

Neo-Colonialism in Africa?

THOMAS MOLNAR

OUR AGE IS more convinced than others ever were that great transformations necessarily project around themselves an aura of ideologies, myths, and irrational beliefs, a kind of penumbra around the light, compounded from sentiments, enthusiasm, and theories which may be wrong objectively, but which have, nevertheless, a role to play: the rationalization of acts by which the transformations are effected. The Marxists, but also critics of Marxism, have expressed the view that there is no philosophy outside that of a social class; hence it is futile to ask that a philosophy be *objectively true*: it is enough if it *appears* true, and provides that class with the justi-

fication for its will to rise and conquer. Such a "philosophy" deserves, rather, the name "ideology," that is, a set of dogmas, beliefs, sentiments, and biased interpretation of facts, but which are persuasive and aggressive enough to generate steam for action.

Decolonization, as a historical transformation, also has an ideology with a double role: it helped persuade the colonial powers to yield leadership to Asians and Africans after which it pretends to examine the conditions of rising from underdevelopment to prosperity. The first task is now by and large completed; the second is subject to controversy because there is wide

disagreement on the following issues: the causes of underdevelopment, the remedies, the quality of material and human resources involved, the outside aid needed, the political repercussions of this or that road to prosperity, the subsequent relationship between the underdeveloped areas and those who can help them, the latter's motivations in extending aid, and so on.

Without attempting to decide categorically which of the roads from poverty to prosperity is the best one, we cannot be blind to the fact that there is a popular ideology circulated in the world which tries to do just that: impose a certain image of decolonization as well as a solution to the problems that decolonization has created. This ideology was succinctly expressed by Jean-Paul Sartre in an interview with the Algerian news agency, A. P. S. In connection with French aid to Algeria, Sartre declared: "This is an absolute duty. When a country was exploited for a hundred years and left in a state of misery, the exploiter, by granting aid, only restitutes what he had taken."¹ We will not elaborate here on the fantastic and mendacious character of this statement, only mention that in 1830 the French did not find a country called Algeria, but a miserable land of perhaps a million herdsmen, a pirates' nest; they left it in 1962 with fertile fields and farms, vineyards, orchards, oil wells, big and active cities, roads, airports—and nine million people.

Professor Jacques Berque adds a doubtfully sophisticated refinement to Sartre's blunt statement. According to his book, *Dépossession du Monde*, decolonization has finally broken the magic spell which kept the colonized people victims of a vampire. This vampire, the colonialist, actually was sucking the substance of his victim, perverting his will and corrupting his natural environment. The colonialist was himself possessed by a depraved will; but

now he too is freed from the bonds he created and is ready to link his destiny with that of his victim; together, they will put the affairs of this planet in order and march hand in hand toward universal happiness.

At regular intervals American press organs indulge in similar fantasies. Some years ago, Professor C. K. Yearly, Jr., in the leftist-Catholic *Commonweal* wrote of the "sins of the white men" against the colored peoples, and recommended that the United States should henceforward vote with the Afro-Asians in order to make at least partial amends for the sins of European colonialists.² Editorials in the *New York Times* also suggested on several occasions that the United States "should dissociate itself from the white race" and, building on its past of non-involvement in Asia and Africa and in the colonial venture, prove by acts to the colored nations its future fidelity to them.

It goes without saying that in spite of these protestations of goodwill and an anti-sin stance, the peoples of Africa and Asia put the United States in the same category with the British, French, Belgians and Dutch, that is in the category of "colonialists." In fact, very often they now say the place of a weakened France and England has been taken by "American imperialism." Even the populations which are helped by direct United States aid, like the Congolese, say that Washington treats them as a colony, and that aid is merely a way for the United States to get rid of its cheap surpluses. Thus the "colonialist" tag sticks, one way or another; it is even pinned on the chest of protesting nations.

