive against the independent African states, went out of their way to retard the process of Angola's decolonisation. Relying on collaboration with Portuguese domestic reaction, primarily with Portugal's ex-President, General Antonio Spínola, they made the question of granting Angola independence on November 11, 1975 dependent on a recognition of the right of the FNLA and UNITA to take part in the interim government.

Loyal to the cause of liberation of the Angolan people, the MPLA actively joined in the work of decolonisation. By its collaboration in the interim government which came into office in February 1975, in forming new government bodies and units of the national army and in setting up mass organisations of the working people, which assumed much of the work in bringing life in towns back to normal, the MPLA did its best to safeguard the vital interests of the Angolan people at the new responsible stage of the struggle for national independence. The local population enthusiastically welcomed the patriots who had proved their allegiance to the cause of liberation during the 13 years of armed struggle.

The progress of decolonisation, however, posed a real threat to the positions of the imperialist powers in the former Portuguese colonies. This was precisely why international imperialism stepped up its subversive activities against the liberation forces to be able to hold on to this fabulously rich region of Africa and simultaneously to create additional difficulties for Portugal's democratic forces. It soon became evident that in the new situation imperialism was determined to go into its first open battle against the national liberation forces of the former Portuguese colonies precisely in Angola, where the national forces were divided and reaction had managed to retain fairly strong positions. It was here that imperialism took steps to interfere with the transfer of power to the patriots in a normal situation and complicate the Portuguese government's cooperation with the national government bodies taking shape in Angola.

The enemies of Angola's true independence again directed their main strike against the MPLA, which had put forward a programme of radical reforms and resolute measures to restrict the domination of the national economy by foreign monopolies. The National Front for the Liberation of Angola

(FNLA), which had entrenched itself in Zaire, took an especially hard line against the MPLA.

Leaning on the support of the Portuguese big bourgeoisie and US aid, the FNLA gradually stepped up its provocations against the MPLA, which impeded the work of the interim government and created a favourable situation for the reanimation of all the forces of domestic reaction. Pockets of "white resistance" supplied with arms from the RSA began to spring up in the country's central areas. The secret services of the imperialist powers became more active in Luanda.

International imperialism had thoroughly prepared itself for battle with the patriotic forces of Angola. At the NATO Council session in Brussels in May 1975 the Western powers discussed the question of carving up Angola into spheres of influence. Simultaneously a special coordinating committee was set up of representatives of Britain, Belgium, the USA, France and the FRG. In that period the Western powers decided to abstain from direct military intervention in Angola. They chose to use as their strike force the FNLA units formed in Zaire territory and reinforced with Zaire troops.

From April to June 1975 Holden Roberto and Jonas Savimbi had meetings in Paris, under the aegis of the NATO coordinating committee, with emissaries of General Spínola and representatives of the Portuguese industrialists. The latter assured the FNLA of the neutrality of Portuguese troops in Angola, and the FNLA promised to preserve the "system of economic liberalism" in the event of its coming to power in Angola.

Aware of the fact that the separatists had no strong support among the population, international imperialism faced them with the task of creating in Angola a situation favourable for an intervention by foreign reaction. This was precisely the purpose of the reign of terror unleashed against the civilian population by the FNLA gangs which had invaded Luanda from Zaire. Holden Roberto finally discarded all his commitments assumed at the meetings of the leaders of the Angolan nationalist organisations in Mombasa in January 1975 and in Nakuru in June 1975 and attempted to seize power in Luanda by force of arms.

International imperialism was safeguarding the "rear" of the separatists. The FNLA was openly supported by the North American imperialists. White mercenaries were hastily recruited to Holden Roberto's units. The FNLA received

military equipment from the FRG under the guise of medical supplies. Large consignments of military equipment arrived at the FNLA bases in Zaire from France, and "specialists" who had arrived from Brazil helped Holden Roberto to organise information and intelligence services. The separatists widened their collaboration with the militarised fascist organisations of the local racists.

In July 1975 when the cause of Angola's independence was again in jeopardy the MPLA, in response to the FNLA's armed provocations and with unreserved support of the population, expelled Holden Roberto's troops from Luanda. The mercenary gangs were ousted from other large towns as well. Towards September 1975 the MPLA was in control of 12 of the country's 16 districts. The FNLA, however, having recalled its representatives from the interim government, declared "a total war" on the MPLA and moved its troops across the Angolan-Zairean border in the direction of Luanda. Simultaneously Jonas Savimbi, the leader of UNITA, which had long played the role of a "third force" seeking to gain political capital, opened military operations against the MPLA.

