M. Braginsky, Y. Lukonin

A Short History of the National-Liberation Movement in East Africa

Progress Publishers
Moscow

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN
Edited by F. Glagolyeva

CONTENTS

I. RESISTANCE TO IMPERIALIST EXPANSION

In order to justify colonial expansion, the imperialists have invented a racist thesis which holds that the African peoples are incapable of independently overcoming their backwardness and reaching a "civilised" state. It claims further that charity alone forced the capitalist countries of Europe "to shoulder a new burden". The British and German imperialists persisted in alleging that East Africa was more in need of Great Britain and Germany than they were in need of East Africa.

However, an analysis of the pre-colonial period, when the peoples of East Africa were progressing along the road of independent development, and a study of the policy pursued by Great Britain and Germany in East Africa in the second half of the nineteenth century completely disprove these inventions.

East Africa on the eve of imperialist occupation

Until quite recently the imperialists refused to admit that the East African peoples had a history and culture of their own. And if they did admit

it (as was the case with Buganda, Bunyoro and Ankole), they usually falsified the facts in order to justify their occupation of East Africa. History, however, now possesses so many irrefutable facts and factual material that any further falsification is impossible.

In the pre-colonial period the tribal system of the majority of East African peoples reached a stage of decay. However, these were not the savage tribes portrayed so exotically by European writers, but peoples engaged in farming, cattle-breeding and crafts. From time immemorial they had worked iron, they were known for their skilled craftsmen and carried on a lively trade with each other.

The East African peoples have not reached the level of development of the Europeans. But this is not attributable to a specific physical or mental development of the Africans, as the racists allege. This backwardness was caused by a certain isolation of these peoples, by their lack of contact with the rest of the world.

At the time of European colonisation a number of East African peoples had already attained a high level of socio-economic development, as is seen in the case of Buganda, Bunyoro, Ankole, Toro and Busoga. By the middle of the nineteenth century Buganda had surpassed its neighbours to such an extent that the possibility of establishing a large, centralised state in East Africa became feasible. However, the imperialist invasion prevented this from becoming a reality.

The successes achieved by Buganda were due to its highly developed economy, as well as its socio-political institutions. Farming and cattle-breeding were not the only pursuits of the population. Crafts were emerging as an independent field of endeavour. The Buganda craftsmen plied their trades to meet their own immediate needs, the needs of the tribe and the market as well.

In time, various regions of Buganda began to specialise in producing specific crops or wares. This created the necessary prerequisites for extending home trade and developing commodity-money relations. The monetary unit used in Buganda was the cowrie shell. The price of a head of cattle was the commodity value equivalent. A standard system of weights and measures and a decimal system of numeration were established.

Thus, the social division of labour had attained a high level in Buganda.

Buganda was a feudal state closely resembling the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Asian states. State ownership of land was prevalent. The Kabaka, or ruler, who stood at the head of the feudal hierarchy, was the supreme owner of land. He had absolute power over all land conditionally held by the feudal lords and used by the peasant communities.

As early as the eighteenth century, the rulers began allotting land on a temporary basis to various influential chieftains, officials and warrior chiefs and demanded military and political allegiance in return. A new type of feudal land

tenure evolved in the nineteenth century whereby land could be inherited.

The population of Buganda was comprised mainly of free peasants. They lived on community land and were governed by elders. However, they were obliged to pay in money and in kind to the state and the Kabaka for the right to use the land. Besides, they had to contribute their labour for various public works.

The nineteenth century saw the emergence of a stratum of peasants who were dependent upon the feudal lords of Buganda. However, they were not yet attached to the land and were free to leave it if they had no debts.

Prisoners of war and tenants who could not pay their debts to the feudal lord became slaves. Slavery, however, never became widespread in Buganda.

In Bunyoro, Ankole and Toro the feudal system was in the making, but the social and economic life of these states was greatly influenced by remnants of tribal relations. Ethnic differences were also a factor to be considered; representatives of the Nilot language group made up the feudal-tribal ruling clique, while Bantu peasants were the basic tax-payers.