No wonder that the communist camp takes advantage of the situation and never misses an occasion of pointing to the "guilt" of western imperialists, colonialists, and neo-colonialists—a guilt that the *Times*, *Commonweal*, Sartre, etc., eagerly

and masochistically admit. The Soviet camp even draws financial benefits from these charges of guilt. In the summer of 1964 the World Conference on Trade in Geneva discussed a French proposition that all industrialized countries should devote one per cent of their national income to aid the underdeveloped countries. The communist delegations refused to vote for this motion because, as they argued, it would merely be a western restitution—and inadequate at that—for the colonialist plunder. Why should communist countries which have never participated in this shameful exploitation, pay the price of western abominations? The Soviet Union and its satellites were of the opinion that all aid should be on a voluntary basis. What they did not say was that, first, they themselves suffer from underdevelopment and cannot afford to give away one per cent of their national revenue, and, second, that the aid they give is strictly for propaganda purposes, not to be submitted to scrutiny by some international distributing organization eventually set up for the purpose of coordinating the aid projects. The real meaning of the communist position was, of course, not lost on the majority of the more than one hundred delegations: the Soviet Union and its camp simply lack capital beyond the very modest contribution they now make to underdeveloped governments. This in itself, by the way, would be sufficient proof of the purely demagogic character of communist charges of “neo-colonialism”: Moscow, Peking, and their satellites would hardly be able to supply the needs of the underdeveloped countries if the latter, in a strange desire to commit suicide, broke off their ties with the West.

Knowing their incapacity to contribute substantially to African development, the communists issue statements, through their parties and front organizations, designed

to undermine fruitful cooperation between Africa and the West. Two examples: the communist parties of Arab countries (all of which are banned by their respective governments and lead a clandestine existence) declared at a meeting held in Prague in the summer of 1963, that “the American neo-colonialists pretend to sympathise with the Arab peoples’ national liberation movement, but try to channel it in an antidemocratic direction and lure it towards an entente with imperialism. The goal they pursue is to divide the liberation movement, prevent the formation of a united national front, and isolate the Arab peoples’ struggle from the Arabs’ natural ally, world socialism.”³ The F.E.A.N.F. (Federation of French Black African Students) which groups many black students at French universities went on record that it “favors the breaking of all institutional and organic ties with the ex-colonial powers and imperialist powers. It condemns all so-called agreements of cooperation which keep a colonial-type relationship between France and the African countries of the Brazzaville group.”⁴

Nonetheless, although it is proved again and again that the African nations (to speak only of them) depend on the western industrial nations for economic aid, loans, investment, market, and technical advice of a thousand kinds, they put great pressure on the western governments, often amounting to blackmail. Nor do they give, in many cases, assurances that the aid received will be put to constructive use. To charges mentioning mismanagement, abuses, and negligence, they answer that the colonial regime left them in such destitution—not only materially but also in terms of education and technical training—that aid will have to be generous and permanent if the prevailing conditions are to be substantially modified. But this is only a somewhat toned-down version of

the "colonialist guilt" theory. Nobody will deny that the colonialist period sanctioned abuses and exploitation which generally follow from contact between superior and inferior economic forces. For example, big companies were granted monopolies of buying cotton, coffee, and other crops from the peasants and re-selling them on the world market. But, as Professor Allais remarks, "if the colonialist intervention had not taken place, the ancient rigid structure of the underdeveloped countries, their political and economic isolation, and their political fragmentation would have been preserved. Any ulterior development would have been impossible."⁵

Circles which promote the slogan of "neo-colonialism" insist, of course, that the big companies (in French Africa, in the Copper Belt, for example) exploit their host countries just as much as before independence. In fact, it is alleged that exploitation has been stepped up because there is an increasing demand for minerals by industrialized countries, and also because the companies' freedom of action in decolonized territories is no longer checked as it was in the days of an Administration representing a strong overseas government.