The South African racists actively contributed to building up tensions in Angola. Expecting to convert Angola into a "buffer state" to help the RSA's neocolonialist expansion northwards, the Pretoria authorities expressed special sympathies for Jonas Savimbi, who enjoyed support from the conservative forces in certain African states, although Holden Roberto was also allowed to recruit and arm mercenaries in the RSA territory.

Already in August 1975 racist units attempted an invasion of Angola to back up UNITA troops fleeing from the MPLA fighters and face the world with the fact of "internationalisation" of the Angola problem. However, the triumphant advance of MPLA units and the stern condemnation of the intervention by world opinion forced the racists to withdraw their troops in that period. Having looted the municipal facilities at Ngiva and seized the documents and archives of the administration of Kunene province, the RSA troop convoy supported by tanks and helicopters beat a retreat.

The attempts to usurp power on the part of the Front for the Liberation of the Enclave of Cabinda (FLEC), which had never ventured to join the ranks of the active fighters against Portuguese colonialism during all these years, also ended in a complete fiasco. Having won support from the African

units of the former colonial army and leaning on the assistance of the North American oil companies which had entrenched themselves in this part of the Angolan territory, the FLEC attempted to stir up a separatist movement in Cabinda as far back as November 1974. After a resolute rebuff from the local population and MPLA units the FLEC leadership fled to Zaire.

In a situation of incessant provocations on the part of domestic and foreign reaction, which tried to prevent the triumph of the cause of national liberation, the patriotic forces of Angola, rallied around the MPLA, rose in defence of the gains of the liberation revolution. The MPLA's appeal for nationwide resistance aroused the mass of the people to active fight against the separatists and interventionists. Leaning on the support of the population MPLA activists immediately got down to work to organise administration and economic life and strengthen the bodies of the popular government. The life in towns gradually got back to normal, and many of the European settlers who had left for Portugal earlier started coming back to Angola.

The enemies of independent Angola, however, were unwilling to lay down their arms. Holden Roberto mounted a massive offensive on Luanda from the northern provinces of Zaire and Uié occupied by the FNLA units. In October 1975 mercenary troops from the RSA again crossed the border into Angola to help UNITA troops advancing towards the capital. The interventionists expected to drive the MPLA out of Luanda or at least to seize as much of the country's territory as they could and create a pretext for defying the declaration of independence slated by the MPLA for November 11, 1975.

In the face of this new grave threat to the cause of national independence the patriotic forces of Angola again rose up in defence of their gains. The general mobilisation announced by the MPLA in Luanda was carried out successfully. Leaning on the support and assistance of the world public, the countries of the socialist community and the progressive forces of Africa, the MPLA, which had borne the brunt of the fighting against Portuguese colonialism, again demonstrated its devotion to the cause of Angola's liberation. The advance of the interventionists towards Luanda was checked.

The government and military circles of the Western countries, losing their trust in the ability of the FNLA and UNITA

to achieve a decisive victory, started talking more and more openly of the need to "internationalise" the Angola problem and prepare the ground for stationing a UN police force in the country. The governments of some African countries, hostile to the MPLA and unwilling in defiance of facts to recognise its nationwide popularity, also attempted to give support to the separatists, taking advantage of their positions within the OAU.

Undoubtedly, in a situation where the MPLA was strongly determined to carry into effect the programme of establishing a united democratic state in Angola, any encroachment on the right of the MPLA to represent the Angolan people might become a loophole for those who over all these years of struggle had been sitting it out in emigration and were now openly collaborating with imperialism, thus betraying the cause of independence. It was not accidental, therefore, that the progressive public of Africa voiced its deep concern about the escalation of the military aid of the imperialist powers to the enemies of Angola's decolonisation. The will of all progressive forces of the world, which demanded that the Angolan people should be allowed to shape their destinies themselves, was strikingly demonstrated at the international conference in Lourenço Marques in September 1975, as well as by the week of international solidarity with the Angolan people held under the motto "Against Neocolonialist Intervention in Angola's Affairs".