Thus, some East African peoples lived in a fully-formed class society, and many others had achieved the primary stage of class development.

The political, legal and ideological institutions of African society evolved in accordance with the social and economic structure.

In Buganda, Bunyoro, Ankole, Toro and Busoga the feudal state safeguarded the interests of the feudal class. Their rulers were endowed with absolute power. They decided all matters of land tenure, taxation, justice, war and peace. The feudal class, the oppressors of the peasants, provided their support.

The rulers had a powerful state apparatus which included a council composed of dignitaries, officials, clergymen, a staff of appointed chiefs, the army, and a judicial system.

The entire state apparatus was based on the principle of complete centralisation. The provincial vicegerents (Buganda was divided into 10 saza) were appointed by the rulers from among the feudal lords and were responsible to them.

In the second half of the 19th century, Mutesa I, Kabaka of Buganda, began appointing his vice-gerents from among the more able freemen, for he feared the growing power of the feudal lords. The vicegerents exercised power over the chiefs of minor administrative units.

The vicegerents and the chiefs subservient to them collected state taxes, recruited soldiers for military campaigns or to defend the country from enemy attack; they were responsible for keeping order in the country and for the maintenance of roads.

The army was a reliable weapon in the hands of the feudal class and was used not only to wage war against neighbours but to defend the privileges of the ruling social group as well. It

was divided into regular units of body-guards under the command of the rulers or feudal lords and irregular troops which were called up in case of war or internal disturbances. The Guards of Mutesa I, numbering 3,000 soldiers, had firearms. The irregular army, mobilised at the Kabaka's orders, at times totalled 100;000 men. The Buganda fleet on Lake Victoria numbered 300 craft and was capable of transporting 20,000 warriors.

Objective European explorers, among whom we find a number of Russians, who travelled into the heart of East Africa in the second half of the nineteenth century provide interesting data on the material and spiritual culture of the African peoples. Artifacts of iron, wood, clay, glass, leather and bast reflected the skill of the craftsmen. Articles of clothing, jewelry and household belongings were indicative of the demands of the market as well as the wealth of the owners and their social status. The peoples of East Africa followed the same development patterns as the peoples of Europe, Asia and America. Similar social, economic and political processes were taking place there. The peoples of East Africa had ancient history, material and spiritual culture. Given the opportunity for free development and the establishment of normal relations with other countries and peoples, they would have advanced much further along the road of progress in their economy and spiritual life. But the expansionist policy of British and German imperialism precluded this.

Foreigners first invaded East Africa in the Middle Ages. In the 7th and 8th centuries Arab feudal lords and merchants had established their colonies here, which in the 10th century were amalgamated into sultanates. In the late 15th and early 16th centuries the first Europeans reached East Africa. Most of the Arab towns on the eastern coast fell prey to the Portuguese invaders who were anxious to bolster their Indian colonies by gaining a strong foothold in Africa. The Portuguese invasion brought immeasurable suffering to the native population which repeatedly rose up against the invaders. After many bitter battles the people, aided by Sultan Mascat of Arabia, ousted the Portuguese from most of their holdings along the East African Coast. However, the Arab feudal lords and merchants reaped the fruits of this victory. Liberation from the Portuguese did not alleviate the people's burden. The East Coast remained subject to the barbarious raids of the slave-traders. Zanzibar was still one of the greatest world slave markets in the middle of the 19th century, with over 10,000 slaves passing through it annually.

The British and French colonialists, who had shipped millions of slaves from West Africa to North and South America in the 17th and 18th centuries, now appeared as the "champions" against slave trading in East Africa. Their campaign against the slave trade was a pretext

for penetrating into and subjugating East Africa.

An agreement signed by Britain and France recognised the Indian Ocean as a British sphere of influence. In 1840 Britain forced the Sultan of Zanzibar to agree to the establishment of a British protectorate on the island, which later became a spring-board for their subjugation of Kenya and Uganda.

