Lest We Forget . . . .

Patrice Lumumba, first Prime Minister of the Republic of Congo in his last days being Mishandled and Tortured by his Murderers, the Belgians and Tshombe
Freedom is a Strange Feeling

by Henri Alleg

(An Algerian hero, who escaped from a French jail after five years imprisonment and torture and is now in Czechoslovakia, a free man).

Now that I am free there is an odd feeling that I cannot shake off. It is the strangeness, after years in prison, of being able to walk freely in the streets, of being able to open a window and finding that no iron bars obstruct the view.

Now my heart does not shrink every time I meet a policeman; now I can smile at him, knowing he is a friend.

I often think of the prison where I left so many friends. Particularly I do remember the hard times in the de Barberousse Prison in Algiers.

In a few days time it will be two years since we began a hunger strike which was to have lasted 12 days.

My prison mates and I were just above the death cell in which there were 120 prisoners at that time.

We staged the hunger strike to obtain some improvement in the terrible conditions which prevailed in that and all other Algerian prisons.

The French colonialists refused to consider us as political prisoners. Our people were often treated worse than the common criminals who enjoyed advantages we were denied.

We didn't have beds, bed-clothes or tables. We ate from rusty pots on the floor.

The prison guards beat the prisoners with keys, fists and constantly insulted them. On the slightest pretext prisoners got two or three months solitary confinement.

Step Failed Them

Each morning death awaited two or three Algerian prisoners. At night we waited in vain to sleep. Sometimes sleep would not come, and when it did we hoped that we would not wake up in the morning to see another of our friends die.

Nor did those sentenced to death sleep. They remained awake so that they would not be surprised by the sudden arrival of the guards and the police who would drag them to the guillotine hardly awake.

They wanted to die fully awake and alert so that they could shout their confidence in the victory of their country. Or if others were to die we wanted to hearten them with our songs.

We lived under such conditions in 1957 and 1958. Thanks to the actions organised by the prisoners and our hunger strikers, thanks also to international solidarity and above all the struggle of the Algerian people, things changed.

There were some improvements, but no sooner were they won than the French administration put an end to them and our problems started all over again.

This is why hunger-strikes were held so often. A recent one lasted until the Algerian prisoners forced the French administration to concede to their demands and grant them the status of political prisoners.

This was a big victory for the prisoners who had been demanding this for years.

Patriots

Their determination and their heroism have won the admiration of the whole world. Yet it is still necessary to say that the conditions of the concentration camps in which patriots are held, are reminiscent of those of Nazi prisons.

The Algerian people as a whole have suffered terribly during the seven years of war. More than a million of their sons have been murdered by the French colonialists.

Thousands of Algerian men and women who have been driven out of their villages now live in camps.

Negotiate

In spite of this they continue their struggle under the leadership of their Government. But their hopes for peace are great.

Peace is possible if the French Government stops manoeuvring, if it stops talking about peace while continuing the war, if it ends its plans to divide Algeria, and if it sincerely wishes to negotiate with the provisional Government of the Algerian Republic.

This is what the French people themselves want.

No matter what happens Algeria will become independent sooner or later and the people of Algeria will take the road of social progress and real democracy.
The British colonies in Central Africa were considered till recently, regions of relative tranquillity among her possessions on the continent of Africa. After the establishment of the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland, however, the situation there radically changed.

In examining the situation in these extensive countries, it is better to consider the situations which led to the lumping together of three different countries—Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland—against the will of the African people.

For over 20 years the industrialists and planters of Southern Rhodesia, where over two-thirds of the Federation's white population live, have fostered the idea of setting up under their rule in Central Africa a big state with dominion status. This would give them hold on the two Rhodesias enormous natural resources of gold, copper, chromite, manganese, lithium, and so on, and also enable them to utilise the labour reserves of over-populated Nyasaland, which annually provides some 70,000 workers for the mines and plantations of her more developed neighbours.

Analyzing the results of the Federation's eight years of existence, one sees that the Federation forced on the Africans has not solved a single problem of Central Africa, but on the contrary, has only aggravated the relationships between white settlers and Africans, and brought further complications to the political situation. A sober look at the schemes of the European colonialists, not on the basis of what they say, but of what they do, one sees in their present efforts to strengthen the unpopular Federation, the wish to consolidate their rule over one of Africa's richest regions.

Let us consider the composition of the Federation's white community. Between 1947 and 1957 alone the number of immigrants from the Union of South Africa nearly doubled. The majority of industrialists and planters of the Federation are linked by origin and tradition with their white brethren of the Union of South Africa. This undoubtedly has a great impact on the attitude of the white settlers towards the native population of the two Rhodesias.

White domination in both Rhodesias began seventy-one years ago and was linked with the name of one of the most shameless colonialists, Cecil Rhodes, who, in the words of Lenin, "pursued an imperialist policy with the utmost cynicism."

Through one of his agents, Rhodes concluded an agreement with King Lobengula of the Matabele tribe giving him right to the gold in the King's domain. A territory of fabulous wealth was acquired with the help of Whisky, in exchange for a month's rent of £100, one thousand rifles, a steamer for tripe along the Zambezi River, which, however, the King never had the good luck to enjoy. A tripping incident was provoked and the deal started by deceit was clenched by force of arms. A war, which cost British four men dead and the Matabele hundreds, made Southern Rhodesia a British colony. The South African Company, founded by a charter granted by Queen Victoria, actually ruled Southern Rhodesia for decades.

Having got its bridgehead for future advancements, the company bought for a song the "copperbelt", one of the world's largest copper deposits on the upper Zambezi—and another British colony appeared—Northern Rhodesia. Then the British seized Nyasaland.

Racialism

We see Southern Rhodesia as a classic country of legalised racialism, where the colour bar embraces all spheres of public life. In 1930, the Land Apportionment Act gave all the best and most of the land to the white settlers. Figures published in the "land in Southern Rhodesia", a pamphlet recently published in London, show that 2.2 million Africans in the country own only 41 per cent of the land, and some million Africans have no land at all, while 50,000 white settlers possess one-and-a-half times more land than all the Federation's white population.