In the meantime the developments continued to gain momentum. On November 11, 1975 Angola was proclaimed independent at a solemn ceremony in Luanda, and a new state—the People's Republic of Angola (PRA)—appeared on the map of Africa. The MPLA President Agostinho Neto was elected President of the country. The first few months of the existence of the young republic were marked by the further mobilisation of forces for repelling the imperialist and racist aggression covered up by the FNLA and UNITA separatists. The RSA racists moved into Angola its regular troops and mercenaries, seized the southern districts and a considerable part of the Atlantic coast. From the north Luanda was threatened by the FNLA troops and the units of the Zaire army taking part in the intervention. The interventionist forces relied on the military, financial and diplomatic support of the USA, France and other imperialist states. The economic blockade introduced by the Western powers

aggravated the economic dislocation. The MPLA leadership and the PRA government, leaning on the support of the Soviet Union, Cuba and other socialist countries, and also of the progressive African states, continued to defend consistently the national interests and independence by force of arms. The national army of the Republic not only threw back the interventionists from Luanda but also dealt a devastating blow to the FNLA gangs in the north of the country and went over to the offensive against the RSA regular army and the mercenaries in the south.

The attempts of the imperialist forces to isolate the PRA have failed. At the Extraordinary Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU in January 1976, independent Africa denounced the imperialist and racist aggression in Angola, and all its direct and indirect participants. The international prestige of the young African state steadily rose. The Emergency Conference for Solidarity with the Peoples of Asia and Africa held in Luanda in February 1976 took a determined stand for ending immediately the intervention of the imperialists and racists in Angola's affairs, and for setting up a united, independent and democratic state in Angola.

The consistent support of the PRA by the countries of the socialist community, the progressive forces of Africa and the whole world was the most important factor in the Angolan people's struggle against the intervention of the imperialist and racist forces. Late in March 1976 South African racist and mercenary troops were forced to pull out of the Angolan territory.

The debacle of the imperialist aggression against the People's Republic of Angola demonstrated again that the unity of all revolutionary forces is the guarantee of success in the struggle waged by the peoples of the world against imperialism.

The MPLA, which the Constitution of the Republic entrusted with the political, economic and social guidance of the nation, and the PRA government started to build a new life in an extremely difficult situation. The majority of enterprises had been put out of commission by the colonialists. On the main transport arteries the interventionists blew up bridges, which resulted in grave stoppages in food supply to towns. The difficulties were made still worse by the flight of a large proportion of specialists of European origin provoked by the reactionaries. There was no adequate experience in

economic management and a shortage of native personnel.

President Neto declared that Angola had chosen the socialist path of development. In view of this historical prospect the MPLA and the PRA government announced their intention to carry on national reconstruction by methods which would restrict the activity of private capital and strengthen public ownership, facilitate the establishment of popular government bodies controlled by the workers and peasants, and help the people's democratic revolution adopt the scientific ideology of the working class.

The PRA leadership are implementing sweeping democratic reforms to strengthen national independence, advance the living standards of the toiling masses and set up truly popular organs of government. The country's main natural resources have been placed under state control. The refusal of foreign companies to submit to government control and overt sabotage on their part had the result that food, textile, cement and steel industry enterprises were proclaimed state property in May 1976. This was followed by the nationalisation of fishing companies, glassworks and metalworking factories. State organisations started to restore industry in cooperation with the workers' commissions set up at enterprises.

In 1976 the people's first harvest of coffee and sugar cane was gathered, and large foreign merchant firms were deprived of their monopoly right to the purchase and marketing of these products vital to the national economy. The people's commissions—elected committees set up on the working people's initiative—have become a dependable support for the government. On February 2, 1976 the Revolutionary Council, which is the supreme legislative and executive body of the PRA, officially recognised the people's commissions as the organs of government, through which the working people shall govern the country under the leadership of the MPLA.

The young republic has embarked on sweeping social reforms: free medical service and education have been introduced, and measures have been taken to supply the population with prime necessities and food. The institution of government control over the activities of the banks and the monetary reform implemented in January 1977 dealt a heavy blow at the positions of the exploiter groups.

The nationwide support for the MPLA policy, the determination displayed by the government of the young republic in defending national interests, the successes in economic reha-

bilitation and the consistent support from the countries of the socialist community—all this enables the PRA to oppose imperialist diktat effectively.

