

awareness, fretted against the restraining hand of what they conceived to be the 'old guard', itched for action, moved leftwards towards the ideology of Communism.

At the same time, the old, the tried and tempered heads of Congress were being lopped off by government bans imposed in terms of the Suppression of Communism Act.

This was one of the critical moments in ANC history. The Defiance Campaign had inspired an atmosphere of fear and panic in government circles; it had inspired a new national pride and consciousness amongst the African people. Perhaps for the first time in South Africa's history the real contending giants of white supremacy and African liberation stood starkly revealed.

It was not easy to come new to the helm in a situation like this. There were many conflicting ideas of how Chief would manage. There were those who thought that, with his experience predominantly amongst the rural peoples, he would be out of his depth in the ANC, predominantly an organisation of the towns and of the town workers and the town 'white-collar'. There were others who imagined he would become an unimportant figurehead, cut off in the reserves of Lower Tugela when the headquarters of Congress lay in Johannesburg and its main strength on the Reef and in the Eastern Cape. How wrong they proved to be!

Golden Years

Chief presided over the ANC through its most difficult years — the years of vicious personal persecution of its leaders under the Suppression of Communism Act, the years of the trial of its leaders on charges of high treason, the years of the decline in civil liberties leading to and culminating in the final outlawing of the ANC in March of 1960.

But these were also the ANC's golden years, the years when it set its impress firmly on the page of South Africa's history — the years of the Congress of the People and of the formulating of the Freedom Charter, of the Alexandra Bus Boycott and the Potato Bolcott, of the great demonstrations outside the treason trial Drill Hall, of the June 26th general strike of 1957, of the national protest strike over Sharpeville and the great pass-burning campaign and the 1960 Emergency.

The ANC grew, in this period, from a minority sect to the main opposition — the majority opposition — to white supremacist South Africa.

Chief's part in that growth is tremendous; his personality and his policy have left their mark on the whole period. But equally, Chief has grown in that period with the ANC and as part of the ANC growth. He entered the ANC a country chief, but grew with it to the stature of national leader and the country's foremost statesman.

In portraying him as "the man of moderation", as an Uncle-Tom figure of conservatism, caution and respectability, the press have tried to reduce him from his real stature to a pygmy.

In truth, Chief fits none of these formal categories.

In South Africa, the conservatives — those who could not move and grow and develop with the changing situation about them — have long since been swept aside by history, along with the cautious and the seekers after respectability.

The last ten years, especially in the liberation movement, have been years of growth and rapid change, of radically expanding horizons; they have called for boldness and courage, for the sacrifice of respectability and comfort. Chief Lutuli has come through these times because the motives that impel him are far stronger and grander than the shabby timidity and conservatism with which he is now being branded.

He believes, passionately, in a way simple faiths; in the brotherhood of men, regardless of their colour; in the right of men to live in freedom; in the possibility of the kingdom of righteousness being created here on earth, even here in South Africa, in our own lifetime. With these beliefs as his guide, he makes up his mind — slowly, careful to consider the other side — but nonetheless firmly. Once his mind is made up, then his course is clear. Chief pursues the right course as he sees it, regardless of the consequences for himself.

No Fear of Change

To speak of such a man as a "conservative" is an injustice. Conservatives resist change, fear change. But Chief's whole life shows that he is not afraid of change. He comes to new ideas, new policies slowly, carefully, without recklessness. To this extent his has been a sobering influence on what might otherwise have been excessive recklessness on the part of the younger men of Congress. But having once come to see the justification for something new, Chief's acceptance and support comes forth boldly and fully. His ability to change, to move with the times, has dismayed many of his former followers.

The Africanists, hide-bound in their national chauvinism, abused Chief for his developing multi-racial horizons which crystallised finally in the Freedom Charter. His one-time colleague, Jordan Ngubane, poured bitter vituperation on him, when he moved forward to support the quasi-socialist ideas of nationalisation of some major industries, which is contained in the Freedom Charter.

White liberals saw in his Christian lay-preacher background the hope of a new crusader against the left-wing in the African liberation movement; their hopes have been dashed. Chief has stood steadfastly, often against the wind, for the right of Communists to belong to Congress, and of Congress to promote them to leading positions.

