



# africa weekly

VOL. IV NO. 16

FRIDAY

OCTOBER 24, 1958

## DJIBO BAKARY RESIGNS AFTER NIGER VOTES "YES" TO DE GAULLE

Djibo Bakary, Chief Minister of the Niger Government, resigned together with his entire cabinet after the Niger had returned a majority of "Yes" votes in answer to De Gaulle's referendum. Bakary had campaigned for "No."

A new coalition government is in the process of formation. Nationalist parties in other parts of French West Africa have questioned the returns which resulted in Bakary's fall from office.

## VERWOERD APPOINTS HIS CABINET

Prime Minister Verwoerd of South Africa has appointed his cabinet. Cabinet members are as follows: -

Dr. Nicolaas Diedericks (Economic Affairs)

W.A. Maree (Native Education)

Dr. J.A.M. Hertzog (Posts, Telegraph, and Health)

D.C. Huys (Agricultural Economics and Marketing)

C.R. Swart (Justice)

Paul O. Sauer (Lands, Forests, Public Works)

Eric Louw (External Affairs)

Dr. T.E. Donges (Finance)

Francis C. Erasmus (Defense)

Ben J. Schoeman (Rail and Transport)

J.F.T. Naude (Interior)

Jan F. Serfontein (Education, etc)

Jan der Klerk (Labor and Mines)

Daan de Wet Nel (Native Administration)

Pieter le Roux (Agriculture, Technics).

## THE SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT SENDS 500 WOMEN TO JAIL

Over 500 African women have been sent to prison in Johannesburg, South Africa, for protesting against the issue of passes.

The pass laws of South Africa are at the basis of the totalitarian control of Africans in the Union. Until now women have been exempt from carrying passes.

## DE GAULLE OFFERS TRUCE TALKS TO THE ALGERIAN F.L.N.

Premier De Gaulle of France offered truce talks to the leaders of the Algerian Front of National Liberation (F.L.N.) He proposed that they come to Paris under a safe conduct to discuss a 'brave man's peace'.



IN TRAINING: Young Nigerian athletes sprint round a racetrack at Enugu. Nigeria is to become independent in 1960. (United Nations)

## PAN-AFRICAN FREEDOM MOVEMENT FOR EAST AND CENTRAL AFRICA

A Pan African Freedom Movement for East and Central Africa has been formed with headquarters at Dar es Salaam. The decision to form the movement was taken in Mwanza, Tanganyika, where political leaders from Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, Zanzibar, and Nyasaland met together. The meeting was convened by Mr. Julius Nyerere, president of the Tanganyika African National Union (T.A.N.U.).

At the conference, of which Mr. F.J. Khamisi of Mombasa, Kenya, was chairman, a freedom charter was signed. The charter declared: -

- (1) That democracy must prevail throughout Africa from Senegal to Zanzibar and from Cape to Cairo.
- (2) That colonialism, the so-called trusteeship, and so-called partnership, apartheid, multi-racialism, and white settlerism are enemies of freedom and can be eradicated only by African nationalism - virile and unrelenting.
- (3) That the right of self-determination is God given, and no man or nation is chosen by God to determine the destiny of others.
- (4) That poverty, ignorance, ill-health, and other human miseries cannot be satisfactorily eradicated under imperialism, but only under self-government and international co-operation on the basis of equality and mutual benefaction."

# THE CROWN THE COMMONWEALTH AND AFRICA

The British Commonwealth of Nations - united by the "Golden Link" of the Crown - is, it is generally agreed, a most curious institution. The very vagueness which surrounds its precise character has served to smooth over potential conflicts, and to promote harmony between its members.

In a world, however, which is moving forward at what often seems an alarming pace, the Commonwealth - which was confined in concept to those peoples and countries impregnated, in varying degrees, with the consciousness of British culture - often appears structurally incapable of reacting satisfactorily to the urgent demands of our times. This was, of course, made most dramatically apparent at Suez - when Britain, leader of the Commonwealth, moved, without prior consultation, and in conjunction with two non-Commonwealth members, in warlike array against a former British satellite, Egypt. The question still remains unanswered today - did the Commonwealth receive at that time its first genuine challenge, or its deathblow? Or - to put it another way - Is the Commonwealth broad enough in concept to survive in the twentieth-century world?

The forum at which the question of Commonwealth survival will ultimately be decided is most likely to be the United Nations. For, while questions of common interest are discussed at London and at Ottawa, it is at Turtle Bay that the conflicts break the surface. And - if the Commonwealth is indeed to survive - Britain, its founder and leader, must now demonstrate that the Commonwealth is not in conflict but in harmony with the principles of the United Nations Charter. That is to say there is a growing onus on Britain to prove that the Commonwealth has no less to offer its junior members in the years ahead than has the United Nations itself. Nor is it only a question of pounds sterling. It is also a question of an acceptable future status.