Nevertheless, international reaction has not abandoned its plans of aggression against Angola. In an effort to regain its lost positions imperialism has begun active subversion in Angola to complicate as much as possible the development of the young republic. The international monopolies and banks are persisting in their economic boycott of Angola. The Western bourgeois press has launched a campaign to discredit the PRA on the international scene. Imperialism is again pinning its hopes on the leaders of the defeated reactionary groups who have fled to the neighbouring countries. NATO arms supplies continue to arrive at the bases on the Angolan border from where the traitors are attempting to organise subversive activities in the country.

In the face of this real danger people's Angola is building up its defence capability. Leaning on the support of the Soviet Union, Cuba and other socialist countries, the People's Liberation Armed Forces of Angola (FAPLA) are developing and growing stronger. In the struggle for consolidating the revolutionary gains the Angolan leadership give keen attention to strengthening the MPLA and enhancing its role in the state system. They regard the conversion of the MPLA into a party of a new type, the vanguard of the toiling masses, as a prerequisite for the development of the Angolan revolution.

The achievements made by the Angolan people in the cause of national construction are closely associated with the support and assistance given to the young republic by the progressive independent African states and the countries of the socialist community. "Soviet aid has been the key factor in our historical development, in achieving independence and in the country's reconstruction," President Neto stated during his visit to the Soviet Union in October 1976.*

The relations of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Angola are developing successfully. A number of agreements on economic cooperation, trade, shipping, fishing, etc. have been signed. On October 8, 1976 Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the

* *The Visit of the Party and Government Delegation of the People's Republic of Angola to the Soviet Union*, Moscow, 1976, p. 13 (in Russian).

CPSU Central Committee, and President of the MPLA and the PRA, Dr. Antonio Agostinho Neto, signed the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation Between the Soviet Union and the PRA.

Every new victory of the People's Republic of Angola in its fight against economic dislocation and the intrigues of reaction and imperialism, every new success in its daily work of construction testify to the Angolan people's strong determination to achieve peace, progress and happiness for their homeland.

The Battle of Ideas over the Ways of Socio-Economic Development

In the last decade, for the first time in its centuries-old history, Africa has become the scene of an extremely tense internal ideological and political struggle which flared up in all other continents of the world much earlier. For all the variety and dissimilarity of the conditions prevailing in different parts of the world the struggle in Africa is in the final analysis a contest between the forces of capitalism and socialism, revolution and reaction, national independence and oppression.

An irreconcilable conflict between the two social systems is developing in the whole of the African continent. Imperialism uses its political, economic and military power to preserve its positions of domination, to support the colonialist and racist regimes still surviving in Africa, to strengthen neocolonialism and prolong the period of exploitation of the African peoples. The Soviet Union and the socialist community see their task and their duty in wiping out the last strongholds of racism and colonialism, in supporting the just struggle waged by the peoples of the former colonial countries for complete national independence and in helping them to break the chains of economic bondage and free themselves from all forms of imperialist and neocolonialist exploitation.

The struggle between the forces of capitalism and socialism in Africa is not limited to this conflict alone. It is wider in scope and greater in depth. This struggle is being waged in the first place by the internal forces in the process of the in-

ternal social differentiation of the African peoples, as well as under the impact of the main contradiction of our day on a global scale. The ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism in Africa is attributable to the fact that the African countries liberated from direct political oppression are now practically faced with the question as to which way to follow, where to direct the labour and struggle of the multi-million masses awakened to political life, what system—capitalism or socialism—would ensure complete national liberation and social progress.

There is no doubt that capitalism has to struggle for the minds of the Africans under disadvantageous conditions. It has discredited itself so much in their eyes and so closely identified itself with the atrocities of colonialism and imperialist exploitation that it can no longer lay claim to general recognition as a prospect for the continent's development. It is not accidental that almost all African leaders today address their peoples under socialist slogans. While being fully aware of the significance of this fact attesting to the bankruptcy of capitalism and to the immense force of attraction possessed by socialism, it should not be presumed, however, that a verbal recognition of socialist ideas in general form invariably means a truly socialist choice.