Meanwhile, the African peoples, driven to exasperation by the slave-raids, began to mobilise their forces. Strong resistance was shown to the slave traders by the Nyamwezi people inhabiting the territory later known as Tanganyika and led by their chiefs Manwa Sera and Mirambo, whose troops attacked slave-trading caravans and set free captives doomed to slavery. In 1870 Mirambo gained hold of Tabora–the chief base of the slave traders. In the course of his struggle against the slave trade Mirambo created the Nyamwezi State, an unsurmountable barrier in the path of the slavers. In an attempt to destroy this state, the Sultan of Zanzibar launched a most unsuccessful attack. However, with the death of Mirambo, this state went into decline and finally collapsed.

The slave trade was most detrimental to the development of the East African peoples; in plundering and depopulating entire regions, it was responsible for stemming their progress. Slave traffic increased inter-tribal strife, preventing the tribes from uniting against the impending danger of British and German imperialism.

Great Britain and Germany were the chief rivals in the struggle for power in East Africa. In 1884 a German expedition under Karl Peters landed in Zanzibar. One of its goals was the annexation of the interior areas of East Africa. Peters used threats, bribery and deceit to impose the bondage of a German protectorate upon the chiefs of the tribes that inhabited present-day Tanzania. Where bribery and deceit failed, the German imperialists used arms. They waged war against the Wahehe and other tribes from 1891 to 1898 and could claim a considerable part of East Africa by the turn of the century.

These successful operations were of great concern to their British rivals, who had plans of creating a chain of British possessions from Cairo to Capetown. A British expedition, headed by Harry Johnston, was immediately dispatched to East Africa. Like that of Peters, its main purpose was to force enslaving agreements upon the Kenyan chiefs.

In November 1886 "spheres of influence" agreement was signed between Britain and Germany. The British imperialists claimed Kenya, known thereafter as the British East Africa Protectorate, while the Germans secured Tanganyika, renamed German East Africa.

This agreement left the territories west of Lake Victoria free from influence. Being of exceptional strategic and economic importance, these lands became the arena of a violent struggle between Britain, Germany and France.

Each of these powers strove to gain possession of the headwaters of the White Nile, and thus gain control of the Nile Valley.

Buganda became the centre of this imperialist rivalry. He who won Buganda would hold the key to all territories north and west of Lake Victoria. The matter was finally settled in 1890 by a new imperialist agreement. According to this agreement, Germany, in consideration of Britain's secession of Helgoland, surrendered its claims to Zanzibar and consented to British rule in the territories later included in the Uganda Protectorate. Thus, East Africa was divided up by the imperialists.

The struggle of the African peoples against imperialism

In dividing up East Africa, the British and German imperialists were not in the least concerned with the desires of its true masters. However, the peoples of Kenya, Tanganyika and Uganda vigorously opposed these imperialist agreements and put up a stubborn resistance to the invaders. It was easier for Berlin and London to sign an agreement than to assert their actual power over East Africa.

In view of the varying conditions, the British imperialists resorted to various methods for consolidating their rule in this part of Africa. The states of Buganda and Bunyoro, for example, were too powerful to be captured by direct attack

and therefore, in their conquest of Uganda the British resorted to kindling internal strife.

The methods they used in Buganda were quite different.

The Protestant and Catholic missionaries, acting with the full knowledge and support of the Imperial British East Africa Company, provoked a religious war in Buganda. The Cross became a means of enthralling the African states.

The Protestant missionaries were acting in the interests of the British imperialists, while the Catholic missionaries promoted the interests of their French rivals. With control over Buganda as their final goal, the British set the African Protestants against their Catholic compatriots. Fratricidal war ensued. It lasted for nearly three years (1888-1890) and resulted in pillage and depopulation. Once a powerful state, Buganda now lay helpless in the face of impending colonial serfdom. The young and inexperienced Kabaka Mwanga strove in vain to save his country from the imperialists. He was betrayed by the feudal lords, whose chief concern was to preserve their own privileges. Kabaka Mwanga did not suceed in securing German help in the struggle against Britain. At any rate, German domination would not have been better than British domination. In 1890 Captain F. D. Lugard of the Imperial British East Africa Company, used armed force to impose a protectorate upon Mwanga's country.

