

vene effectively; half of its African investments are in the Republic of South Africa, and it continues to purchase 40 per cent of Rhodesia's chromium in spite of the UN boycott. It appears that only the fear of an outbreak of violence triggered by nationalist movements inside the country, the spread of racial difficulties or the threat of outside intervention from neighbouring states supported by socialist powers could finally stir the Western nations to action.

The credibility of the dialogue was weakened by the South African leaders themselves when, in collusion with the United States, they decided to intervene in Angola in support of Savimbi's UNITA. The South African whites' desire to maintain their hegemony was poorly disguised by the pretext that they were acting for economic reasons — protecting the large South African and Western interests in Angola — and by the political-ideological pretext of preventing the spread of Communism in Africa. Denunciations of

Cuban and Soviet intervention are carrying less and less weight with a growing number of moderate African states. To place these interventions and those of South Africa on the same footing is to fall in with the ideological arguments of the West, whose activity in the Third World is geared only to competition with the U.S.S.R. or to arranging a situation beneficial to their interests. In any case, Zambia, after bowing to the inevitable, drew the appropriate conclusions from the fiasco of its dialogue with South Africa and joined with Tanzania, Mozambique and Angola in drawing up a new policy with teeth in it. The consolidation of this front, aided by the socialist powers if necessary, will have more influence on the destiny of southern Africa than years of conversation. A number of African states are now aware of this, and the Western powers would be wise to take a look at what is happening.

Portuguese Africa resounds to MPLA victory in Angola

By René Pélissier

With the total victory of the MPLA in Angola an accepted fact, which for the present appears unchallenged by its neighbours and by its adversaries in Angola or in exile, the regime in power in Africa's major Portuguese-speaking country has joined its three former fighting companions in an independence that was long in doubt. Each of the five parts of what was formerly Portuguese Africa (Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde, and São Tomé and Príncipe) is now headed by a regime connected with the nationalist parties that fought against Lisbon for over 14 years — by force of arms in the three

continental territories and with words in the editorial rooms of the two archipelagos.

Common points

Despite the obvious differences among the MPLA (Angola), FRELIMO (Mozambique), the PAIGC (Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde) and the MLSTP (São Tomé and Príncipe), the four victorious parties had much in common, which is why the latter three were relieved when the MPLA overcame the difficulties facing it and came to power in Luanda. A partial enumeration of these common points gives a clearer picture of the reasons for the satisfaction felt in Maputo, Bissau, Praia and São Tomé. All these parties based themselves on Marxism, or at least on African socialism, seeing it as the only possible solution to the problem faced by their countries. All of them proclaimed their intention not only to topple the colonial regime but also to forge a new society based on the elimination of the exploita-

René Pélissier, docteur ès lettres (Sorbonne) and a specialist on contemporary problems in Portuguese and Spanish Africa, has published a three-volume thesis entitled Résistance et Révoltes en Angola (1945-1961) and a large number of other works. The views expressed here are those of Dr. Pélissier.