

FOUNDINGS OF FASCISM

by

Eskor Toyo

From 1965 to 1967, I carried out an intensive factual research on the one-party state throughout the world which resulted in a book entitled One-Party State and the African Revolution. The completed manuscript of this book was lost in Bendel State during the civil war.

I wrote the book because I was deeply disturbed by the prevalence of the one-party state in Africa on the marrow of independence. The reasons severally given for this phenomenon, the characterisation of its social content, and the prognostications regarding its potentialities were, in our view, almost entirely wrong. The naivety with which the African one-party state was being viewed even by avowed Marxists only matched the wishful stupidity with which Nigeria was being declared a stable democracy not only by out-and-out lay men but also by so-called political scientists.

This lost book is relevant, because there is today deep concern among thousands of politically conscious Nigerians with the dangers of creeping fascism. It seems that thirteen years of military dictatorship mounted by Nigerians have made Nigerians more keenly alert to violations of democratic rights. Since 1979, however, not only has S. G. Ikoku and Shehu Shagari called for a so-called all-party government, that is, a government without opposition in a neo-colonial, semi-feudal and capitalist world dominated by imperialists, landlords and capitalists, but also there has been heard an advocacy of straight-forward one-party state without the Ikoku - Shagari euphemisms.

In point of fact, as I pointed out in One Party State and the African Revolution, although Nigeria was being vaunted as a proud island of democracy in a sea of African absolutisms, yet the First Republic in Nigeria only concealed a core of actual absolutism within a semblance of democracy. I drew attention to the fact that the Federal Government was a sort of League of Nations where regional governments that were in reality virtual one-party absolutisms, intolerant of criticism, bargained, not without all the crude, barbaric and ruthless manifestations of bourgeois competition, for shares of the national patrimony.

That soon the mask of this facade of democracy was ripped off and the reality in the form of military absolutism stood starkly before us only confirmed the observations and predictions made in One Party State and the African Revolution.

The roots of the tendencies to absolutism in contemporary Africa must be carefully extracted.

Forms of Absolutism

In the 1960s, the absolutist state in Africa assumed three forms: Haile Selassie's feudal no-party state in Ethiopia, the one-party state, and what in One Party State and the African Revolution we called 'the one-army state'. After the elimination of Haile Selassie's state we are left with two forms of absolutism, the one-party state or the one-army state, that is, so-called military regimes. We regard all the states, such as South Africa, where there are formal opposition parties but the opposition is suppressed and only manages to show presence through struggle against odds as 'virtual one-party states'.

Let us say one or two words about the one-party state as we saw the matter in One Party State and the African Revolution and still see it.

The one-party state was presented even by self-professed Marxist writers as

- (a) representing national unity of progressive forces for nation building, the single party being a united front of such forces,
- (b) an anti-imperialist revolutionary instrument of such forces,
- (c) an indispensable instrument of advance to socialism.

I contested all three propositions in detail pointing out counter-examples.

The one party state does not represent national unity. On the contrary, it expresses the sharpening of class and other contradictions on the marrow of independence. I pointed out the significance of the fact that many parties almost invariably existed before independence, whereas the one-party state was decreed by the suppression of parties other than a major one after independence.

This does not deny that the nuisance of ethnic conflict often promoted by agents of imperialism found response in one-party absolutism. Nevertheless the absolutism was an attempt - not really very successful in a bourgeois order - to suppress ethnic antagonisms. The one-party state seldom was a voluntary union of nationalities in a situation where the social policy of the leading party spontaneously evoked a sea-change from ethnic antagonism to real collectivity.

As for the one-party state being necessarily an instrument of anti-colonialism, we pointed out three facts to counter this presumption. First, the struggle for independence was usually fought and won without a one-party national movement, since such a movement could not have been decreed. A one-party state emerged only after independence - by legislation usually.

Secondly, after formal independence many of the one-party states pursued policies favourable to neo-colonialism.

Thirdly, Liberia and South Africa had always been one-party or virtual one-party states and yet were not noted for their opposition to imperialism or their revolutionary fervour. Nor was Hitler's one-party state.

Was the one-party state a necessary instrument of transition to socialism?