Foreign diplomats saw in his American-orientated education, a hope of a powerful recruit to their cold-war diplomacy; their hopes have been dashed. Chief has spoken out for peace, regardless of whose diplomatic interests get hurt, and against the colonial adventures of all the imperial powers.

Chief has always moved forward with the times, forward with his people. This is part of his greatness.

To the outside world, he has become a symbol. Few abroad have seen him, heard him speak, read his writings.

For them he is a symbol of the forward thrusting forces in South Africa — of the building of African nationhood in place of tribalism; of non-white unity against white domination; of multi-racial co-operation for a democratic future. Perhaps it is as much to the symbol as to the man that the world has paid homage in the award of the Nobel Peace Prize for 1960.

But to South Africans, Chief is more than a symbol. He is a leader, a crusader, a builder. Inside the ANC, he has held left and right-wings together in a close, co-operative unity. He has led the campaign for Congress unity, for multi-racial co-operation. When the need was there — as it was in March, 1960 — he was the first to burn his pass, and thus give a lead to the country. Since then, for over a year, the ANC has been outlawed. But Chief, its leader, has continued to grow in stature, till today his giant shadow dominates the whole future of South Africa.

Gathering Forces

We are moving into new times. The old days of legal ANC organisation and campaigns have gone; the prospects of peaceful mass pressure exerting its will on the government have been whittled down by the growing weight of military preparations which the government assembles against it. The menace of violence hangs heavy in the air.

Chief has worked for peaceful solutions, fought for them and suffered for them. So have his Congress followers. If they fail to maintain the peace, it will be because the government desire for peace is not as strong as theirs.

But it could be that the very imminence of violence in South Africa, the very obvious gathering of forces for violent clash, will serve to cut the Gordian knot that all the non-violent crusading of Congress has failed to cut.

No one has striven more earnestly to avert a violent clash than Chief and his followers. But peaceful solutions become impossible where one of the contending giants resorts continually to brutal violence. Chief will move with his people and the times. Significantly, it is now, when the conclusion is inescapable that the future of South African peace hangs in the balance, that the Nobel Prize Committee has made its award to South Africa's greatest son, Albert John Lutuli.

L.B.

SOCIALIST AID TO AFRICA

(Continued from page 7)

Key to all the economic relations being built up between the socialist countries and the politically independent states of Africa is the readiness of the former to help Africa industrialise. The Western powers look with disfavour on the attempts of the African states to become industrialised. They would prefer them to remain as sources of raw materials. This explains why, for sixty odd years since the commencement of this century, the imperialists did nothing to establish iron and steel bases in Africa, or create centres of modern engineering, except in territories of substantial white settlement as South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the Congo.

Scientifically speaking, industrialisation means the construction of machines which can produce the means of production. In other words, machines which can make machines and machine tools, thus enabling a country to manufacture its own main requirements. Such a modern engineering industry must have its base in an iron and steel industry, electric power and chemicals. It is precisely this kind of industrial development which the socialist countries are willing to assist. One has only to examine the various

economic agreements made between African states and the socialist countries to appreciate the character of the aid being provided.

In the United Arab Republic, the Soviet Union is assisting in the construction of over 80 projects, including five metallurgical establishments, eleven engineering plants, five chemical and pharmaceutical factories, textile mills, and a ship-building yard. All this is in addition to the huge Aswan Dam.

To Mali, the Soviet Union has granted a £16 million long-term credit which will be used for technical assistance in geological prospecting, to improve the navigation of the River Niger, to survey and design a railway line from Bamako to Kan Kan in Guinea (thus giving Mali an outlet to replace Dakar in Senegal), and to set up a training centre for Mali technicians. Similar agreements have been reached between Mali and China and Czechoslovakia, the last named providing Mali with equipment for a textile mill and a hospital.

A recent agreement between Tunisia and the Soviet Union provides for a £10 million loan to assist Tunisia's ten-year plan. The loan will be used for building dams on five rivers and for erecting a national technological institute.

Under an agreement between the Soviet Union and Somalia, work has begun in planning a number of enterprises and institutions for the republic, including harbour works, a fishery, meat-canning

plant, hydro-electric stations and a radio station as well as assistance in agriculture, geology and architecture.