At the mines in Northern Rhodesia where the Africans get higher wages than elsewhere, 40,000 African receive approximately £7,000,000 a year, while 7,000 white workers get £14,000,000.

Race discrimination bars Africans from any professions. Recently, it is true, African doctors and lawyers have appeared in Central Africa, but they can be counted on the fingers of one hand.

The African, the legitimate ruler of Africa, has to suffer race discrimination at every step: in the hotels, railway restaurant cars, in the shops, where he is served with inferior goods through a "black" window. The pass system restricts his freedom of movement. The Federation has a total of 60 colour bar laws.

And this is all the more disgusting, because the doctrine of race segregation—pariah which blossoms so profusely in the Union of South Africa, is not the official ideology of the Federation's ruling circles. Today when colonialism is disintegrating all over the world, and one African people after another is winning its independence, it is becoming increasingly clear that the old way of ruling cannot go on. Racial policy in the Federation has therefore, been made to look respectable. It is now called "partnership."

To believe the racialists, the Federation is destined to become a "great experiment zone." "The Central African man will cease to be considered as black, white or brown," and "henceforth the division will be drawn between the civilised and the
These are freedom fighters in Northern Rhodesia Prison. For three days these men were told to hold the food in their hands without eating it. Later they were transferred to another Prison some 5,000 miles away from Lusaka and were forced to carry these tins containing food which was never served on their way to another Prison. This is the moral fibre of the so-called British “civilizing mission” in Africa.
primitivem. But Cecil Rhodes also advanced the principle of "equal rights for equally civilised people."

In his book Central African Witness published in 1959, Cypril Dun, correspondent of the influential British Sunday paper, the Observer, sarcastically ridicules the colonialists’ notion of "Civilised Man."

"Provided a man earns more than £750 a year, he is civilised even if he is barely literate. Contrariwise if a man’s income is low, his civilised state can be recognised only if his standard of education is high."

**Partnership**

"Partnership" envisages the parallel development of both races and gradual bringing of the fruits of culture within the reach of the native population. But what is being done to bring this about in practice? Nothing.

The policy of "parallel development" is a gigantic fraud. In Central Africa, every member of the segregation Society—which supports the apartheid policy—has the vote. Their blatant racialism receives no check from the authorities!

Only the white man is allowed to assert his right to rule. Every attempt of the African to defend his legitimate right to rule his own country is immediately treated as a threat of "black racialism" and is repressed.

Despite the great publicity which has been given to the "partnership" policy, nothing is being done in the Federation to ease the policy of race discrimination. For all the manoeuvres of the Federation’s leaders on this question are linked with current political expediency and dominated by the desire to assure public opinion that they are not pursuing the racists from the Union of South Africa.

The ruling Federal Party acts according to what an author calls "the businessman’s ethic." The proponent of this point of view consider that the Africans must be granted some measure of freedom in the economic field, otherwise the whites cannot prosper. But at the same time they do everything to halt the political activities of the African and preserve the existing social barriers. Years will pass, they say, and these barriers will vanish of themselves. But how long will this take? "Even in a hundred or two hundred years’ time," answers Premier Roy Welensky, "the African shall never hope to dominate the Federation."

**The fight**

The peoples of the two Rhodesias and Nyasaland, however, cannot accept this geological rate of change. They understand perfectly well that under the whiteman’s rule they will never be able to overcome their profound economic and cultural backwardness.

Despite the flood of loud hypocritical phrases of the colonialists about their "civilising" mission, they are more alarmed than pleased at the prospect of acquainting the Africans with education. At any rate, they are not at all keen on the job. The Federation’s former Premier, Lord Malvern, spoke quite frankly on this subject:

"There is no need to suggest to the African that we came here to help him", he declared towards the end of 1956. "We came here to earn our living ...." And in truth during the last years more foreign capital has been invested in the Federation’s economy than in any other African country, except the Union of South Africa and the Congo (former Belgium).

The situation has been made clear to us that it is the aim of Britain to allow the minority white group to govern the Rhodesias and Nyasaland to the exclusion of the seven million inhabitants.

The British Conservatives, still empire-conscious, sensitive to the plight of their fellow countrymen settled overseas, aware that the white community has made itself rich by exploiting the African, feel that the British Government has a moral obligation to safeguard European interests.

It is surprising that despite the British boast that they have faith in democracy, they find it difficult to accept that universal adult suffrage is the first measure which must be considered in guaranteeing the right of the many over the privileged few.

Despite the arrest and imprisonment of African nationalist leaders on flimsy charges; the alerting of troops throughout the Federation; the threat of Europeans to sabotage any constitution which ensures universal adult suffrage; the double tongue role of Iain Macleod, the British Colonial Secretary; the numerous raids by Roy Welensky’s Police on the homes of Africans; and the tightening of already stringent laws, the African nationalist movements have made several strides.

It is the view of some people that a path must be found in Central Africa for a multi-national community in which the African would, of his own free will, co-operate with the white man, who would continue the skilled work in developing the resources of the region. For ensuring this co-operation an interim period of ten—fifteen years is necessary during which time the metropolis is to act as a stabilizing factor between white and black. This, they say, may save us from both the threat of apartheid looming from the South and from "black dictatorship."

Thus have these people based their argument for preserving colonialism in Central Africa. This "positive programme" is not new. It is beneath criticism and unacceptable to the African.

Such formulas as "multifarious community" or "internal self-determination" mean nothing. This mystification is aimed at depriving Africa of her rights to freedom.

The Africans of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland are determined to win their freedom and decide on what to do with the minority groups in their midst.

The pressure of the nationalist forces has increased in the Rhodesias and Nyasaland. No use of attempting to damn the revolutionary tide. The British Government by attempting to side with Roy Welensky and his crazy white settlers is precipitating the destruction of the European in Central Africa in rapid more precipitous and turbulent than the Victoria Falls.