We pointed out that no notable Soviet socialist from Lenin himself to this day has ever considered a one-party state as indispensable for the transition to socialism. On the contrary several statements of Lenin clearly pointed out that the one-party state emerged in Russia out of the special circumstances of the history of her revolution and was not to be simply adopted elsewhere. We also pointed out that there were countries that set out to make socialist revolutions and were building socialism with an alliance of socialist and progressive parties in power and not with decreed one-party states. Examples are the People's Republic of China, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

We raised the question of what were the crucial conditions for a serious effort to go over to socialism and denied that the mere declaration of a socialist intent by the leading party plus a one-party state constituted such crucial conditions.

As for the one-army form of absolutism, it must be pointed out that the same factors as produce the one-party state produce the one-army state.

Casting our minds back on history, if we can pinpoint the factors that produced the absolutisms of the so-called 'enlightened despots' of Europe in the sixteenth, seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries we shall be more likely to understand the rise of African one-party states. And if we can isolate the factors that gave birth to the military coups d'etat and military absolutisms of Cromwell and Napoleon, the Latin American military dictators of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and the rival war lord dictatorships of late nineteenth and early twentieth century China, then we can have a better insight into the roots of military absolutism in contemporary Africa.

All the places we have mentioned were passing through a period of their history parallel to that of contemporary Africa. In each case a bourgeois order with its myriads of contradictions, undisciplined by industrialism which is not yet a dominant structural-moral fact, and uncertain of itself, struggles to break out of the integument of an agrarian and traditionalist past.

There can be no doubt that the need of the bourgeois epoch for a national market as an antithesis of rural-patriarchal localism and particularism on the one hand and the chaotic effect of bourgeois particularist ambition and competition which negate national discipline on the other are the key factors making for governmental 'enlightened despotism' during periods of primitive capitalist accumulation.

Absolutism or 'enlightened despotism' in the nascent bourgeois order is a regime resting on the rampart of traditional paternalism on the one hand and in search of a discipline dictated by the needs of the market with its cash nexus on the other.

In the contemporary situation in underdeveloped countries, an emerging bourgeois order can make use of Soviet forms without the Soviet revolutionary or communistic content. The actual content of the one party state, we urged, cannot be simply presumed from the soviet example. It must be found out by empirical investigation.

Basis of Autocratic Tendencies in Africa

In the contemporary African situation we have the following factors which tend to produce absolutist solutions.

First, the bourgeoisie aspire to a national market. Incompatible with this aspiration, as we should expect, are the fissiparous tendencies due to the overwhelming remnants of rural and ethnic localism. Further, in their political-economic competition for pieces of the so-called national cake, the bourgeoisie themselves exploit the ignorance, ethnic biases and intense insecurity within this very precarious national market. To enforce their national ambitions and contain their elemental anarchy, the bourgeoisie need so-called 'strong men', civilian or military.

The second influence that generates a tendency to absolutism is the patriarchal heritage which matures as feudal heritage in some parts of Africa. Autocratic and paternalist traditions hold sway. This factor is reinforced by an authoritarian outlook born of beliefs in divine ordination, a closed mentality hardly open to the liberating wind of scientific searching for rational validity.

In the Maitatsine affair there has been raised the spectre of transcendental fanaticism being used to smoke-cover the concrete social contradictions between the masses and their exploiters and for shaping a zealot section of the lumpen proletariat into ready instruments of the exploiters' fascist violence. This aspect of traditionalist irrationality is to be watched. It operated seriously against the democratic mission of the Northern Elements Progressive Union in the First Republic. It is an extremely dangerous factor

The third major influence undermining the struggle for democracy in Nigeria is the tradition of colonial government which we inherited. Colonial police methods, sedition laws, bureaucratic cult, and benevolent dictator mentality on the part of rulers and colonial-type alienation from the conception and processes of government on the part of the masses heavily feature the post-colonial state in Africa.

Yet a fourth factor is at work. Cromwell's absolutism was in part directed against the thoroughly radical revolutionary poor peasants who formed part of his mass following during the

English revolution. The followers of Winstanley sought a communistic or genuine egalitarian solution to the governmental and social crisis in England. Cromwell's dictatorship was in part designed to suppress those of the common people to whom representative government meant something that went well beyond what the bourgeoisie would accept.

The absolutism of Napoleon equally served in part to suppress the Jacobins, those that stood nearest to the egalitarian aspirations of the toiling masses in the French revolution.

Chinese war-lord absolutism during the nascent modern epoch in China served in part to suppress peasant revolts. Latin American Presidential and military absolutism has been consistently designed in part to suppress radical popular movements seeking to overthrow the latifundist oligarchy.