It would appear, however, that up to the present Britain has done little or no thinking on this subject. The vision of a multi-racial community of nations has sufficed, during the past few years, as a bright enough star to steer by. The point is rapidly approaching, however and more patently so than ever before since the 1958 race riots in Britain - when mere inter-racial fraternising at official functions and at governmental level is not acceptable as sufficient guarantee of Britain's sincerity and good faith. The maintenance of this faith and mutual trust is vital, for on what is the Commonwealth built if not on trust?

It is, however, becoming increasingly ap-

parent that the trust that Britain has inspired in the past is being eroded away. It is perhaps only to be expected that the last party to become conscious of this situation is the party most directly concerned - Britain herself. For Britain has become accustomed to inspiring trust in others. Even when the sum total of that trust is diminishing, Britain still continues to exact from others the outward signs of a formerly thorough-going admiration that is sometimes now subject to certain qualifications. As a result there has come into being a somewhat ambiguous situation which is in danger of degenerating.

As it is at the United Nations that the underlying conflicts are seen in clearest focus, so it is precisely at the United Nations that the situation can be best understood. In examining the circumstances, however, two aspects should be emphasized beforehand. Firstly, this article focuses on disagreements rather than on agreements, since the latter may be taken for granted. Secondly, while these disagreements stand revealed at the United Nations, it is not the United Nations which created them or is in any way responsible for them, since these disagreements would exist irrespective of whether or not the international organization were in being.

It is primarily concerning African affairs that the difficulties in question arise. This is, perhaps, because African questions most frequently possess, by their nature, racial overtones. The fact that these questions are growing more acute precisely as Britain's stand on them grows more ambiguous, if not openly negative, serves to emphasize that the racial issue is rapidly becoming the fundamental issue of our century. It is therefore not difficult to understand that it is upon Britain's reaction to the racial question in the near future that the destiny of the Commonwealth will soon come to depend.

On no question is the British position more open to criticism than upon that of apartheid in the Union of South Africa. Recently when 68 nations combined to vote through a resolution in the U.N. Special Political Committee "expressing regret and concern that the Government of the Union of South Africa has not yet responded to appeals of the Assembly that it reconsider governmental policies which impair the right of all racial groups to enjoy the same rights and fundamental freedoms"; Britain, together with another Commonwealth member known for its policies of racial exclusivity - Australia - voted against the rest. Short of walking out of the meeting, Britain could not have gone further to support South Africa. In order to

maintain her contention that the resolution infringed Article Two paragraph Seven of the U.N. Charter Britain even took up a position in flat contradistinction to that adopted by the United States of America. It was hardly surprising that the conclusion generally drawn was not that Britain was upholding the Charter (for the same argument has not been used with respect to the Hungarian issue), but that the U.S. had adopted a racially progressive attitude, whereas the United Kingdom had not. The thoughts of some participants went winging back to an article which appeared in the London "Observer" on September 25th which had quoted the complaint of a non-white Commonwealth delegate: "If only they'd admit to us that Britain votes for South Africa because she doesn't want the United Nations looking into Central Africa - instead of talking hypocrisy to us as if we were nincompoops."

An even graver situation appears to have developed with respect to South-West Africa. The South-West African question has - after some initial struggles to come into being at the United Nations - been somewhat slowly growing in size, like a baby elephant, as the years go by. Every year, however, it is viewed with increasing alarm by those who have reason to be nervous concerning its future growth. Accordingly this year a decided attempt was made to push the bulky beast once and for all out of the way. Alas for the pushers! Those who stood out of the way, whatever their feelings about the elephant, were not harmed. But almost without exception those who hurried forward to give a determined push retired with their feelings hurt, if not with their reputations trampled upon.

When, at the conclusion of these efforts, the animal still stood where it always did, as large as life, the United Kingdom delegate on the U.N. Trusteeship Committee - Mr. Longden M.P., took his courage in his hands, and attempted to goad the elephant out of the way with legal argument involving the Crown, on whose behalf South-West Africa is administered by the Union of South Africa. The elephant promptly kicked back in the form of a letter from the Rev. Michael Scott - a reply which not only sent the Honorable Delegate spinning, but which also opened up serious prospects of discord regarding the continued British countenance of the notorious conditions prevailing in the territory of South West Africa. In short, it became apparent that unless Britain decides to take action concerning South West Africa, for which it bears such an overwhelming responsibility, an issue might arise which - over the years - might become a focus for precisely those racial differences which exist within the Commonwealth, and which the Commonwealth is meant to overcome.

The letter in question - which was read out by the chairman of a U.N. Committee - read, in part, as follows:

*S.W.A. Scott letter*  
"I feel in conscience bound to ask if I may make a brief written submission on a matter raised in the course of a statement to the Fourth Committee by Mr. Longden, Delegate of the United Kingdom, when he dealt with the question of the status of the South West African Mandate in relation to the British Crown.