In Africa today, just as in other parts of the world, both "pre-capitalism" and capitalism have to camouflage themselves. The almost universal recognition of socialist slogans by no means indicates that capitalism has no scope for operation, has proved a total failure and can be written off, and that the struggle between capitalism and socialism has ended. On the contrary, this struggle is being carried on everywhere and every day in all spheres of life, in politics and in ideology.

All African countries have many tasks in common in strengthening their national independence, ensuring their economic growth and advancing the welfare and cultural standards of the people. Some common features and principles, common social forms and institutions, methods of economic management and political leadership are also observed in the economic and political life of many African countries. Nevertheless, one can clearly discern behind them the emergence of different class and political trends, the gravitation of some forces towards an orientation on socialism, and of others, towards the bourgeois national-reformist "models of evolution". A comparative analysis of contemporary political thought in

the African countries reveals with adequate clarity and profundity a certain similarity and differentiation on the political scene of the African continent.

A genuine test for any political doctrine, the socialist one in the first place, is provided by practice, since the latter alone enables one to size up the real value of the proposed ideas. When it is a question of development trends alone, however, the ideological platform of the individuals and the social forces behind them is quite important for defining their character, if only such a platform is not utterly demagogic.

A detailed examination of the platforms of the ruling parties and the leaders of African countries confirms that a few socio-class trends have emerged or are in the formative stage in African political life, and that the differences between them in a number of fields have become differences of principle, although all of them are often united by some common attitudes. On the ideological plane these differences often appear in more salient relief than on the economic, political or social plane.

Indeed, in examining the economic and political life of the young African states we shall discover in most of them a mixed economy and private enterprise (to a varying extent, it is true), state planning and a one-party system, great centralisation of government, etc. These phenomena which seem identical at first glance are of different types and often exhibit different tendencies, which become strikingly evident when comparing political ideas. Suffice it to compare, for instance, the concepts of the economic foundation of socialism, the private sector and its relation to socialism held by the ideologists of Algeria and Tunisia, Senegal and Guinea to see that they follow fundamentally different trends of socio-political thought.

Contemporary socio-political thought in the African countries (this does not apply to Marxist thought, which gains growing recognition there) may be divided into three major trends. These are national-bourgeois reformism, petty-bourgeois Utopian socialism, and national democracy associated with the socialist orientation of young African states, i.e. with a non-capitalist path of development. Despite certain differences on this question in Marxist literature (some scholars deem it unjustifiable to define petty-bourgeois Utopian socialism as a separate trend), such a classification is on the whole gaining recognition. The presentation of anti-imperialist petty-

bourgeois socialism as a specific trend of African political thought carries weight. It applies accurately to societies dominated by petty-bourgeois anarchy with strong patriarchal-communal traditions. The petty-bourgeois strata in town and country constitute the bulk of the population. Small wonder, therefore, that their sentiments not only leave an imprint on the ideological platforms of African nationalists but also become an independent trend of socio-political thought, if only unstable and intermediate between national-reformism and national democracy.

African national-reformism, which is a typical manifestation of bourgeois nationalism in a new situation, is characterised by a strong influence of the modern bourgeois-reformist conceptions of the West concerning the amended nature of capitalism and the modern state allegedly standing above classes. The ideologists of the national-bourgeois wing of African social thought deny the applicability of the Marxist analysis of the historical process to African conditions, and are opposed especially vehemently to the Marxist theory of classes and class struggle. The thesis on national and sometimes on racial exclusiveness is most commonly used exactly to disprove Marxism once again, as it were, and transplant the bourgeois conceptions of affluent society onto African soil. Such ideas are propagated by the Socialist International and some European Social-Democratic parties, which have considerably increased their infiltration of the African countries and of the social thought of African democracy.

National, or revolutionary, democracy is a promising, revolutionary trend of African political thought and practice distinguished by intransigence towards modern capitalism and assimilating many elements of scientific socialism. The majority of national-democratic movements and ideologists recognise the universal laws of historical development and the doctrine of class struggle. The national democrats are implementing sweeping social reforms preparing the ground for socialism. In the recent period the vanguard role of the working class in social transformations has been mentioned in the programmes of some parties and the statements of some revolutionary ideologists.