Equally in contemporary Africa, statutory one party, virtual one-party, or one-army absolutism is designed to prevent a more popular or egalitarian development of the modern revolution in Africa than the bourgeoisie who have taken over the reigns of power from colonial masters consider to be in their interest. Mass movements that question the justice or moral validity of bourgeois rule, in view of its 'man must be a wolf to man' orientation, are suspect and must be suppressed.

Absolutism in Africa, far from representing unity, manifests class struggle on the morrow of independence. In most cases absolutism is an attempt to prevent the masses from interpreting self-government as an opportunity for the self development of millions of poor people rather than a chance for the greedy self-promotion of the bourgeoisie. But the self-development of the bourgeoisie is nothing other than the exploitation of the masses which makes possible future bourgeois financial empires.

African Fascism

Fascism is reactionary terrorism directed against modern democracy.

Fascism is the terror of the capitalist class in power mounted to prevent the politically conscious working class, the revolutionary peasantry and other mass strata from carrying

democracy beyond the bourgeois stage. It represents a retreat from the concept or practice of liberal or socialist democracy by a dominant bourgeois and landlord clique determined not to lose power to popular democratic forces. Fascism, then, is the suppression of these popularly-oriented forces in the name of 'stability' or unity. Most one-party or one-army states in Africa are fascist by the above definition.

In Africa, the tendency to fascism is the result of the inability of the bourgeoisie to fulfill the expectations of the masses raised during the struggle for independence.

Instinctively, the masses thought that national independence and their own freedom would mean one and the same thing. This identity was encouraged by the bourgeois propagandists. Exploitation was colonial exploitation or white man's exploitation. Since colonial or white rule had deprived the indigenes of almost every opportunity of exploiting their national 'brothers', no one even gave thought to the possibility of such exploitation.

Oligarchy was colonial or white oligarchy. It was presumed that once an indigenous government and an indigenous parliament were set up, the government would be automatically democratic and would dedicate itself to the needs of the masses and be controlled by them. It was even claimed that egalitarianism was indigenous to Africa or was even African nature. In the language of Nnamdi Azikiwe the African was 'his brother's keeper'.

In fact, 'the people' tended simply to mean indigenes as opposed to the colonial administrator or the white man. Since the indigenes did not hold power, the dichotomy between government and the people was taken to mean one and the same thing as the dichotomy between colonialists and the colonised or between white oppressors and the indigenes oppressed.

Mass resentment against colonial exploitation and autocracy was roused by such humanistic slogans as 'That the universal brotherhood shall become a reality' or 'That man shall not be a wolf to man', used by Nnamdi Azikiwe in his newspapers, or such populist slogan as 'That the will of the people is the supreme law'. In short, the African masses were exhorted as by Nkrumah: 'See ye, first the political kingdom and all other things will be added unto you'.

Come independence, the exploitation of the governed African by the now governing African, the intolerance of criticism by those who had made criticism of white rule their speciality, the new alliance between indigeneous businessmen and the colonial exploiters that has now developed, the corruption, opportunism, hypocrisy and mendacity that has blossomed to serve this new dispensation all have greatly alienated the masses and created a deep well of discontent.

Fascism in Africa is an attempt to prevent the disillusioned and discontented masses from being organised by trade union leaders, socialists or more patriotic and liberal bourgeois ideologues towards a profoundly democratic solution to the problems created by backwardness and colonial rule.

The mere existence of a one-party state or a one-army state does not signify fascism. In Tanzania, Angola or Mozambique, for instance, there is a one-party state. In Ethiopia there is a one-army state. Yet in these cases we have genuine revolutionary orders striving towards a new democracy free from the exploitation of the people by the few, a real people's republic.

Fascism is rather a movement away from the deepening of democracy. It is a movement against the masses rather than in their favour. It is an attempt to entrench against popular challenge the political-economic power of the new ruling fraternity of indigeneous landlords, bourgeois businessmen, bourgeois bureaucrats and their neo-colonial allies.

Fascism expresses the objective economic weakness of the African bourgeoisie - more correctly petty-bourgeoisie - who are ambitious to develop capitalism and are afraid of ruin from instability. In actual fact, the indigeneous bourgeoisie in Africa are by and large petty-bourgeois, since they are only on the way to becoming a class associated with industrialism which is the modern bourgeois class properly so called.