The nationalist leader of Northern Rhodesia, Mr. Kenneth Kaunda has sounded the warning note: "Not even an inch of Africa will be given to a foreign race. We are determined to clean the entire Central Africa of the evils of imperialism and colonialism."
History and Civilisation

by Staff Writer

Mr. Verwoerd recently assured us once again that "it is the White man to whom all progress must be ascribed of which people all over the world at present boast."

The learned Doctor obviously knows nothing or prefers to know nothing about the history of Europe, Asia or Africa. He finds it more convenient to replace history by myth just like his admired model, Alfred Rosenberg, the "philosopher" of Nazi Germany.

According to one of the most cherished myths of the racialists Europeans created civilisation out of nothing, rather like God creating the world out of chaos.

But the blessings of civilisation are not the property of any one human group which they can grauously distribute or rightfully keep, as they see fit. Civilisation happens to be the product of mankind as a whole and to its development peoples from all over the world have contributed. No group, least of all the people from the North and West of Europe, who arrived so recently on the historical scene, can claim a monopoly of contributions to civilisation.

West Came Late

One wonders where civilisation would be if Asian and African peoples had not invented the use of writing, discovered how to smelt iron and cultivate grains, created the wheel, produced multiplication tables and minted coins thousands of years ago before the people of Europe emerged from the most primitive savagery.

We could easily fill several issues of Voice of Africa if we tried to give an exhaustive list of Asian and African contributions to civilisation because it would turn out to be practically a history of human civilisation as such.

White civilisation, in the "purity" with which it is propagated in Verwoerd's South Africa, does not compare too well with the ancient civilisations of Asia and Africa. Just to take one example from the material sphere, it may surprise some of the pundits of apartheid to know that the elaborate drainage system of the ancient Indian cities which flourished on the river Indus about 4,000 years ago was superior to that provided by White civilisation in that part of its towns which it refers to as the "location."

Moral Ideas

And the moral ideas of these ancient civilisations would seem to have risen to a conception of universal justice and human brotherhood which is far beyond the grasp of the "civilised" defenders of Afrikaner tribalism.

"Behold it is not to make for himself slaves of any people," stated the traditional address delivered by the Egyptian Pharaoh two thousand years before the birth of Christ.

Upon assuming office, high state officials in Ancient Egypt were told: "Forget not to judge justice. Look upon him who is known to thee like him who is unknown to thee; and him who is near the king like him who is far from his house."

The social philosophy of Ancient Egypt reached its climax in the universal moral doctrines of Ikhnaton (fourteenth century B.C.). In his beautiful hymns Ikhnaton makes no distinction between his own people and foreigners.

All men are in the same degree God's sons and must regard themselves as brothers. For the first time in human history religion is conceived as a bond uniting men of different colour, language and custom.

Greek Learning

The wisdom of the Bronze Age civilisations of the Ancient Near East provided the basis for the later cultural achievements of the Greeks who were great traders and travellers and so were able to benefit by learning from the Asian and African peoples with whom they came into contact.

Subsequently, the barbarian invaders from Northern Europe destroyed the old Graeco-Roman slave civilisation and most of its cultural achievements. Europe entered the long period of its Dark Ages, while the cultural heritage of the ancient world was productively developed by the great civilisation of the Arabs.

When the Crusaders from Western Europe invaded the Near East from the end of the eleventh century A.D. onwards they were amazed to find themselves in the presence of a civilisation far more advanced than their own. The same discovery was made by the Venetian traveller Marco Polo when he visited China in the thirteenth century and found there a degree of culture which made most of Europe look like a jungle.

Surprise in Africa

And a similar surprise awaited the readers of the first reliable description of the Negro civilisation of West Africa to be published in Europe.

Its author, Leo Africanus, described to his astounded readers the huge libraries of African scholars in university towns like Timbuktu, the great wealth of the African rulers and merchants, their efficient and peaceful administration and other matters which might make many an inhabitant of war-torn sixteenth century Europe feel envious.

Civilisation has never been confined to particular human groups but has grown step by step through the contribution of people of every race and colour. At different historical periods different kinds of contributions have been made by different kinds of people. Some...
KENYA: The old Tory
Game of Divide and
Rule—John Siddon

The statement on Kenya by Mr. Maudling, Britain’s Colonial Secretary, shows the Tory Government is up to its old tricks again. Divide and rule. Bolster up reaction. Play for time in order to give added strength to the chosen collaborators, and to allow disunity to deepen and spread.

Most people know how British imperialism has used these tactics. Hindu versus Moslem in India. Arab versus Jew in former Palestine. Catholic versus Protestant in Ireland. Tamil versus Sinhalese in Ceylon.

Africa has been no exception to this rule. But in Africa further refinements to the method have been added.

Division

Faced in the past decade with a growing insistence by the African people that they be allowed to rule themselves, British imperialism has worked hard to play on every division and backward-looking force.

Its aim has been to make possible the creation of “federal” States in which feudal and tribal reaction would play a key role, and British imperialism be left, in effect, to rule the roost from behind the scenes.

If anyone doubts this, let him read Kwame Nkrumah’s autobiography and learn how this trick was attempted in Ghana.

Despite the clear verdict of the 1954 General Election, which gave the Convention People’s Party an overwhelming majority, reactionary politicians in alliance with semi-feudal chiefs in Ashanti, started a separatist agitation, hoping to secure the establishment of a federal form of government which would enable them to resist and sabotage the central government’s programme.

This agitation points out Nkrumah was backed by most of the Press, while the actions of the British Government “served as a stimulant to the unrest.”

Majority

By strong decisive action, backed by the overwhelming majority of the Ghanaian people, Nkrumah smashed this separatist plot and Ghana was thus enabled to embark on a programme of advance.

Though balked in Ghana, British imperialism has scored in Nigeria, making use of the feudalled Northern People’s Congress to ensure that the leading positions are in the hands of a feudal reaction.