African petty-bourgeois political thought has stopped half-way between national-reformism and national democracy. On the one hand, it is characterised by frank anti-imperialism, sincere anti-capitalist sentiments and loyalty to the peo-

ple's ideas of equality and justice. On the other hand, the petty-bourgeois Utopians are still scared of scientific socialism, are unable to renounce the bourgeois concepts of scientific socialism and hence have not yet rid themselves of mistrust of it, which has been overcome to a definite extent or, to be more exact, is being overcome relatively successfully by the national democrats. The subjective socialism of African petty-bourgeois political thought combines with reformist illusions of a largely patriarchal, Utopian character.

It may seem that petty-bourgeois Utopianism is fully retrospective. However, the fact that retrograde concepts, which are at first glance based exclusively on traditions, are capable of working for the future and serving the interests of progress, if they are not devoid of revolutionary elements, i.e. anti-colonialism, anti-racism, anti-imperialism and democracy, is a characteristic feature of backward agrarian societies. Lenin noted this circumstance in his analysis of Sun Yat-senism. Petty-bourgeois Utopian socialism in Africa is also capable of playing a positive role as long as it remains loyal to the working people's ideals. In such cases it draws closer to national democracy and discards certain illusions. If bourgeois reformism takes the upper hand in the contradictory complex of petty-bourgeois concepts, they merge increasingly into the national-bourgeois views and gradually lose their revolutionary potential.

The central problem of estimation of contemporary political thought in Africa may be formulated as follows: socialism or nationalism?

There is no universal solution to this problem, however. The appeals for socialism in Africa have been made in an extremely unusual situation. They are motivated not so much by the severe class antagonisms within the local society as by the national liberation movement against imperialism — exploiter foreign capitalism. They are conditioned not by the maturity of national capitalism but by its underdevelopment — the country's general backwardness in the face of an external enslaving force, which has penetrated deeply into the social life of the people. The recourse of the majority of the African leaders to socialist slogans is attributable primarily to the fact that socialism quite naturally appeals to them as the best if not the only method of progressive social development. In the opinion of African leaders the prime task of socialism is to ensure the rapid development of young states, to

strengthen their independence, which is quite logical and understandable.

Various social movements merge in the socialist concepts now prevailing in Africa. Here we witness the striving of the vanguard of the working people to achieve social justice on the basis of the class struggle, and the illusions of the main mass of the petty-bourgeois population in the spirit of the patriarchal "Golden Age" and "family" relations between classes, and the inclination of national-bourgeois elements to using the popularity of socialism for the so-called modernisation of society and creating the conditions for a rapid growth of national capital. The contradictions and struggle between these two tendencies are obvious. However, their ability to coexist with one another in some measure, at times even within the framework of one political organisation, is attributable not only to the inadequate class differentiation and the uncertainty of the concepts of African ideologists but also to the objective coincidence of the interests of different social forces in the struggle against imperialism and for safeguarding national independence and progress. Hence the non-uniform character of the class basis of the so-called African ideology, which has also adopted socialist slogans, and the intertwining within it of elements of socialism and nationalism.

Small wonder, therefore, that under these conditions African politicians and ideologists interweave socialist doctrine into the fabric of African nationalism, and "socialism" is placed, as it were, at the service of anti-imperialist and anti-racist nationalism. At the same time, the very content of socialism is interpreted merely as a means of ensuring the country's independent development, not infrequently regardless of the class character of political power and social transformations. Such an interpretation of socialism is quite common in Africa, and, as is only natural, Western bourgeois politicians and ideologists, the right-wing Social-Democrats in particular, stake on this when alleging wishfully that true socialism has no prospects in Africa, that Africa will inevitably adopt "Western democracy" which is in fact capitalism in neocolonialist disguise. It is only natural that they ignore not only the subjective aversion of many social strata of the African peoples to capitalism, which for them has come to be a synonym of colonialism, but also the objective conditions urging them to a road leading away from capitalism.

Many African statesmen cannot but see that the develop-

ment of capitalist social relations, which doom African countries to integration into the world capitalist economic system, is linked with the continued exploitation, the unequal exchange with the economies of the imperialist states, the exuberant flourishing of new forms of colonialism and the widening gulf between the levels of development of the capitalist countries of Europe and America, on the one hand, and the neocolonial African periphery, on the other. It is precisely this circumstance that compels the governments of many African countries to choose a non-capitalist path of development, to implement radical social reforms of an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, anti-monopoly and, more and more often, also anti-capitalist character.