The interested reader may turn with profit to Brian Crozier's little volume on *Neo-Colonialism*⁶ in which these accusations receive a thorough treatment and are conclusively refuted. The fact is that these companies pursue a policy of good relationship with the new black governments and make very important contributions to the welfare of the host countries. Speaking of the Copper Belt companies, Crozier notes that about 50 per cent of their revenues find their way to the governments' coffers in the form of taxes, investments, loans, grants, education, hospitals, and other welfare measures. True, the capital of these companies is mostly in British, Amer-

ican, and Belgian hands (and they also take the risks); but gradually the positions, even the highest ones, will be filled with black personnel. Thus a declaration like Mr. Quaison-Sackey's, Ghana's representative at the United Nations, is both unjust and meaningless: "By neocolonialism we mean the practice of granting a sort of independence with the concealed intention of making the liberated country a client-State, and controlling it effectively by means other than political ones." (At the UN, on April 5, 1958.)

It is not surprising that Mr. Quaison-Sackey makes such empty statements since he serves one of Africa's dangerous demagogues. But it is startling to read an article in a similar vein by a generally respected journalist, Jean Lacouture, in the Parisian leftist *Le Monde*.⁷

Whereas the accusations mentioned and refuted by Mr. Crozier deal with "neo-colonialism" supposedly practiced by resident companies, M. Lacouture attacks the very concept of aid to African countries if it is channeled through "unpopular" governments. Which are, according to Lacouture, the unpopular governments? The ones that have fought for and won independence from France (the article is concerned with the former French territories only), and have remained in power ever since. Briefly stated, Lacouture denounces the French and the respective African governments on two counts: first, that Paris wishes to promote French economic interests in the new countries; second, that in order to please the local leaders, French economic aid officials give in to what Lacouture considers unreasonable requests.

The first accusation is not only unjust, it is meaningless in a world of competitive markets. If French companies did not try to sell in Africa, others would from other European, American, or Asian countries.

Moreover, the former French territories enjoy considerable economic privileges, higher prices for their products, guarantees that these products will be bought up each year, certain advantages vis-à-vis the Common Market thanks to French insistence, and so on. The second accusation is similarly unjust since it implies that only those African countries are guilty of abuse which have remained "clients" of France, but not the so-called socialist countries. The truth is that much of the aid from the West goes into the wrong hands; but if anything, such cases are more frequent in uncontrolled despotic regimes (Guinea, Mali, Ghana) than in others where institutions modeled after those of the West still prevail.

Thus Lacouture's suggestion that French (Western) aid should benefit only the "popular layers" is, in effect, a demagogic call for socialism and for leftist regimes which claim "the support of the masses." In the light of the precarious economic and political situation of most newly independent countries in Africa, Lacouture's suggestion is disturbingly irresponsible since it equates the troubles between France (the West) and Africa indiscriminately with "neo-colonialism." The normalization of these relationships must result in more cooperation between the new countries and the West; to cast gratuitous suspicion on what has been done so far—not just criticism but suspicion—may jeopardize the slow and delicate progress of the future. It amounts to indicting France and any dealings it may have with the African governments; and paradoxically, it also amounts on Lacouture's part to the demand that the French and other Western governments should interfere with the internal affairs of the African countries by putting pressure on them to change their present regime to a more "popular," that is socialistic, one. In

my opinion, *that* would be real neo-colonialism.

At any rate, Lacouture's article shows that today anybody who wishes to undermine the precarious stability in Africa may attract attention and give false weight to his arguments by irresponsibly waving the flag of "neo-colonialism."

In the present situation, recriminations, one-sided or mutual, are of no help. A dispassionate examination is absolutely indispensable for, after all, the destiny of an entire continent is at stake, and the forces, active as well as passive, which would disrupt this destiny are day and night at work. The disquieting aspect includes not only communist infiltration but also certain features inherent in an Africa left to its own devices, yet irreversibly integrated into the community of nations, and in world currents.