In Northern Rhodesia, where the “threat” of independence draws ever nearer, British imperialism has already made the first moves to foster a separatist agitation in Barotseland.

While in the Congo, largely due to British imperialist influence, the same classic game has been played with Katanga.

Background

Some understanding of this background is necessary if one is to appreciate what Maudling and the British Government are trying on in Kenya.

The present crisis arises from the refusal of British imperialism to accept the demands of the Kenya people.

In the 1961 elections, deliberately held before Jomo Kenyatta’s release and appointment as leader of the Kenya African National Union, that party received 550,000 votes against 150,000 votes for the Kenya African Democratic Union.

Yet it is not KANU, with nearly 80 per cent of the votes, which is the Government of Kenya. It is the British Government with a Council of Ministers composed of KADU representatives together with Europeans.

KANU, with support from all the different peoples of Kenya, stand for a united Kenya, for the formation of a strong central government which will be able to stand up to imperialism and plan the development of the country’s economy. It has called for independence by February 1962.

KADU, which is supported by the Governor as well as by many settlers in Michael Blundell’s New Kenya Party, stands for a regional federation.

This would give full scope to tribal, separatist and parochial tendencies, lead to disunity and leave British imperialism in the background but with decisive control still in its hands.

Regional

At the beginning of October, KADU put forward a plan for a “regional government system” which would establish no fewer than five regional governments in a land of only seven million people.

“The details of the plan,” said The Times, “were worked out by KADU’s European associates.”

Since then, KADU has stirred up hostility in the country and openly threatened “civil war” if its plans are unheeded.

Kenyatta has rightly warned against the dangers involved in this agitation by KADU. “Regionalism leads to a Congo situation,” he said, “and we don’t want that to happen in Kenya.”

But the British Government, far from trying to damp down the spreading flames, is only fanning them further, as Maudling’s statement shows.

In his announcement last week he gave backing to the federal scheme and refused to accept Kenyatta’s proposal of February 1962 as the date for independence, arguing that it “will still take some time” before independence.

Even on the very day of his arrival in Nairobi, before he had acquainted himself with the situation, Maudling said: “Clearly, there could be very
African Struggle
by Osagyefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah

We in Africa today are engaged in a relentless struggle against colonialism, imperialism and neo-colonialism. The continent is in a great nationalistic ferment and the chains of oppression are breaking down everywhere. In nineteen fifty-seven, when Ghana became independent, there were only eight independent African states; today there are no fewer than twenty-eight, with many others still to follow. The struggle is hard and fierce. The events in the Congo, in Angola, in Algeria and more recently in Tunisia, are clear indications of the determination of the colonialists and imperialists not to give up.

Divide and Rule

great advantages in a federation.”
A week later, on the day he left Kenya, Maudling gave his views in more detail.

Rights
In his statement he pushed forward the idea of regional “governing authorities” with “their own defined rights which do not derive from the Central Government.”

Significantly, he added that the powers of these regional government “would be entrenched in such a way that they could not be swept aside as they had been in Ghana.”

Clearly Maudling favours the Nigerian pattern rather than that of Ghana.

And when one remembers that the Nigerian Government representative at the U.N. last month was coolly suggesting that colonialism should not be ended until 1970, while Ghana is playing a leading role in the battle to liberate the whole African continent, one can easily understand Maudling’s preference.

Equally dangerous—and all of a piece with his support for regionalism—was Maudling’s threat that, “no maintain security,” steps might be taken to restrict “the movements of the leaders of one party in the territory of another.”

In saying this, Maudling is evidently trying to spread the false claim put forward by leaders of KADU and by the Tory Press in Britain that KANU only represents some “tribes” and is not a national party.

Confining
By confining the leaders of KANU a party with overwhelming support in Kenya—to certain regions, it would be possible for British imperialism to hinder the spread of that party’s influence before the next elections, and, at the same time, sharpen divisions among the Kenya people.

The British Government is playing with fire.

There is only one way out of the impending crisis. And that is for British Government to concede the demand of the Kenya people for independence in February 1962, to respect the wishes of the majority of Kenya people for a unitary form of government, and to stop giving encouragement to the forces of disruption.

It is also a clear reminder of the necessity for the political unification of the African continent. We are confident, however, that the days of colonialism are numbered and that the evil which it represents will be crushed once and for all. In addition to the preservation of world peace, the two basic aims of our foreign policy are African independence and African unity. The one is inextricably bound up with the other. I repeat here what I told the Ghana Parliament on July fourth, “the people of Africa have learnt to their cost that independence is not just a matter of political constitutions or changing of flags. There are subtle and sur-reptitious ways by which the colonial powers can maintain their grip of the subjected peoples even after the visible trappings of foreign sovereignty have disappeared. So long as the peoples of Africa are divided into so many wholly artificial political units arbitrarily fixed for them by their colonial masters, it is not possible to attain true independence or economic equality.

If we in Ghana are so much in favour of Pan-Africanism, it is not on account of any selfish motive of increasing our own importance but because we are so deeply convinced that it is only through African unity that the peoples of this great continent can really free themselves from foreign domination and rule.

Our struggle against colonialism and imperialism is part of the struggle for world peace; for the liquidation of imperialism and colonialism means the positive removal of the fundamental causes of war. This is why we support all efforts aimed at establishing the fundamental rights of all peoples, and the promotion of peace and security throughout the world. It is also for this reason that we have persistently supported the just demand of the Chinese people’s republic for admission to the United Nations. It does not make sense to us that over sixhundred million people should be excluded from the only international body dedicated to the pursuit of peace.
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EVER since the South African Settler regime received its most serious challenge on the launching of the Positive Action campaign of the Pan-Africanist Congress in March 1960, they have been tightening their measures of repression and terrorism against the African people.

Their most important step in that direction was the imposition of a ban upon the Pan-Africanist Congress and the African National Congress and their attempt to confiscate the property of these organisations.

Their measures against known politicians have been reflected in the arrest of twelve former members of the Pan-Africanist Congress and of thirteen members of the continuation committee.