It would seem that the seizure of Buganda would provide the imperialists with a key to the rapid

subjugation of all the neighbouring territories. However, they were to be bitterly disappointed. All attempts to subjugate Bunyoro ended in failure. Mukama Kabalega, the courageous and determined ruler of Bunyoro, led his people in active guerrilla warfare against the colonialists from 1890 to 1899. In 1897, Kabaka Mwanga and a group of his followers joined Kabalega's guerrillas.

The British imperialists found the task of suppressing the Bunyoro resistance a most difficult one, even though they had the support of the Buganda feudal lords who provided troops in return for nearly half of Bunyoro. With their help the imperialists also subjugated the Iteso, Bagisu, Bakedi, Busoga and Langi peoples. Taking advantage of the split inside Buganda and the treachery of the feudal lords, as well as the lack of unity among the African peoples, the British gained possession of Uganda. In Buganda, as in Ankole, Bunyoro and Toro, the feudal lords supported the imperialists until the very last days of the Protectorate, fighting against the true patriots, splitting and weakening the anti-colonial movement in Uganda.

The imperialists met with greater resistance on the territory of present-day Tanzania. In 1888, under pressure from the German imperialists, the Sultan of Zanzibar consented to lease the coast under his control (including the harbours of Dar es Salaam and Pangani) to them for a period of 50 years. In 1890 he sold these lands to the Germans for four million marks. The leasing of the coast, followed by the imposition of a monetary tax on the African people by the colonial authorities, resulted in a powerful uprising of the native and Arab populations under the leadership of Bushiri bin Salim el Harthi. Mkwawa, chief of the Hehe people, was one of the leaders of this movement.

By May 1889 all the coastal areas, with the exception of Dar es Salaam and Bagamoyo, were in the hands of the insurgents. Bushiri declined the German imperialists' offer of a highly paid post of Governor in one of the regions.

Despite the rivalry which existed among Britain, Germany and France in East Africa, the imperialists were quick to find a common language when the question at issue was the suppression of anti-colonial movements. The uprising led by Bushiri coincided with the Mahdi uprising in Sudan, and threatened to grow into a general uprising of the East African peoples against imperialism. Sensing this, Britain, France and Portugal scurried to the aid of the German imperialists.

Germany allotted nearly 10 million marks for suppressing the uprising. Punitive troops armed with cannons and machine-guns were dispatched to East Africa. Theirs was a victory of modern weapons, aided by the lack of unity among the East African peoples. The Swahili, Hehe, Yao and Arab peoples took an active part in this uprising, but they were not supported by the other peoples

of East Africa. In 1889 Bushiri was betrayed and executed by the Germans.

In the years between 1891 and 1900 the Chagga, Hehe, Nyamwezi and other peoples rose against the German rule, delivering a series of heavy blows to the occupants. In order to preserve their rule, the imperialists flooded the country with troops. It took Germany over 15 years to consolidate its rule in Africa by means of its blood-and-iron policy.

Thus, it is historically established that the British and German imperialists came to East Africa as conquerors and oppressors, as enemies of the African peoples; that their motto was "divide and rule", that they used deliberate lies and armed force to suppress the native population; that the peoples of East Africa stubbornly resisted the imperialist rule; that the imperialist invasion was responsible for upsetting the normal development of these peoples.

Colonial slavery

The British and German imperialists claimed they had come to East Africa to abolish the slave trade. What they actually did was to bring an even greater evil to the African peoples, that of colonial slavery.

The driving force behind the imperialists' annexation of East Africa was the lure of vast new markets for the British and German monopolies, new sources of raw materials and profitable spheres of capital investment. The British and

German colonial authorities were guided by the motto: "super-profits and super-profits alone" for the European capitalists.

The peoples of East Africa were deprived of all political and legal rights, they were subjected to brutal exploitation and racial oppression. Next to nothing was paid for the raw materials and foodstuffs exported from East Africa.