The inertia of the black Africans, true or false, has always been taken for granted by the whites dealing with them and resulted in white paternalism. Statements that "the blacks are essentially rural and wish to revert to the agricultural way of life" and "no matter how much they earn, the blacks spend it on beer and women," are very frequent among white officials, farmers, housewives, and entrepreneurs. It is an article of faith among Africa's white men that the blacks are lazy, happy-go-lucky, reluctant to work unless strictly supervised. Quite a few South African industrial leaders and researchers hold the view that the Bantu, while he can be taught to execute mechanical and repetitious work, breaks down when faced with the draftboard or positions of responsibility in industrial precision work. These South Africans refer to conversations with American colleagues whose experience with Negroes is allegedly similar.

Let us admit, however, that many black Africans hold similar views. Mr. Lawrence,

a black Frenchman delegated by O.N.U.C. to the Congolese Ministry of Economics, stressed in conversations with me that the Congolese must be made to work, otherwise no amount of aid might lift the country from its present state of disruption and confusion. He attributes the relative economic health of Senegal and Ivory Coast to the strictness of French Colonial Administration which used to compel the chiefs to cultivate the land and plant suitable crops.

Liberia is another striking example. Investigated by a Commission of the International Labor Organization (Geneva), Liberian officials admitted a similar problem. "The most difficult problem of increasing the productivity of our labor," they said, "would seem to us the inherent unwillingness of our people to work. We cannot make a people work just by telling them they have to work, but we must re-create a situation that makes it necessary for them to work or perish. [Certain measures, such as enforcement of the vagrancy law, must be taken.] But beyond this it may be further necessary for the government to take harsh measures, short of force, to make the people work."⁸

The Black African writer, Duduzu Chisiza, believes that while Westerners live to work, Africans work to live. That is why, in Western estimation, they are so often idle, why they value leisure so highly. In their view the idle rich are sensible, not wrong, in being idle. Black officials told me in Dakar of the strange concept of saving among young black employees: instead of opening a savings account in a bank, they band together and put up every week the salary of one among them on a lottery basis. As a result, every week the winner lives like a prince, enjoying a double salary.

Self-professed friends of independent Africa have similarly come to the conclu-

sion that the colonialist view of the black man was not altogether wrong or originating from prejudice. The leftist economist, René Dumont, admitted in a sensational book a few years ago that as a result of corruption and inefficiency, "black Africa started out the wrong way."⁹ Dumont, although he blames most failures on the "colonial heritage" and on "neo-colonialism," finds practically nothing praiseworthy in the present (French) African social and economic set-up. But the remedies this economist offers are all of the nature of wishful thinking; his text is full of what the Africans "ought to do" to conform to his, Dumont's, ideal which is, in agriculture, the Soviet kolkhoze and the Chinese commune, and in politics "the spirit of sacrifice." Among his recommendations: corrupt civil servants ought to be executed (sic!), provincial governors ought to be trained in mechanical skills so as to help out with the shovel and repair automobiles when they break down.

Yet, Dumont is right when he speaks of corruption and high living. The same thing was pointed out in the French National Assembly by a socialist deputy during the 1964 debate on aid to Africa: "A class of new overlords is taking advantage of the windfall; they build palaces for themselves, have an ever-growing account in Swiss banks, surround themselves with a bevy of Ministers. We have every reason to fear that one day the masses of peasants and the inhabitants of slums might revolt against this new privileged class and blame us for having so abundantly provided for them."

Considerations of this sort, and a growing number of cases which give material for these considerations, have led to "cartierisme." Why should the French (or American) taxpayer finance the shaky African structure when the money seems to go down the drain, contributes to cor-

ruption, encourages indolence and inefficiency—only to lead to violent social upheavals in the end? Raymond Cartier even goes so far as to question the advisability of encouraging the education of black women—a problem in which everybody recognizes one of the causes of social instability and backwardness. The black men who go to school, Cartier argues, are in their majority unwilling to do constructive work, consider themselves superior to all others, and join the civil service, the diplomatic service, or even settle permanently abroad in order to escape their natural responsibilities toward their country. If now women will also be schooled in large numbers, they will merely increase the number of job-seekers in the bureaucracy and other sinecures.