The alleged members of the PAC were sentenced to varying terms of imprisonment and their alleged leader Abednego Ngcobo, National Treasurer of the banned Pan-Africanist Congress was sentenced to two years imprisonment with hard labour under the Unlawful Organisations Act. He lost his appeal and is today serving sentence.

Among members of the “Continuation Committee” who have been convicted and sentenced but are now out on bail pending their appeal are Messrs Congress Mbata, Field Officer of the Institute of Race Relations, Jordan Ngunbene, well-known journalist and Vice-President of the Liberal Party of South Africa, Paul Mosaka, a well-known African businessman and the Reverend Ben Rajullu, Presiding Elder of the African Methodist Episcopal Church of South Africa in Orlando.

Mr. Makwetu, former chairman of the Western Cape Region of the banned Pan-Africanist Congress and Mr. Sokhanyile, former Chairman of the Transkei Region of the banned Pan-Africanist Congress have both fallen victim to the repressive Unlawful Organisations Act of the Pretoria settler regime.

Both Messrs Makwetu and Sokhanyile have been removed to Pondoland where a state of emergency has existed since March 1960. Here they can be indefinitely detained because of the existence of the state of emergency. And there are no signs that these will ever be lifted except under terrific pressure either from within or without South Africa or from both sources.

Mr. Elliot A. Msafa, former National Organiser of the banned Pan-Africanist Congress has been in jail since the launching of the campaign. He is serving a two-year sentence. It is learnt that he has been so tortured and persecuted in jail that he has become paralysed. Attempts are being made to obtain his release from jail.

Mr. Joe Molefi, a well-known Pan-Africanist leader, is now in Basutoland. Joe Molefi, who was propaganda secretary of the ANC Youth League in the early 1950s has probably spent a record time in jail since the launching of the Positive Action campaign. He and all his colleagues had each been sentenced to three years hard labour or £300 fine. They had faced many phoney trials of the settler regime jails and before their courts although he has so far never been convicted of any “crime.”

He successfully led the Evaton Bus Boycott of 1955—1957 and became in those dangerous days the chief target of the hirelings and agents of the Bus company.

Together with Yusumuzi Make, Permanent Pan-Africanist representative in Cairo and New York, Joe faced many phoney trials of the herrenvolk.

For full four years he appeared in the Treason Trial and was discharged when it finally collapsed. Before his departure for Basutoland Joe was before the settler courts again this time on a charge of unlawfully running the Pan-Africanist Congress by publishing and distributing Mafube an alleged organ of the PAC.

Joe appeared together with Matthew Nkoana, veteran journalist and well-known PAC leader. The Mafube copies which had been distributed before the May 1961 pre-Republican Telephone Booth fiasco, had warned the African people against being misdirected by the multi-racists who were asking them to protest because the settler regime was changing their form of government from monarchy to republicanism.

The journal accused the multi-racists of attempting to use the African people to serve the interests of one settler party against another.

It made clear the point that to African nationalists the settler government Nationalist Party and the settler opposition United Party were Tweedledum and Tweedledee, all agreed on the basic question of the need to oppress the Africans and differing among themselves only on matters of detail.

The journal, of which thousands had been issued, exposed the aim of the Telephone Booth demonstrations as an attempt “to turn the people from the goal of freedom and independence now.”

“In place of the vacillation and loud-mouthed badinage of multi-racialism” the journal said, “must be raised the standard of Positive Action.”

Incidentally, the Telephone Booth fiasco received its name from the behaviour of one of its multi-racist puppet directors, who attempted to direct it from one telephone booth to another and who has since gone into hiding—from the wrath of the indignant masses.

Matthew Nkoana had led 142 fellow freedom fighters on the day of the launching of the Positive Action campaign. He and all his colleagues had each been sentenced to three years imprisonment with hard labour or £300 fine. They had all elected to serve their sentence.

Their sentence was later reduced by the suspension of half the sentence and half the fine.

In the Mafube case Mr. Nkoana was sentenced to three years hard labour with no alternative of fine.
Federation of Rhodesias and Nyasaland (1)

by M. Sipalo

Here in the Centre of the Southern African plateau the British imperialists have worked night and day to create an artificial state in an effort to “dominionise” the interests of the British rentier class, create a white paradise for the 297,000 of their kith and kin now settled there and to act as a buffer against the surging waves of the African liberatory forces from the North.

The creation of the Federation in September 1953 was such a political swindle as no White historian can compare to any event in the annals of the ugly British Colonial record. For this misdemeanour both Labour and Conservatives are equally charged: for the Labour, (when in office) laid the egg which the Conservatives hatched.

The two Rhodesias and Nyasaland form a land-locked unit bounded by the Union of South Africa, Bechuanaland and Angola to the South, South-West and West respectively. By Tanganyika in the North-East, Mozambique in the East and Katanga in the North. Within this area of 475,000 square miles live nearly nine million Africans, 297,000 Europeans, 25,000 Asians and 13,000 members of the coloured community.

In 1938, a Royal Commission was appointed under the Chairmanship of Lord Bledisloe “to enquire and report whether any, and if so what, form of closer co-operation or association between Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland is desirable and feasible, with due regard to the interests of all the inhabitants, irrespective of race. . . . . .”

The Bledisloe Commission examined the alternative of amalgamation of the three territories or of associating them in some form of Federation. May it be noted here that at this very time a movement to incorporate Southern Rhodesia into the Union of South Africa was under way. This movement was strongly supported by the South African Premier, J. B. M. Hertzog. In Southern Rhodesia itself a “Back to the South” movement was mooted-out supported mainly by White settlers of South African extraction.

The Bledisloe report came out clearly that to federate the three territories “enjoying such different measures of responsibility and in such different stages of social and political development was unlikely to succeed.” The Commission went on: “the striking unanimity in the Northern territories, of the native opposition to amalgamation, and the anxiety of the natives in Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland lest there should be change in the system was clearly visible everywhere.

