

Expose the Plans to Appease Verwoerd

ALMOST as if by common consent a number of voices have been raised in different quarters warning that the European racialists in the Republic of South Africa will never give in to the present demands of the African majority, that all the international pressure in the world to force Verwoerd and Co. to abandon apartheid and introduce universal franchise will never get anywhere, and that therefore the opponents of apartheid should tone down their demands for full democracy and find some compromise acceptable to Verwoerd.

Those who are spreading this argument are trying to back it up by playing on people's genuine fears of a third world war, and by asserting that increased pressure against the Verwoerd Government will only stiffen its opposition and could lead to a frightful holocaust.

The supporters of this view are busy producing new "plans" for South Africa which veer right away from or even run counter to the demands of the African majority in that country. Thus we have the "Scandinavian plan" for South Africa—a kind of "partnership" (beloved conception of Welensky) which would deny the people universal franchise and majority rule.

We also have the amazing proposals of John Hatch (recently published in the *New Statesman*) which turn out to be nothing other than partition and thinly disguised apartheid in the form of a "Confederation". And we have other "Confederation". And we have other "partition" proposals advocated in other journals.

Such proposals will never be acceptable to the African people who will be satisfied with nothing less than full democracy, an end to all forms of racial discrimination and segregation and the ending of white domination.

The excuses offered for putting forward these new "solutions" are the old familiar ones that if you press the white racialists too hard they will get nasty and bite you—and then you will have a world war on your hands. We have met this argument before. It is called

by
Jack Woddis

ed appeasement. It is not the opposition to Verwoerd but the appeasement of him by the imperialists which endangers peace.

Of course, no one should under-estimate the fanaticism of the white rulers of South Africa nor their determination to maintain their system of apartheid for as long as they can. But equally, no one should forget that **Verwoerd and his government could never continue in power but for the support they receive from the imperialist powers.**

The appeasers argue that international action has failed or that it will not weaken the Verwoerd Government but only stiffen its opposition to making any concessions.

But the real fact is that real international action has not yet been tried!

When the Western imperialist powers who do 93 per cent of South Africa's trade, supply 96 per cent of her oil needs, and provide 100 per cent of her arms purchases, refuse to carry out United Nations' resolutions and to impose economic and arms sanctions against South Africa, how can one argue that international action is useless?

Only the first steps towards international pressure have so far been taken against South Africa, and these have been taken by a number of Afro-Asian states and the socialist countries.

It is clear, therefore that international pressure must be increased. This is the best kind of help we can give to the people fighting to break down the gates of Verwoerd's prison house. For these heroic fighters, who have decided that recourse to arms is necessary, struggle—hard, bitter struggle is inevitable, and no one should underestimate the immensity of the task remaining to be done.

But there is a good deal of bluff in the threats of Verwoerd and Co., and in the "warnings" of many Western commentators and politicians.

I remember in 1952 the white settlers in Kenya proclaiming that they would never surrender their rule over that rich territory. The people struggled. The British imperialists intervened to drown the struggle in blood and to keep the settlers in power. But the people won. Imperialism had to retreat, and once Britain decided that she could no longer impose a solution of force, the settlers' bluff was called. They were powerless. Uhuru conquered.

WELENSKY'S BLUFF

It was the same in Central Africa. Month after month that big blusterer, Welensky, shouted and roared that he would never allow the Federation to be dismantled. He threatened another "Boston Tea Party". He said he would use arms to resist.

As long as the British Government was prepared to play his game, he could get away with it. But the people of Nyasaland and the Rhodesias struggled. It became clear to the British Government that the Federation had to end. Welensky's bluff was called. Like a pricked balloon, he was deflated—and has now retired to grow roses and write his memoirs. The people of Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia are on the road to independence.

In Algeria, too, there were many white settlers.

One and a half million. "Algerie Francaise"! they cried. And as long as the French imperialists and other NATO powers backed them, with an army of 500,000, with arms and finance which, by the end was running out at hundreds of millions of pounds a year, the colons ruled. But the Algerian people struggled. France had to come to terms. The colons had their last desperate fling in the terror campaign of the O.A.S.—**but by themselves, without French imperialist support, they were relatively powerless.** Algeria won its independence.

THE LESSONS

What are the lessons of these struggles? Simply that the settlers, on their own, without imperialist econo-

mic, military and political backing, cannot sustain any long-term struggle against the majority peoples they are trying to hold down. This is equally true for South Africa, despite the presence there of three million Europeans, with a considerable development of industry behind them, too.

The main blows against the Verwoerd Government will be struck by the people of South Africa. That is essential. But the action of the British people to stop military and economic support going to the South African Government will be of immense help to the courageous liberation fighters in South Africa. And all who try to weaken or disrupt this international action must be challenged and exposed.

NKRUMAISM

THE Kwame Nkrumah Ideological Institute in consultation with Osagyefo the President has finalized the concrete definition of Nkrumaism: "NKRUMAISM IS THE IDEOLOGY FOR THE NEW AFRICA, INDEPENDENT AND ABSOLUTELY FREE FROM IMPERIALISM, ORGANISED ON A CONTINENTAL SCALE, FOUNDED UPON THE CONCEPTION OF ONE AND UNITED AFRICA, DRAWING ITS STRENGTH FROM MODERN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND FROM THE TRADITIONAL AFRICAN BELIEF THAT THE FREE DEVELOPMENT OF EACH IS THE CONDITION FOR THE FREE DEVELOPMENT OF ALL."