The chief task of the colonial administration, whether "direct", as in the German colonies, or "indirect" as in the British, was to suppress any and all attempts of resistance to European oppression on the part of the African peoples and to create for the British and German capitalists the most favourable conditions for plundering the national resources of East Africa and exploiting its population.

The agreements signed between Britain and Buganda, Ankole, Toro and, later, Bunyoro, deprived the African states of their sovereignty and independence, leaving them some illusory rights in the management of their home affairs. The system of "indirect administration" used by the British became a reliable means of safeguarding their rule in East Africa. The traditional government institutes were made to serve their interests, while the greed of the feudal lords and tribal chiefs helped to keep the population in submission. The system of "indirect administration" was based on the time-tested imperialist principle of "divide and rule".

From the very outset, the imperialists had aimed

at transforming their East African colonies into settlements engaged in agricultural production. This could only be realised if the tribal lands were handed over to the colonists. And this is exactly what the imperialists did. In 1895 all the land in German East Africa was proclaimed to be the property of the German Crown. Similar measures were effected somewhat later in the British colonies, viz.: Uganda (excluding the "Mailo" lands) in 1902 and British East Africa (Kenya) in 1915.

The laws adopted by the imperialists, contrary to the interests of the African peoples, provided the basis for unprecedented land pillage.

The European colonists were not satisfied with grants of land. They sought also to acquire land that was particularly fertile and situated in the most favourable climatic regions. They demanded that these lands be made their private property. The Tanga and Kilimanjaro regions in East Africa and the Highlands and Rift Valley in Kenya were turned into "white man's country". By 1914 the German colonists owned over 3,500 square miles of fertile land. The expropriation of land took on vast scope in the British East Africa Protectorate (Kenya).

The British Protectorate was then commonly known as the "kitchen garden" of the House of Lords. Vast territories were seized by the Earl of Portsmouth (350 thousand acres), Lord Delamere (100 thousand acres), Lord Francis Scott and others. These lands were leased for 99 years, and,

beginning with 1915, for 999 years in return for a meagre rent. Lord Delamere, for example, paid an annual rent of only £200 for 100 thousand acres of land. His Lordship, however, considered even this sum to be burdensome, so he parcelled out his lands to tenants who brought him an income of over £200,000 annually.

In 1903 the Protectorate numbered nearly a hundred colonists. In 1904 the British authorities invited colonists from South Africa, promising them extremely profitable conditions. In Rift Valley, for example, 640-acre plantations and 5,000-acre pasture lands were not only handed out free of charge, but were tax exempt as well.

The British authorities leased these lands without a thought for the hundreds of thousands of African families who lived on them. Moreover, the Africans were driven off their ancestral lands and herded into reservations, first set up in 1906. The reservations had no fixed boundaries until 1926 in order that even new lands might be expropriated.

However, the robbery of the land was only begun prior to the First World War; the final stage was reached after the war.

The Decree of 1915 proclaimed all the lands of the Protectorate to be the property of the British Crown and turned the Africans into tenants.

In Uganda, where 90 per cent of all the land was now Crown property, vast territories awaited European colonisation. At one time the imperialists

wanted to create a Jewish centre, or an African Israel, in this area.

A remoteness from all sea ports and the absence of modern transportation made the Protectorate an unprofitable enterprise, and forced the imperialists to resort to cunning in their exploitation of the African population of Uganda. The petty economies of the African peasants, and not the European plantations were made the chief units of agricultural production. The colonists forced the Africans to grow cotton and coffee and then bought them up for next to nothing. Land alone, without the possibility of exploiting cheap labour, was not of much use to capitalist enterprise. The question was how to make the Africans work. Although the imperialists had deprived the Africans of the best lands, this did not make them come to work on the European plantations, farms and enterprises of their own accord.

The problem was solved by introducing monetary taxes. In the British colonies, for example, the Africans were first made to pay a hut tax (3 rupees), then a poll tax (up to 5 rupees). Small as the tax was, it forced the African to find a job in order to earn the required sum. The tax system, however, did not provide the capitalists with the labour power they needed, for having earned enough to pay his taxes and buy a few goods, the African usually returned to his village. In regions where export crops were raised, the Africans sold their crops for money.