It was not until 1950 that the question of a form of political association of the three territories was again seriously examined. And in 1951 James Griffiths—the Labour Colonial Secretary—was busy organising Conferences in Rhodesia and London. He was assisted by Patrick Gordon Walker the Labour Commonwealth Secretary. When Labour lost the elections, the Conservatives took up the matter with full vigour and brought about the Central African Federation on September 23, 1953.

The support the Labour are trying to give to the Africans, struggling against Federation, is a mere confidence trick. They cannot escape the fact that they are the progenitors of the Central African Federation and in that sense the authors of all our woes and the fore-runners of the atrocities now being perpetrated by the Conservatives in the name of the British people.

May it be stated here that at no stage did any of the British Governments consult the African people about the whole scheme.

The Federal Scandal

The inception of Federation was procedurally undemocratic in that, in spite of the overwhelming opposition by the Africans, it was imposed. A referendum by a few European settlers in Southern Rhodesia decided the issue and since 1953, the direction of the affairs of Central Africa have always depended on the political wishes of the settlers in Southern Rhodesia in particular and on whites as a whole. Adequate examples are the Federal Franchise, National Army Service and now the calling up of “White Troops” in case the constitutional talks may lead to African majority in the Legislature.

The Federalists threw overboard two essential requisites necessary to a federal state namely, Cultural uniformity and the Equality of the political status of the federating units. They also ignored the fact that there was and still is a great constitutional diversity between the constituent parts. The two Northern Territories are Protectorates by treaty, whilst Southern Rhodesia is a white self-governing colony by conquest (even though wars fought between white nations have not ended in permanent foreign occupation such as is the case of Germany, Italy and Japan).

The Protectorate Treaties are legal contracts entered into by the United Kingdom Government and the
hereditary rulers of the African people to the effect that the Protectorates would be developed on clear and unequivocal understanding that the African people would ultimately take over the reigns of government and these treaties did not envisage any other contrary constitutional arrangement, certainly not settler domination, however, temporary.

The overwhelming influence of the Federation over the Protectorate (Northern Rhodesia) matters have been such that even the Northern Rhodesia pre-Federation franchise which could have allowed a larger number of Africans to qualify as full voters has been dropped in favour of the highly qualitative Federal Franchise.

We interpret this unwarranted increase in the franchise qualifications according to the words of the Federal Premier, Sir Roy Welensky, when, in a moment of political unwisdomness at Ndola on December 2, 1959, he said: "Responsible Government for Northern Rhodesia should be on the same basis as Southern Rhodesia had enjoyed since 1923."

Knowing the type of government Southern Rhodesia has enjoyed since 1923, the African people actually wonder just how much the Federal Government is in touch with the British Government. In August 1959, the British Prime Minister said: "The conception is that as power is transferred from the United Kingdom, in respect of the two Northern Territories (Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland), it will be transferred, not to the Federal Government, but to the Government of the two Northern Territories, which will become more and more representative of the Africans until they have African majority."

In fact the whole picture of the role of the Federal Government was aptly put by Mr. Garfield Tood, former leader of the Central African Party, when speaking in Livingstone on November 30, 1959, he said: "It (Federal Government) does not represent the people, as by its own designs it has set the qualifications for the franchise so high that it is not possible to visualise Africans having anything real in any election."

The Federal policy of "Partnership" killed the pre-Federation policy of African Paramountcy upon which lay the foundations of an ultimate African Self-Rule. Politically, partnership is only possible among equals, i.e. persons enjoying the same rights in the spheres of politics, education, remuneration, uniformity in social up-bringing and unrestricted avenues to Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness, all of which the Federation does not provide.

Thus did Lord Malvern, then the Federal Prime Minister, have the arrogance to say, in 1954, that "the partnership we mean between Black and White is the same as exists between Rider and Horse."

At a joint meeting of the Catholic Hierarchies of Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, which took place at Kacebere Major Seminary, Fort Manning, on October 12 and 14, 1959, a memorandum was drafted which was then forwarded to the Federal Governments and the three Territorial Governments in Central Africa. Among other things it said: "The Bishops protest against the disparity which exists between the ideal of partnership so greatly publicised and the practice of it in all three Territories, a disparity which regrettably seems to stem from statutory law based on race distinction, and cannot too greatly insist on the necessity of according to all men, irrespective of race, the rights due to them as human persons and citizens."

In pre-Federation days no African Chief was deposed because of his political ideas, but during the struggle against Federation and after, several important Chiefs have been deposed and some of them imprisoned as well. The list includes Senior Chief Milambo, of the Ushi—deposed and rusticated, Senior Chief Chitimukulu of the Bemba was stripped of his hereditary and traditional powers because he has all along fought against Federation and refused to meet Sir Roy Welensky as that would have meant acceptance of Federation on behalf of his people.

After the imposition of Federation the expenditure of the Federation on Police increased, consequently, personnel and weapons increased as if there was to be a state of war. (Budgets for 1950 and 1957).

Law and Order

In pre-Federation days there were two shooting incidents on the Copper Mines, but after the imposition of Federation the armed Police have become "trigger-happy" and rule by gun powder and lead has inhumanly resulted.

The British Colonial Office has it on record that:

1952 Tear-gas bombs were used in Luapula against an up-to-then peaceful and law abiding villagers, followed by depositions rustications of chiefs.

1953 Tear-gas bombs were thrown at women and children at Broken-Hill; 1954 Women and children were tear-gassed at the District Commissioner's Office in Lusaka;

1955 Tear-gassing at Kasama, in the Northern Province, and at Fort-Jameson in the Eastern Province;

1956 Tear-gassing at Chingola on the Copper Mines followed by numerous arrests;

1957 Tear-gassing and shootings at Luwingu, Abercorn, Kasama, Lusaka, Ndola, Mufulira, Chingola, Kitwe, Luanshya, Choma and Lundazi;

1958 Cold-blooded shootings at Gwembe leading to the death of 11 persons. Still in 1958, cold-blooded shootings at Ndola leading to the deaths of six persons.