The non-capitalist path of development opens up socialist prospects before the African countries. It requires, above all, precautions against an unfounded, sometimes misguided domestic policy characterised by unwarranted haste in implementing radical reforms and by isolation from the masses, close friendship with the world socialist system and consistent anti-imperialism while conducting socialist-oriented home and foreign policies. Selfless constructive work in production will become for the African peoples a highroad towards socialism.

The problem of socialism and nationalism in Africa cannot be resolved correctly if the real opportunities for non-capitalist development are ignored. The doctrine of non-capitalist development contains the Marxist methodological approach which gives a correct solution to the problem of relationship between socialism and nationalism in Africa.

In estimating the socialist orientation of the progressive African states, two extremes may be pointed out, which lead in effect to a negation of the contemporary Marxist interpretation of non-capitalist development. Both are dangerous to a correct estimation of the ideological platform of national democracy.

On the one hand, this is the tendency to identify the platform of national democracy with scientific socialism, referring to numerous statements of African politicians about their recognition of scientific socialism by borrowing a number of Marxist principles and formulas. Such an assessment of national democracy would err against reality, fail to take account of the entire complexity of the transition period of non-capitalist development and give a mistaken description of the class strata directing this exceedingly important socio-

economic and political experiment, if it may be called so. Such an estimation is linked with idealisation of national democracy and oblivion of the serious differences between the national democrats and the Marxists, which, however, are not decisive at the present stage and do not inevitably lead to a division between them.

On the other hand, a nihilistic, rigidly dogmatic, sectarian negation of non-capitalist development as a step towards socialism is also dangerous. The logical outcome of this stand is full denial to national democracy of any socialist content whatsoever. The revolutionary, anti-capitalist character of national democracy is rejected; it is alleged to be a common manifestation of national-reformism, i.e. bourgeois nationalism, and no distinction is drawn between national-revolutionary democracy and other, reformist, national-bourgeois trends in African political thought.

It is said in such cases that the truth evidently lies somewhere in the middle. One would try in vain to search for this golden mean; it is simply non-existent. The Marxist conception of non-capitalist development is based on the fact that in many African countries the conditions for immediate construction of socialism have not yet arisen. If this is so, anti-colonialist nationalism has not yet become outdated, nor has it ceased to be a progressive factor in definite spheres of struggle. Hence the objective law of combination of elements of socialism and nationalism in the process of struggle against imperialism, and of the tasks of two fundamentally different stages of revolution—the national liberation and general democratic, and the socialist, although this by no means amounts to the development of the one into the other. These are far from all but the most important qualitative characteristics of non-capitalist development under the guidance of national democracy.

National democracy should not be reduced to nationalism, as is done by the opponents of the conception of non-capitalist development. Nationalism in itself is not uniform. There is reformist, bourgeois nationalism guarding the interests of the privileged classes, ready to make and really making compromise deals with imperialism to the detriment of the newly-won national independence. There is radical, revolutionary nationalism intolerant of imperialism and neocolonialism, permeated with democratism, capable of taking bold measures not only against foreign, but also against local exploiters,

venturing to change the social mode of production and hence ceasing to be nationalism per se. Such is national-revolutionary democracy, its best part anyway.

It is obvious that the real content of anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist practices in these two cases is quite different. In the first case, socialist ideas camouflage what is basically a national-bourgeois platform (although the influence exerted by the democratic forces through these ideas on the leadership gravitating towards bourgeois "models" cannot be ruled out). In the second case, socialist ideas are the basis for a progressive popular movement, which is not yet consistently socialist but is capable of implementing many measures necessary for building socialism eventually and of a radical change of home and foreign policies. National democracy is contradictory, and its policy is characteristically wavering, but at the same time it is radical, revolutionary, and capable of accomplishing eventually the tasks of the present general democratic stage in the development of the African countries. Needless to say, the degree of consistency and success in handling this enormous task is directly proportional to the degree of consistency in implementing an anti-imperialist policy, democratisation of the regime, and the extent of reliance on the popular masses and of drawing closer to scientific socialism and the world socialist system.