"This statement would make it appear that Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth is not one person but several legal entities who may be moved in several different and even opposite directions at the same time, according to the advice of the several governments which constitute the Commonwealth.

"The effect of this form of legal logic would be to deprive Her Majesty of any personality or initiative as Head of the Commonwealth and render her unanswerable to international law or on grounds of conscience even to considerations of common humanity.

"The practical difficulties of such a position can be seen from the political dilemma in which Commonwealth countries now find themselves in the Fourth Committee. The governments of Ghana and Ceylon, India and Pakistan have accepted the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice and would advise her accordingly with respect to her obligations under the Mandate treaty. The Government of the United Kingdom accepted the advisory opinions only in part, whereas the Union of South Africa has rejected both the opinions of the International Court and the General Assembly...

"May I plead, with every respect to Mr. Longden as a representative of his government, that this matter so vitally affecting the integrity of the Commonwealth and the United Nations cannot be dealt with by the erection of legal fictions and suggest that the Commonwealth countries and the United Nations could resolve their dilemma by agreeing to accept the judgement of the International Court."

From the foregoing considerations, certain conclusions follow.

(1) It is time for the United Kingdom to give sober consideration to the next step in the Commonwealth's evolution.

(2) Without undue haste, the United Kingdom must also come to a decision as to what official policy it will eventually recommend that the Commonwealth adopt when the time comes to choose sides between integration and segregation.

(3) Britain must desist from supporting South Africa's apartheid policies at the United Nations.

(4) The obligations of the British Crown towards the inhabitants of South West Africa must be discharged. (A petition sent to the Queen was recently sent back to the petitioners for re-submission through the South African Government).

The Commonwealth is potentially one of the greatest creative influences at work in the world today. It must not be allowed to disintegrate through apathy and lack of leadership.

## BOOK REVIEW

THE QUEST FOR AFRICA. By Dr. Heinrich Schiffrers. Translated from the German. Putnam. 352 pp. \$5.00

The subtitle of this book is "Two Thousand Years of Exploration". From this one might be led to expect a systematic account of the development of European contacts with the African continent. Dr. Schiffrers' work, however, is more in the nature of a compendium of tales about travellers. Certainly a book purporting to be an account of the history of African discovery, and yet which fails to mention - to mention some random names - Ibn Battuta, Captain Binger, or Joseph Thomson, cannot be taken as a comprehensive study.

Which is not to say that "The Quest for Africa" is without its own peculiar virtues. Germans are rightly renowned for scholarship, and there is much scholarly lore and little-known historic detail in the spasmodic stories of episodes from the Afro-European past - episodes told with sudden flashes of vivid dialogue and detail, and separated from one another by inexplicable lacuna, and confused and ambiguous historical references.

What is of particular interest is the departure from the 'national' approach. Who does not know, by now, that Cecil Rhodes came from an English vicarage and carved out a fortune and an empire? It is an oft-told tale, as are the tales of Stanley and Livingstone, of Mungo Park, and others. Dr. Schiffrers has the habit of telling us instead of the Scotsman, James Bruce, who was the first explorer of modern times to visit Ethiopia - and who was laughed into silence when he returned with stories of Abyssinian life. Carl Peters, too, although well-known to German readers, has not often had his story told to us in English. The story, even, of Martin Behaim from Nuremberg, who learnt the use of an early type of sextant so that ships might navigate out of sight of land, and who was given high honor

## AFRICA WEEKLY

'AMERICA'S WEEK-BY-WEEK REPORT ON AFRICA'

Editor KEITH IRVINE

P.O. Box 75 Murray Hill Station  
New York 16, N.Y.

Subscription rates:

One year \$6.00: Six months \$3.00

at the fifteenth century Portuguese Court, has its rightful place here too. These - as well as many of the better-known examples of African exploration - are here recounted. The basic fault of the book remains, however, that it has retained the old European insolence in its approach to foreign ways and customs. In its ethos, no less than in its adventurousness, it remains tied to the nineteenth century.

Of topical interest is the chapter on the occupation of Algeria. In 1809 Napoleon planned the invasion of Algeria, and sent a Captain Boutin to reconnoitre. Boutin reported that landings might be made at Sidi Ferruche. The plan was dropped, but not forgotten. Twenty-one years later 37,000 Frenchmen came ashore at Sidi Ferruche at the very place chosen by Boutin. There followed the epoch of war and conquest, symbolised by the despotic General Bugeaud, who outlined, at one time, the task of the French in Algeria as to "do all we can to destroy the very foundations of agriculture."

Dr. Schiffrers has led us along some little-travelled routes winding through the African past.

### AMSAC OFFICIAL GETS HOEY AWARD

Mr. James T. Harris Jr., assistant executive director of AMSAC (the American Society of African Culture) has been presented with the James J. Hoey Award for Inter-racial Justice.

## AFRICA WEEKLY

P.O. Box 75,  
Murray Hill Station,  
New York 16, New York



GRAND CENTRAL  
STATION