1959 Cold-blooded shootings on Chilubi Island, Northern Province leading to deaths of four persons.

In all these numerous arrests, injuries and unofficially recorded deaths occurred. It is a shameful record which could be a smear to the record of any Colonial Power. And yet all this crime on the part of the Government is excused by quoting "Law and Order," and the blame put on innocent Africans who are seeking nothing more less than natural rights.

In pre-Federation days there were no political imprisonments but during the struggle against Federation and after its imposition political imprisonments have become the rule rather than the exception of State Policy. Since 1952, but for a few Native Authority and Central Government Courts (the former are entirely in the hands of District..."
Commissioners) there have been political cases leading to fines and fantastic terms of imprisonments in the rest of the courts every year.

In March, 1959, a popular African Political Organisation the ZAMBIA AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, was arbitrarily banned, all its leaders, numbering well over 60, unlawfully arrested and rusticated to areas far away from their homes and places of work. Some of them were later re-arrested, charged and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment and the rest, among whom no charges were preferred languished in the solitary places of rustication until January 8, 1960. This was apart from imprisonment of 137 people convicted on various political charges whose sentences range from four to ten years.

Rustications and imprisonments of popular African leaders are intended.

(a) To keep out of the way intelligent and effective Africans

(b) To create a fear complex among African Freedom Fighters so that the African should not claim for that which is politically and legitimately his by right.

The post-Federation period has seen the entire neglect of the Rule of Law and a consequent disregard for the place of Law.

(a) FREEDOM OF ASSEMBLY has been completely tempered with, to the detriment of African interests, through the operation of the Police (Amendment) Ordinance of 1958, the Societies Ordinance and the Penal Code Amendment Ordinance, 1959, outlawing boycotts.

(b) FREEDOM OF SPEECH is completely denied and police have powers to record

He has since appealed against the conviction and sentence and has been allowed bail of £250.

These are some of the people that are today the victims of the persecution and terrorism of the sadistic settler regime.

Those among the settlers who have at long last sponnted a conscience and those of them who are panic-strickers at the course of events in South Africa are busy, packing and going.

The census figures of a year ago showed for the first time more emigrants than immigrants. Bookings on ocean liners especially on those going to Australia and Canada are today unavailable.

Only the West German Republic has once more thought of stabbing the struggle of the African people in the back. They have promised the settler regime immigrants to the number of 50,000. Most of these are intended for South-West Africa where by some strange quirk of logic the Germans seem to think the country belongs to them.

Settler South Africa has always been a police state but now it threatens to be a military state as well.

Settler regime has issued a call to 10,000 settler ducktails to train for nine months to crush African nationalism.

The war expenditure of the settler regime has risen by £14,000,000 to £35,750,000 during last year.

The settler regime is also reported to have entered into agreement with a French arms arm to establish a factory in the Transvaal, capable of producing rocket missile equipment.

The South African settler regime is also known to have had conspiratorial agreements with Welensky and Salazar on the need to crush the rising tide of African nationalism.

Already the people of South Africa are so impatient that a number of attempts are being made to blow this and that but some of those engaged in these look too amateur to achieve anything worthwhile.

Once in South African history Paul Kruger, President of the “South African Republic” chose to go to war rather than grant the vote to other Europeans whom he contemptuously referred to as uitlanders (foreigners). He boasted that these would receive the vote over his dead body.

When they did receive the vote he had run away to Europe.

The present Prime Minister of settler South Africa was born in Holland. Today he is busy boasting that the African people will receive “one man, one vote” over his dead body. History has a strange tendency of repeating itself and it may soon do so.
Goa—Five Centuries of Oppression

by Bob Leeson

The Indian military action in Goa follows demands—which have mounted since India itself became independent in 1947—that this last imperialist foothold in India be freed.

Goa, south of Bombay on the west coast of India, together with the tiny enclaves of Deman and Diu, cover some 1,500 square miles with a population of about 640,000—60 per cent Hindu and 40 per cent Catholic.

It forms a part of the oldest colonial system in the world. The Portuguese set up forts on the India coast in 1510 to guard trade routes to China.

On October 25, 1955, The Times described the empire of the 72-year-old dictator Salazar as a “colonial system on the lines of the Roman Empire,” with a “remarkable degree of political stability.”

From this empire Portugal draws oil, asphalt, coal, diamonds, uranium, manganese, iron, gold. Figures quoted by The Times in 1955 show that Portugal paid about £5 10s. for every ton imported from her colonies.

Exports

But the colonies paid about £7 a ton for all that Portugal exported to them. Since then, the trend has been for this “gap” to widen.

While Portugal has a population of some ten million and a land area of 35,000 square miles, the empire, spread South America, Africa and Asia, covers 800,000 square miles and 12 million people.

Under Salazar’s “democracy,” the colonies send 17 “deputies” to sit in a Portuguese Parliament of 130 deputies.

The “right” to vote in this empire is extended to about one in eight adults in Portugal itself. In the colonies “democracy” is even more diluted. Thus in Mozambique, 8,000 Africans out of a population of five million can vote.

The empire is held together by driving the bulk of Portugal’s 80,000 soldiers throughout it. Armed forces in Goa are estimated to be about 10,000.

When India became independent of British rule in 1947 she demanded that French and Portuguese occupation of various enclaves around the coast be ended.

Negotiations with the French to liquidate France’s colonial possessions were concluded in 1956 with the French giving up Pondicherry, Make and Yanaon.

But requests to Portugal were rejected outright in 1950. In 1952, Salazar issued a decree turning the colonies into “provinces” and declaring them to be “an integral part of Portugal” . . . . at a distance of several thousand miles.

From then on, Portuguese oppression of the Goan population worsened as the struggle to reunite Goa and India developed.

From 1953 to 1957 3,000 Goans, one in 200 of the population, were arrested, 87 shot or killed by torture, and 15 deported to penal settlements in other colonies.