What M. Cartier says openly, diplomats, ministers and economists in government service say with much more circumspection, but they say it nevertheless. In March, 1963, President de Gaulle caused a commission to be set up under the respected Jean-Marcel Jeanneney as chairman, with the objective of elaborating a “doctrine” of aiding the Third World. The so-called “Jeanneney Report” is a bulky document of 400 pages, and its recommendations were first aired by de Gaulle himself at a press conference on January 31, 1964. The Report deplors the illusions with which irresponsible elements are encouraging the earth’s “disinherited peoples,” and says: “But if the masses of miserable humanity, rocked in the cradle of illusion, themselves refrain from exerting the necessary efforts, then illusion will give way only to barren bitterness and perhaps to fruitless revolt. . . . It is a fact that in the world today an appetite for well being is spreading and becoming intensified. But the will to work—which is necessary for the satisfaction of that appetite—often does not go along at an equal pace.”

The answer to the situation which is pointed out rather delicately by the Jeanneney Report is emphatically *not* the continued indiscriminate supply of aid, gifts, and loans to the needy countries of Africa. Most of this aid is absorbed without a trace in the treasure chest of a few individuals, in prestige projects, airlines carrying only a few passengers, the salaries of officials, the upkeep of expensive missions and embassies, etc. The Jeanneney Report, indeed, notes that “no amount of gifts and loans from abroad, however generous, can furnish durably the capital needed for investments. . . . The absolutely imperative condition for continuing development is that the population work hard and that this extra work be for the purpose of investment.” With an even greater authority vested in him by his secretaryship of the European Common Market, Professor Walter Hallstein denounced recently¹⁰ “the ideal of an indiscriminately humanitarian aid policy on a cosmopolitan basis” as “both unrealistic and economically unreasonable.” Then he added: “It is utopian to suppose that the Common Market can just pour out aid to the whole world. We can and want to help only those who are ready to help themselves. The underdeveloped countries bear the principal responsibility for the development of their economy. They should first create the minimum of preconditions without which external aid disappears like smoke in the air.”

The first of these preconditions is, of course, security for investment. As the Jeanneney Report notes with much needed common sense, “too much uncertainty discourages farsighted men, without whom no progress can be made.” Those who invented the term “neo-colonialism” are knowingly or unwittingly blind to the position Africa is in, a position that does not allow a large margin for experimentation, delay, and extravagance. The choice

belongs to the Africans, but if they examine their circumstances with a sober mind, they must realize that there are only a very few roads for them to follow. If what we called the "ideology of decolonization" did not confuse the issues and injected in them large and repeated doses of demagogy and destructiveness, the West could simply say this to the Africans: "Since you have nowhere else to turn, you had better follow our advice. Instead of blackmail and the agitation of political radicalism, you should seek cooperation with us." Otherwise some version or other of "cartierisme" may gain the upper hand among the electorates of western nations. They may say, after repeated frustrations, what Colonial Secretary Duncan Sandys is supposed to have said to Sir Roy Welensky: "We want to get them [the Africans] off our backs as soon and as completely as possible."

The economic presence of the West is imperative for any future progress because its precondition as well as its consequence would be political stabilization. Professor Allais summarizes his advice to the Africans (and to the entire Third World) in two points: they should actively participate in international trade and not obstruct it, and should allow the free investment of foreign capital, as well as the repatriation of benefits. This advice is motivated neither by irresponsibility nor by selfish "neo-colonialist" intentions: it follows from the correct reading of hard facts. Perhaps the most important of these hard facts is the negligible volume of trade among the African nations themselves. This was pointed out to me in Senegal where I also heard a lucid explanation of why an African common market simply would not make sense at this juncture, since it would merely group nations having nothing to sell one another. M. Raphaël Saller, Ivory Coast's Minister of