A new agreement with Sudan provides for Soviet assistance in constructing several industrial projects and in training technicians and skilled workers.

Socialist aid to Africa means that the West has lost its monopoly of capital equipment in the world market, as well as its virtual monopoly in the fields of trade, credit and the training of technicians.

The effect of the character and weight of the aid from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries has been to modify imperialist economic policies towards underdeveloped countries, even compelling the imperialists, as Khrushchov has said, "to make certain concessions in dealing with these countries."

Joseph S. Berliner, an American publicist and economist has admitted that Soviet aid "strengthens the bargaining power of recipient countries in their negotiations with the older sources of aid."

If peace can be safeguarded and world disarmament achieved, then the socialist camp, which will account for half the world's total production within a decade, will be able to offer increasing economic assistance to the new African states—assistance, moreover, with such leaders as Sekou Toure, Kwame Nkrumah and Nasser have publicly declared to be without any strings.

DOLLAR DIPLOMACY

(Continued from page 7)

seller and Morgan interests. The bank's African profits come from oil concessions, from Congo transport, from mines in the Rhodesias and South Africa, and from South African bank commissions.

Dillon Oil in Africa

Oil is Dillon's biggest African venture, and his firm has set up a special operating company in Africa for this purpose. Together with other companies controlled by Rockefeller and Morgan, these giants of international finance have acquired 60,000,000 acres in Libya since 1952, for oil prospecting. They also have exploration rights over 58,000,000 acres in the Somali Republic, and a great deal more in other North African territories.

Dillon, Read & Co. also have investments in the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, which is pumping Algerian oil in partnership with French companies. It is a substantial shareholder in the Newmont Mining Corporation, a large Morgan bankers firm which is the U.S. partner of the French Societe Algerienne du Nord, and the Societe Algerienne du Zinc. It is therefore not surprising

that political Dillon should say, "The French . . . can be proud of their efforts in North Africa." (New York Times, May 21, 1956.)

Of special interest to us is the fact that Dillon, Read & Co. is the official investment banker — the American fiscal agent — for South Africa. It is believed that this bank has granted South Africa up to 100 million dollars in credits since 1955.

U.S. Money for Armies

Mr. Soapy Williams, swept away by his enthusiasm for African liberation, has omitted to mention that the U.S. also "aids" certain countries in Europe. Some of these countries have colonies in Africa, for whose benefit this "aid" is used. Benefit? Well, not exactly. The bulk of the "aid" happens to be of a military nature. Portugal, for example, received 376 million dollars in "aid" of which 286 million dollars was for "military assistance". France received the staggering figure of 9,786 million dollars since the war, of which half was also for military assistance — against, not for, Algerian independence!

Under the Kennedy Administration, the figures for military assistance are on the increase. The enormous sums are jointly administered by Defence Secre-

tary Robert McNamara, the former President of the Ford Motor Co., and Secretary of State Mr. Dean Rusk, the former President of Rockefeller Foundation.

It seems that the most powerful trusts in America are always ready to spare their top men to assist in the Government of the country. But their sacrifices in personnel is more than made up in financial gain.

The International Bank, for example, is officially owned by 68 member states, but the U.S. subscribes 35% of its capital, the bulk of which is supplied by the largest American banks. The International Bank's allocations of "aid" therefore are not as disinterested as may seem. For instance, a 20 million dollar bank loan to Portugal for a railroad to haul Rhodesian copper was very useful to American business which owns at least half of the Rhodesian copper companies. A further 50 million dollar loan to French interests for an oil pipeline from the Algerian Sahara was very useful for Rockefeller. Standard Oil Co. is the French company's chief American partner in Algeria.

And so it goes on. Politics, economics and military needs are all combined under the control of the same people, working under different guises but serving only one cause — U.S. Finance Capital.

Collection Number: A3299

Collection Name: Hilda and Rusty BERNSTEIN Papers, 1931-2006

PUBLISHER:

Publisher: **Historical Papers Research Archive**

Collection Funder: **Bernstein family**

Location: **Johannesburg**

©2015

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document is part of the *Hilda and Rusty Bernstein Papers*, held at the Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.