Capitalism is developed through the continuous exploitation of workers and peasants by what is initially a petty-bourgeois class. It is this exploitation that creates an industrial revolution and the capitalists that emerge as the product of this revolution. This exploitation is carried out by processes which generate among other things inflation, unemployment, the convulsion of all aspects of society by bourgeois competition and all the insecurities associated with it, hunger due to rural-urban migration and the relative technological-financial backwardness of agriculture, slums, strikes and other forms of urban and

rural misery and strife.

Out of this mixture of misery, antagonisms, insecurity and strife, arises absolutism. The bourgeoisie, petty and weak, are frightened by rural discontent and by the urban forces which its own development unleashes.

Fascism and the Bourgeois Order

Crucial in the development of fascism is the development of the working class movement. The working class occupy a strong position in modern industry as suppliers of labour. In a neo-colonial economy, especially, a strike of the working class in a few towns is sufficient to paralyse the modern sector. Hence the sections of the indigeneous bourgeoisie made up of nascent capitalists are vitally interested in preventing the working class from using its position in the modern sector in any way harmful to the development of capitalism.

The peasantry occupies a vital position in a neo-colonial economy because of the reliance of such an economy on peasant production and export. A development by the peasantry of a deeper consciousness of their exploitation and still more their organisation for self liberation from exploitation is dangerous to the development of capitalism.

Fascism manifests itself in underdeveloped countries as an attempt by the indigeneous bourgeoisie and their neo-colonial allies to stem the tide of working class and peasant liberation or egalitarian radicalism. The fascists suppress or subvert democratic forms, lest they be exploited to undermine the development of capitalism.

When we speak of the bourgeoisie here it must be understood that we are speaking of a section of the bourgeoisie, for the bourgeoisie are often divided on which policy will best suit the interest of their class. It is usual even for a section of the petty-bourgeoisie, the most democratic, to turn towards the working class and peasantry and towards socialism as a solution to the crisis of the colonial and neo-colonial order. Politically, therefore, the bourgeoisie do not form a monolithic group.

This is even more so in a multinational country with little national bourgeois industrial and commercial business integration.

Ethnic sections of the bourgeoisie inevitably practice bourgeois chauvinism with abandon as they compete for shares of the national cake. In this situation, the state bureaucracy, dominated by bourgeois-minded bureaucrats, becomes the bastion of bourgeois 'national unity.' Fascism becomes a movement in which this bureaucratic stratum of the bourgeoisie, acting as keeper of the national conscience and watch-dog of so-called 'national interest', essays to impose discipline on the bourgeoisie themselves. Of course, the expatriate monopolies, interested as they are in keeping the masses quiescent and exploited and in the stability of the foreign market which they exploit, are ever willing allies of the bourgeois bureaucrats in this disciplining enterprise.

An important factor that promotes the rise of absolutism in the contemporary African situation is the role of the state in bourgeois primitive accumulation. Because of today's concept of guided 'national development' through an enlargement of the state sector, the state plays a much larger role in accumulation as a regulator of economic activity, as a mobilizer of funds, and as a central redistributor of economic means accumulated by it than hitherto. Thus the stakes in the control of the state by bourgeois accumulators are much higher in contemporary underdeveloped countries than during the epoch of classical bourgeois primitive capitalist accumulation in Western Europe - 1400 to 1850. Consequently, the group of bourgeois politicians that get into office to wield state power prefers violence to losing its privileged position. Competing bourgeois factions are invited to join it in an absolutist 'all-party' exercise of power, failing which they are suppressed.

Moreover, in the contemporary situation there are few kings in the underdeveloped countries whose ministers and army can suppress the masses and hold the ring while the bourgeoisie compete to accumulate. The place of the king's government and army is taken by the 'The President', civilian or military, himself a bourgeois, who decides the kind of 'opposition' he and his gang of fellow travellers will have and suppresses the rest. In the Central African Republic, 'The President' in the person of Bocasso, even found it appropriate to proclaim himself a king-emperor. Bocasso, like the French he adored, was merely calling a spade a spade. A lover of form, he was not satisfied with the reality of an absolutist kingdom; the form must be made to fit the thing to the last detail. It is significant that he was consciously aping Napoleon.

Every absolutism in post-colonial Africa has a heavy hammer aimed against the head of the working class. The movement towards fascism is simply inevitable as the crisis of the neo-colonial dispensation matures. The more organised and politically conscious the working class is, the more pronounced is the fascist check on the development of democracy.