Finance, Economic Affairs and Planning, is of the opinion that since the volume of inter-African trade constitutes an insignificant 10 per cent of all African trade (90 per cent is with the outside world), the only intelligent policy is to strengthen the ties with European economy. He predicted, in fact, that the day is not far when commercial relations between the Common Market and the African countries will surpass in importance those existing among the members of the Common Market itself.¹¹

Ivory Coast is in a more fortunate position than most of its neighbors. Mr. Saller expressed the not unreasonable hope that by 1970 his country might be able to do without foreign aid.¹² But for Ivory Coast and for other, economically less balanced countries, cooperation with the West must be a built-in, long-range policy, otherwise louder and louder voices will be heard in Europe and America echoing M. Cartier. In Geneva, last summer, it was obvious that the industrialized nations (North America, Europe, and Japan) were reluctant to commit themselves on the question of aid and to institutionalize its administration and distribution. They were mainly discouraged by past experience; but as long as the situation remains unchanged (anti-western demagogy, blackmail, confiscation of property, political instability, etc.) their prudence will be well-advised and Africa will be unable to get out of its sorry state. In spite of tendentious reports about western opposition to industrialization in the Third World, the African countries must understand that the feeding of the population, that is agriculture, is to have absolute priority. After all, today's rich countries were not always industrialized: their agriculture had to be made productive first in order for them to devote their resources to the production of industrial goods. Western Europe grew to its

modern prosperity thanks to the efforts of its peasants who individually put for many centuries an average of three thousand man-hours per year in their work on the fields. In Africa, women work much less than one thousand hours per year, and men even less.

Nobody pretends that this is as easily done as said. There is still the gigantic problem of monoproduction versus world prices to solve. There seems to be a danger both in the free-market and in the planned solution. If the industrialized countries keep down the world market price on these products, the Africans, having little revenue, will be unable to buy the industrial goods the West produces; on the other hand, if these prices are stabilized through an international agreement, unsalable surpluses will be built up, as on American farms.

Another problem is the drainage on resources and revenue that the military build-up represents in Africa. At present these countries spend an annual average of \$845 million on armament, and the figure is likely to grow.¹³ This is about 10 per cent of their yearly budget, in some countries less, in others more. In the case of Egypt it is as high as 15 per cent!¹⁴

We should not be afraid of certain terms just because demagogues and fools are using them and bending them to their sinister purposes. "Neo-colonialism" is the only way of getting Africa to the take-off stage. Without using the label, this is the consensus of economists with a world renown, like Professor Wilhelm Roepke of Switzerland and Professor Milton Friedman of the United States. It is also becoming the adopted policy of the Common Market. Like all lucid policy, it conforms to the precepts of morality too: instead of launching the continent on a frightful adventure of driving it to the adoption of the Russian and Chinese system of brutal exploitation

and neo-serfdom, this policy recognizes the imperative need to help the newly independent African countries. It is a sad comment on the twentieth-century state of affairs that one must point out the evidence and be attacked for it. The evidence is—and let me repeat it—that only fruitful economic contact with the western industrialized countries may guarantee Africa's future. One look at Angola or South Africa shows what foreign investment can do, simply because the political conditions and western standards in these lands permit it, encourage it.

The moral aspect enters the picture when we think of the magnitude of the task. Let us face the facts squarely: the West is called upon to shoulder a large part of it. Not because the West has any reason to feel ashamed, let alone guilty, for the colonial period; but because only the West can do it. Decolonization took place in a hurried, haphazard way, and I would say that if the ex-colonial powers bear a heavy responsibility for things done in Africa, it is for the precipitation with which they have left it, for the moral cowardice of not doing it by slow steps. However, this is now the past; in the future, as the best white and black elements will tell you in Africa, the West is under obligation to keep up its aid, not as a tribute paid for past spoliations but as one half of a two-way process of cooperation.