Efforts to liberate Goa grew, and in 1953 the tiny enclaves of Dedra and Nagar Haveli were freed by an uprising.

Struggle

Non-violent efforts to free Goa in 1954 met with a bloody response from Portuguese armed forces, 15 people being killed and 225 injured.

Inside Goa, the struggle against Portuguese occupation grew, while in the rest of India people grew impatient with the slowness of the Indian Government to take stronger action than the issuing of Notes to Portugal.

Prime Minister Nehru was charged by Joao Cabral, Secretary of the Goa League, in London last month of “having prevented us from using force to liquidate Portuguese colonialism in Goa.”

Throughout this autumn the Portuguese hold over Goa has been increasingly challenged by the Goan people. Some 7,000 strikers brought the manganese and iron ore production to a standstill.

Conditions in Goa were reported as “chaotic,” a description confirmed by the state of emergency declared by the Portuguese authorities, who instituted a curfew with “shoot-at-sight” orders.

Volunteers

Nevertheless several villages ejected Portuguese forces and ran up the Indian flag, while police posts were attacked and political prisoners freed.

The Goan Political Convention, uniting all organisations in the colony announced its intention of calling for 5,000 volunteers to liberate Goa, if the Indian Government did not take action.

In early December, a series of Portuguese frontier violations, firing on an Indian passenger ship and a fishing vessel, killing one man and others, caused anger to rising reach storm level.

In face of the Portuguese provocations, Indian Army units were moved to the border.

American and British pressure on Nehru not to push the Goa issue to open conflict grew. Not only is Portugal a cherished NATO ally, but the natural harbours of Goa are regarded as very useful for Seato operations.

Indeed India more than once had to warn against the use of Goa as a foreign base.

But inside India the demand that the liberation of Goa be achieved without more ado, grew and grew to include all except the extreme Right Wing.
Even the Hindustan Times said that Portuguese actions “call for not only deterrent but punitive action.”

While the Communist Party’s New Age asked: “What is the Indian Army for, if it is not sent out to liberate Goa, Daman and Diu?”

Premier Nehru declared on December 10 that while still wanting a peaceful solution, “if the other side pays no heed to reason we have to be ready.”

The bulk of the British Press have, of course, assailed Nehru as an aggressor, but The Times is shrewd enough to point to the real reason for their anger.

“So far as the dictatorship of Dr. Salazar is concerned, this disaster, coming on top of the insurrection in Angola must affect his regime.”

Salazar’s empire is crumbling. Its peoples are on the move, inflicting another great blow against imperialism as a whole.

We Shall Fight
Continued from page 13

On the lower level, it is important that the conditions in detention and prison camps be investigated by some unbiased Red Cross International members immediately. In one prison camp, one of my followers has died from what medical authorities believe to be dysentery. Others were taken ill at the same time. They are in Hospital.

The stage is now set for Her Majesty the Government to act and meet the representations of various sections of our community who approached them. We have been too liberal as a nationalist party. I am beginning to wonder whether Her Majesty’s Government would have gone back on their word had we played as tough as Welensky has been playing it. If Mr. Macleod’s removal means Welensky’s victory, I shall implement the 3rd and 4th stages of my master plan. When the 3rd and 4th stages of my Master Plan are launched there will be few smiles and indeed no capital will come in—at least not in Northern Rhodesia. Now is the time for Her Majesty’s Government to grant to the chiefs and people of Northern Rhodesia what is divinely theirs. (Welensky, we shall fight to the last man.)

GOD BLESS AFRICA—HER SONS AND DAUGHTERS.

Blazing Fire
Continued from page 7

officers who remain loyal to their former masters.

Conference expressed the conviction that it is by intensifying the mobilisation of the African masses for the liberation of Africa that the African will find the most efficient way to fight neo-colonialism.

Counteracting Neo-Colonialism

Conference condemned the balkanization of emerging states, and federations created before independence under the patronage of colonial states.

Conference invited all Independent African States to give aid and assistance to liberate the African countries still under foreign domination and urged those Independent African states which still retain foreign military and para-military bases, to liquidate these bases as soon as possible.

The launching of the All-African Conference expressed the conviction that it is by intensifying the mobilisation of the African masses for the liberation of Africa that the African will find the most efficient way to fight neo-colonialism.

The USA continues to finance the colonialist war against African liberation.

Out of the $76 million dollars of American aid given to Salazar $286 million dollars were given for military assistance.

De Gaulle has since he was against Algeria received the fabulous sum of $9,786 million dollars as aid from the USA. He hasn’t used half of this money in effect to exterminate the Algerian people for the sake of Algerian oil and other Algerian riches.

The Winneba meeting of African nationalist leaders from the Dependent African States discussed imperialism and colonialism in the light of the mounting repression of the African peoples and discussed inter alia.

As the struggle for the liberation of Africa gains momentum the need for a monolithic continent-wide liberatory party becomes accentuated. Such a party must be based on African nationalism and committed to African unity and to the creation of an Africanist socialist democracy.

Sekou Toure, leading Africanist, moved directly towards the definition of such socialist democracy when he declared that:

“We have never excluded co-operation with capital. We have only rejected capitalism as a form of social organisation because it does not suit our stage of development.

“My country will not attempt to imitate or copy the economic system of any other country, either capitalist or socialist, because the present conditions of life and problems of development in Guinea are not the same as those of any other country.

“Rather, it will employ all means, take advantage of all possibilities, and borrow from all experiences, in so far as they are adaptable to and contribute towards Guinean advancement.”

Civilisation
Continued from page 19

contributed new technical discoveries, other new ideas and others again new kinds of artistic production.

The European pirates and traders who penetrated into the Indian Ocean during the sixteenth century did not and could not consider themselves more civilised than the ancient communities which they attacked. They killed and plundered in the name of the Christian religion, not in the name of “White Civilisation.”

Western technical superiority is hardly more than two centuries old, and it is already being lost again.

February, 1962 ● 27