Creeping Fascism in Nigeria

The extent to which the tendency to fascism can be contained in Nigeria is problematic. A force sustaining liberal democratic notions here is the relative size and level of development of the middle class, the rapidity of that development and the political quiescence of the working class as a class, all of which impart to the bourgeoisie a measure of self-confidence and the bourgeoisie a measure of self-confidence and the relative tolerance that results from this. The multiplicity of large ethnic groups means that there are competing 'big-nation' chauvinisms. Since, on the national level, no ethnic bourgeois detachment finds it easy to suppress the others and assert dominance, the bourgeoisies have perforce to bargain as they do in a market and work out compromises. On less than the national level, however, wherever the bourgeoisie of one ethnic group can be supreme, it does assert its supremacy by fascist tendencies.

Furthermore, the compromising game in Nigeria is an involuntary product of factors beyond bourgeois control and does not spring in large measure from any democratic philosophy or conviction. As events have already shown, it is no guarantee against military absolutism but can, in fact, provoke it. It can do so either because of the impression of groping 'without a sense of direction' which it promotes or because the capacity to compromise will evaporate when the issues involve irreconcilable interests.

On the debit side of the prospects of democracy is the Presidential system, a facile machine in the hands of the most opportunistic, philistine, power hungry, bureaucratic and opposition-hating bourgeois group in any country. On the debit side also one may put the following consideration. Since 1950, the Nigerian working class has been largely divided and a-politicised. Industrially and politically the working class has for thirty years handed the bourgeoisie a sweet holiday. With a

persistent inflation in the economy, this easy time **is unlikely** to last much longer.

What will happen when the consciousness and mood of the working class change can be guessed from the fact that the 1964 general strike was followed by a move by the government to ban strikes. The rag of strikes that erupted during the civil war was met by a virtual ban on strikes which the civilian regime has not repealed. The 1980 general strike is being met by a parliamentary move by the ruling bourgeois party, the NPN, to disband the Nigerian Labour Congress, the united front organisation of the Nigerian proletariat.

It stands to reason from what we have said that the existence of the Nigerian Labour Congress is both a potential source of strength for the democratic forces and a potential danger to capitalism.

Fascism, as we have seen, is a retreat from liberal democracy on the part of a section of the bourgeoisie in order to prevent the use of democratic instruments by popular forces to redress the wrongs created by bourgeois accumulation. In Africa these wrongs include the wrongs of colonialism - an extension of European capitalism - which now work to the advantage of the indigeneous bourgeois groups that share economic interests with colonialism.

Whilst the bourgeoisie speak volumes about national unity, it feels threatened by the national unity of the working class. Hence the destruction of the national **united** front of the working class is naturally high on the list of priorities of the fascistic bourgeoisie. If we understand the matter properly the attack on trade union unity is a fascistic attack.

Between 1968 and 1975, the military regime passed shackling trade union laws under which it is an offence punishable by imprisonment for anyone to go on strike in an 'essential service' or do anything that the bourgeois authorities can interpret as undermining such a service. The law defines 'essential service' in such a way that practically every activity on which many Nigerian workers are employed falls under it. In fact, as the law stands, the only thing a trade union can legally do is declare

a trade dispute, enter into a long negotiation and, in the final analysis, accept the verdict of an arbitration tribunal. Strikes are ruled out.

As far as the working class movement is concerned fascism is already a fact in Nigeria. President Shagari, responding to the interests of imperialist big-business and its Nigerian friends, has turned a deaf ear to pleading from trade unionists that the laws shackling the labour movement be repealed. It is interesting that not even colonial rulers found it necessary or desirable to make such laws in Nigeria.

The attack on trade union unity is a stepping up of fascistic attack on the labour movement.

Fascism is creeping. There have occurred the deportation of an opposition leader (the Shugaba affair); the assassination of an opposition leader (Dr. Mohammed); the attempted murder of an opposition governor (an attempt on the life of Governor Abubakar Rimi); inspired riots in a state with an opposition government (Kano State); the massacre of peasant protesters (in Sokoto State); the turning of the police into political thugs who treat opposition governors as political criminals; the harassment of the opposition press by the increasingly politicised police; the instigation of the armed forces by the President against opposition politicians; the emphasis on stability, stability and still more stability; the deliberate creation of a governmental culture in which every criticism and every demand by the people even for entitlements clearly legitimised by law is regarded as 'confrontation'; the darkening ethos of government by threats rather than by persuasion through welcome deeds. The ring is closing.