Such a cooperation would expose the term "neo-colonialism" as nonexistent, a device of communists and half-baked intellectuals to revolutionize the African continent. Soberly examined, the facts behind the term merely indicate that for a long time yet newly independent Africa will be economically dependent. This may hurt some Africans' pride, but this does not alter the situation. The only remaining question is whether cooperation with the West may be made secure, isolated from the

radical and destructive factors at work on the continent.

The main factor is communist infiltration with its many facets: subversion of labor unions and the pressure on them to disaffiliate from the Brussels central office; exacerbation of conflict among groups contending for power; propaganda among students—all of them future officials because of the scarcity of educated manpower—against the present governments as “stooges of imperialism”; and so on. An almost equally important work of destruction is directed from Cairo and Accra: money, arms, sabotage experts are sent out by Nasser and Nkrumah to every African country, and camps for guerrilla training are maintained in Egypt and Ghana for thousands of African insurgents. Their work and influence is invariably directed against Europe, the United States, and the white-ruled territories of Africa.

But the forces weakening the ties with the West do not even have to be radical and destructive: the natural evolution of African states may by itself reduce Western presence. The Africanization of the cadre, in the public and private sector alike, is an irreversible process; nationalism, and a degree of black racism squeeze not only whites, but also Indians out of the jobs they have held; economic boycott movements are aimed, so far with little success, one must say, at the continent's white territories, the Portuguese Provinces, South Africa, and Southern Rhodesia. Black statesmen are under pressure not to sit down to the conference table on inter-African matters with officials of these countries whose competence they would need perhaps even more than that of Western experts.

If then the reader asks me about the chances of cooperation between Africa and the West, I shall answer that it depends to a very large extent on the future

of pluriracialism in Africa, but that pluriracialism is endangered by all the above-mentioned attitudes, ideologies, pressures and, why not, necessities.

But in addition to the white man's irresistible elimination from Africa and to communist efforts to bring it about (outlined already by Lenin and Boukharin), non-communist elements also suffer from a dangerous ideological bias. It is enough to use the example of the thousands of African students at foreign universities to comprehend the nature of the danger.

Large numbers of students do not return home after their studies are completed. At home family and tribal obligations are serious roadblocks for individual ambition and advancement. Life in the West has for these young people an invincible attraction, in some cases they even get married and settle down abroad. In other cases, much more numerous, they go into opposition to their regimes during the university years, even though this attitude may deprive them of the government-paid scholarship. Why do they oppose the regimes set up concurrently with the achievement of independence?

Those studying abroad are in contact with the fashionable leftist-progressive circles, and of course with communist propaganda directed at them with a particular intensity. They touch with their fingers the gap existing between conditions at home and prosperity abroad—and conclude that there are rich capitalist nations (in the West) which exploit poor proletarian ones, their own. Like their fellow-students in Africa, from Dakar to Lovanium, but with more freedom, they denounce the “presidential” system in their respective countries as a “betrayal of independence” and a “bourgeois trick.” They join far-leftist organizations which preach “revolution” with a complete irresponsibility, extend their activities far beyond the task

of learning, into overt political agitation, and publish little magazines with articles about the "caricature of democracy" in the Ivory Coast, or the "western stooges" in power in Cameroun. Many students are from time to time implicated in attempted insurrections in their native countries, even in plans of assassination of their heads of state.

To the bitterness and discontent of African officialdom the revolutionary mood of students abroad who will join them after completing their studies, will add, in all likelihood, a powerful element of unrest and destructiveness. The mood (I refuse to say: ideas) of African—black and Arab—students in France, for example, is so far to the left that they even denounce the regimes of Ben Bella and Sekou Touré as having cheated their expectations. These expectations are the kind of vague socialism, bringing happiness and progress, that parasitic, coffee-house intellectuals indulge in. And, as in the latter's case, in the case of African students too the largest dose in this "ideology" is self-pity. Nevertheless, the climate of destructiveness which prevails is very real, and it is a bad omen for the future of stability at home and stable relationships with the Western countries. For let us not forget that the students we speak about form the still small elite in their respective countries where their influence will, for a long time yet, not be efficiently counter-balanced by other similarly powerful classes and interests. African societies do not have the complex structure of western ones in which shocks started by one class are absorbed, deadened, or deviated by another. In Africa the tribe would play the role of absorbant; but the whole trend is precisely to render the tribes powerless and push them outside the pale of political movements.