It would be wrong to presume that because of the manifestation of petty-bourgeois revolutionary spirit the activity of national democracy and national democracy itself are of a negative character and hostile to socialism. National-democratic, non-proletarian revolutionary sentiments have not yet arisen or matured enough to become the main factor of social development. Revolutionary democracy can be a staunch ally of the proletariat if it does not slide back to the positions of the national bourgeoisie but breaks away from them.

The proletariat and the radical petty-bourgeois strata have always had many interests in common. The ability of the proletariat and its party to assess these common interests correctly and to express them jointly in cooperation with the revolutionary democrats, to take account of the position of its petty-bourgeois partners and to strengthen its alliance with them is crucial in the final analysis to the success of its mission as the vanguard of the revolutionary forces irrespective of whether it is recognised as the vanguard by the petty-bourgeois masses and parties or not yet recognised as such, espe-

cially in countries where the petty-bourgeois strata constitute the bulk of the population and hence their conduct largely determines the direction of development. Of course, as Lenin underscored, "the petty-bourgeois masses cannot help vacillating between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat".* This refers not only to the reformist but also to the revolutionary part of the petty bourgeoisie. This, however, by no means frees the Marxists from the need for a differential approach to the petty-bourgeois masses, for seeking an understanding with them and making a firm alliance with all petty-bourgeois strata capable of playing a positive role in the revolution, and for preserving at the same time their political independence and a clearcut class position.

What course of evolution will be taken by national democracy will be shown by the future. Today it has clearly transpired that it is not homogeneous. Two wings with a centre between them are taking shape within it. One of them seeks to promote the socialist tendencies and draw closer to scientific socialism, and opposes anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. The other is apprehensive of further steps in the direction of socialism and has taken up a wait-and-see attitude, failing to notice that thereby it dooms itself to a slide-back into the quagmire of national-reformism, the abandonment of which was a qualitative leap in the development of political thought and the revolutionary movement. Which of these tendencies will take the upper hand? Probably in different countries the conflict between them will not resolve identically. It can be safely asserted, however, that on the African and, to a certain degree, on the Asian continent national democracy has already played, and its finest representatives will play in the future, a progressive, revolutionising role, that it has stepped up the political activity of the masses, helped popularise the ideas of socialism, carried out a series of radical social reforms and proved to be a historically necessary stage in steady progressive development.

We often refer quite reasonably to the growing attraction of creative Marxism-Leninism. It is precisely this theory and its immense attraction that are responsible for the unprecedented and unusually important phenomenon of today: even the general democratic movements of anti-imperialist, anti-

* V. I. Lenin, "To What State Have the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks Brought the Revolution?", *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 118.

colonialist and anti-racist orientation, which differ from Marxism-Leninism ideologically, borrow some of its fundamental ideas and principles. This is indicative and in most cases effective, of course. Small wonder, therefore, that at times some ideologists of these movements depict their theoretical and political conceptions as Marxist-Leninist ones without taking the trouble to make a profound study of Marxism-Leninism and to assimilate it as an integral, indivisible, all-embracing teaching in which all components without exception make up an organic whole.

Marxist-Leninist theory does not tolerate its mechanical dissection into parts. At the same time, it cannot be a mechanical combination of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook with ideological conceptions evolved in the conditions of petty-bourgeois revolutionary nationalism, let alone national-reformism.

Nevertheless, a close political alliance between representatives of the ideology of scientific socialism and representatives of the national liberation, anti-imperialist movement, whatever mutually acceptable organisational and political form it may take, inside a country or between countries is not only historically possible and desirable but is imperatively demanded by the entire course of the common struggle against imperialism. It is precisely this alliance that provides the major guarantees of a common victory and the growing ideological and political accord between scientific socialism and the revolutionary-democratic, anti-imperialist movement in the liberated countries.

In the historical aspect, therefore, the problem is not to depict the ideology of revolutionary democracy as scientific socialism, which would be an unpardonable delusion, to say the least, nor to reduce scientific socialism to the level of awareness of the petty-bourgeois masses but to take the road of broad and close cooperation in the name of the interests of the nation and the working people not in word but in deed, in the process of joint struggle of the two contingents against imperialism and for social progress.

There is no doubt that this road, however difficult it may be, if followed without groping in the dark or deviating from honest service of the people, will lead to the ultimate goal—socialism, and the forces fighting for it—to a closer alliance and later to integration on the basis of scientific socialism.