There is no country where fascism suddenly appears one ugly day like a bolt from the blue. In all countries it creeps. When the democratic forces allow themselves to be, immobilized, paralysed or overwhelmed, fascism completes its circle. At the end of the day thousands of democratic men, women and even children have their lives squeezed out by the tightening noose.

If it is possible now in Nigeria for those committed to democracy to roll back fascism and avert a catastrophe. However, that depends on their readiness to rally. If anyone still prattles

of democracy, however, while feeling that an attack on trade unions is a matter for the trade unions alone, that the massacre of peasants is the affair of an isolated group of villages alone that the murder of an opposition leader is the concern of a single family, party or state, or that attempts to assassinate a governor while a politicised police force looks on is the business of that governor, then that person needs to take a look either at the history of fascism in other countries or at how this country slipped from an attempt to destroy an opposition party into a civil war and thirteen years of military rule.

Always, partisans of democracy need remember that the Presidential system poses special dangers requiring additional vigilance which must be organised and collective if it is to mean anything.

The Humanistic Challenge

Opposition to fascism will never succeed if it is a struggle of naked power hunger against naked power hunger.

Fascism is not only counter-democratic as a matter of governmental style; it is also counter-humanistic. Opposition to fascism must be based on humanistic principles.

To stem the tide of fascism in Nigeria, three things are required.

First, the working class movement, the most organised section of the people in modern life and the first victim of fascism, must develop a new political consciousness and begin a political struggle for democracy and its own interests. The trade union movement cannot be an island. The labour movement cannot be free or democratic if fascistic tendencies prevail.

Secondly, democrats in all parties must recognise the danger to democracy in Nigeria posed by feudal traditionalists of all hues who wish to retain ancient privileges by clever alliances with opportunistic sections of the bourgeoisie. They must also recognise the danger constituted by the small cabal of opportunistic intellectuals, businessmen (usually contractors growing wealthy from state projects or agents of foreign monopoly firms), ambitious bureaucrats, bread and butter politicians, careerist and sycophantic writers and publicists with no principles

behind their pens, and ethnic chauvinists.

People of this kind are concentrated in the National Party of Nigeria which stands out more and more clearly as merely a motley crowd of all sorts of money and position-seeking gangsters. There must develop against this grouping a broad democratic movement.

Thirdly, there is need now in Nigeria to place humanism in the centre. A powerful movement must emerge that seriously seeks to realise Dr. Azikiwe's humanistic principles: 'That man shall not be a wolf to man' and 'That the universal brotherhood shall become a reality'. This makes the People's Redemption Party particularly important.

The PRP is a mass-oriented party seeking a new social order free of all exploitation of man by man. This implies the destruction of feudalism, neo-colonialism and capitalism and the construction of a new humanism on their ruins. This principle of the PRP is the same as that embodied in Zik's humanistic slogans.

All over the world, the new humanism does not speak simply of the so-called 'freedom of the individual' as the old did. For as we now know, this may mean freedom of a bourgeois individual to exploit a working class or peasant individual. The new humanism speaks of man: the liberation of all individuals and all groups and societies of men from all exploitation.

The People's Redemption Party will develop only when it continues consistently to place the issue of the new humanism before the Nigerian people; only when it strives to rally all democrats and humanists against all forms of anti-humanist manifestation.

I hear an inordinate amount of silly talk about Nigeria being a great country. It is not a geographical area that can be great; only a people can be. Greatness in a people depends on what they do. It is insulting the world to call the United States a great country because the exploiters and racists there are armed with mountains of dollars and guns. Similarly, it is being mean to call Nigeria great because she has an ocean of

of mineral oil and more hungry human beings than the rest of Africa. Tiny Greece was great when she showed the world the rational light out of the traditional darkness of far flung empires. The British, the French and the Americans were great when they revealed to the world the way out of feudal backwardness and obscurantism. Small Cuba, small Angola and small Vietnam are currently great because they have placed the new humanism on the agenda of the day and are showing mankind how to fight for it.

The struggle for a new social order is the only complete answer to fascism or any tendency hostile to democracy. The African will be great only when he fights for what is new, what puts mankind a step forward in its self-development and what is universally valid.

Experience has shown that the struggle against autocracy anywhere requires a deep philosophy of liberation. Without it no apparent success can be permanent.