Complete pessimism, however, as to the future behavior of this potential elite would

also be unfounded. First, many who were radicals in their youth have become sober office holders when faced with concrete realities. Some of today's most reliable leaders took part in Marxist and other far-leftist groups in their student years and after. In the second place, the African governments are aware of the problem encountered by their students abroad. They know that from British, French, and American universities these young people bring back an abundant portion of Marxist slogans. They trust that in contact with daily tasks, the brand-new officials will find out how fragile ideologies are. The governments also take counter-measures: the Ethiopians now send fewer students abroad; Senegal, which has special arrangements with France, now sends fewer students but in their place young *stagiaires* to various Paris Ministries where they learn public administration, finance, and such at first hand. They are paid salaries higher than scholarships for students, and they live in private flats, not in student dormitories accessible to communist propaganda.

It is thus too early to tell what final form cooperation between the free world and Africa will take. One thing is certain, although to state it is to state a pleonasm: it must be a two-way affair. Let us hope that in a growing number of instances the African leaders will realize the seriousness of the situation they face. The tasks before them are substantial, but they can be clearly formulated: increase the productivity, stem internal radicalism, resist the communist siren song, and develop more ties with the West, including the long implanted white territories of the continent.

In their turn, Western critics must learn not to consider Africa one block, but to distinguish the practically incurable from the healthy elements. At home, we should

equally condemn the starry-eyed liberal, an unconditional flatterer of all things black African, and the glib reactionary who would draw the curtain on the de-

colonized continent. The West has many friends in Africa and they are lucid. It is our interest and our duty to encourage them.

¹Reported in *Le Monde*, April 15, 1964.

²"Self-Interest and the United Nations." *The Commonwealth*, March 23, 1962.

³Quoted from the communist magazine *La Nouvelle Revue Internationale*, October, 1963.

⁴From the Resolution of the 14th Congress of F.E.A.N.F., December 24-27, 1961.

⁵*Le Tiers-Monde au Carrefour*, p. 119.

⁶Background Books, published by The Bodley Head, 1964.

⁷*Le Monde* (weekly edition), from November 12 to 18, 1964.

⁸Report of the Commission, International Labor Office, Geneva, 1963.

⁹*L'Afrique noire est mal partie*, Edition du Seuil, 1962.

¹⁰June, 1964, before the joint session of the Consultative Assembly of Europe (Strasbourg).

¹¹The South Africans, who have the strongest economy on the continent, argue the same way. They are not afraid of being economically isolated by African governments with a demagogic bent since their main markets and suppliers are also Europe and America. The African countries do not have the purchasing power to become important customers.

¹²The volume of foreign trade and industrializ-

ation, as well as per capita income are increasing every year. This is due to M. Saller's (of Antillean origin, colonial ex-governor) competence and firmness, to the good relationship of the black and white population, and to western confidence in the leaders of Ivory Coast.

¹³The figure does not include military expenditures by European powers in Africa such as France, Great Britain, and Portugal.

¹⁴Deplorable as these high percentages are, let us bear in mind that there is no nation without military defense. The Congo's example shows that an army is necessary to protect the country even against internal attack encouraged from without. Therefore it is totally unjustified to write, as the pro-communist René Dumont, admirer of Red China and Red Cuba, does: "The armies in Africa are ill-adjusted to the modern world, they are a threat to the continent's development with their fascist mentality: yet another heritage of colonialism!" In Dumont's definition everything opposed to the "socialization" of Africa and its friendly ties with Russia and China bears the stamp of "fascism" which, in turn, he equates with the "colonialist spirit." Fact is, the armies in Africa, in many cases together with labor unions, are bulwarks against communist penetration.