A new means of exploitation was necessary. It was soon provided by the barbarous system of forced labour which was actually a new form of slavery. The imperialists substituted the economic law of supply and demand, as concerned labour, by that of forced labour.

In 1908 Governor Bell of Uganda, whom the imperialists' propaganda represented as "the Africans' friend", introduced the Kasanvu System, which made it obligatory for each African adult to work without pay for 30 days a year. This provided the colonial authorities and the European capitalists with a monthly influx of 20,000 labourers who worked without wages. Some businessmen found the Law of 1908 so profitable that they did everything to keep it alive until 1921. A similar law, adopted in 1910 in Kenya, gave the authorities the right to make any number of Africans work for an unlimited period.

The forced labour system was also adopted by the German colonial authorities in East Africa. In 1913, 92,000 African workers out of a total labour force of 170,000 worked from 190 to 240 days a year on the German plantations.

They lived in frightful conditions and were treated as slaves. Back-breaking toil and malnutrition carried thousands of Africans to their grave. Villages were deprived of their chief labour force for long periods of time, and were brought to ruin.

The use of forced labour was particularly widespread in railway and highway construction.

Germany had built over 1,600 kilometres, while Britain had built approximately 1,000 kilometres of railways before World War I. Besides, thousands of kilometres of highways were laid to make regions engaged in the production of export crops accessible. These were the roads along which the agricultural and mineral resources of East Africa poured out of the country.

East Africa had begun to provide the capitalist countries with valuable raw materials long before the First World War.

Thus, the production of sisal in German East Africa was begun in 1892. By 1912, 7.5 million marks' worth of sisal had been exported from the country. In the same year 2 million marks' worth of coffee, 2.1 million marks' worth of cotton and 8.4 million marks' worth of rubber were exported to Germany.

Uganda, meanwhile, was becoming a major cotton-growing country. In 1905 it had produced only 54 bales of cotton, but by 1915 the figure stood at 32,500 bales. The European capitalists began building cotton gins, the first of which was put into operation in 1906. By 1918 there were 42 such factories in operation.

Thus, the foundation was laid for the vilest plunder of natural wealth and the most brutal exploitation of the people of East Africa long before the First World War. The policy of the imperialists was to take and give nothing in return.

Neither the British nor the German imperialists had spent a single farthing for the educational needs of the African population prior to the First World War.

Education, as such, was placed in the hands of the missionaries, while the missionary schools were entirely dependent upon charity. Instruction was limited to Bible study. The missionaries were not interested in giving the Africans an education that would equip them with a knowledge of natural and social development. They regarded their mission in Africa to be the conversion of the Africans to Christianity and the training of a small segment of the native population for jobs that required minimal knowledge. The missionary schools turned out junior clerks and interpreters who were given the lowest jobs in the colonial administration.

There were no medical centres in any of the German or British possessions. The Africans were deprived of elementary medical aid. Disease-prevention centres were unheard-of. Between 1896 and 1906 over 200,000 Africans died of sleeping-sickness in Uganda. Moreover, Europeans had also introduced venereal disease, tuberculosis, etc., formerly unheard-of in East Africa. The high mortality rate greatly reduced the population of East Africa.

Such was the "civilisation" the imperialists brought to East Africa.

The first steps of the anti-colonial movement

The peoples of East Africa never became reconciled to foreign rule. The plunder of their lands, forced labour, taxes and political and national oppression were factors that stirred them to an active struggle against the imperialists.

In 1905 a peasant uprising broke out in German East Africa following a rise in taxes and a currency reform which depreciated the money then in circulation. The uprising, known as the Maji-Maji Rebellion, was of a religious nature as well. Abdulla Mpanda, one of the leaders, and his followers claimed that water taken from a certain holy spring could rob the German weapons of their power; if it was mixed with corn and sorghum, it would even turn the German bullets to water.

The uprising broke out in August 1905 at one of the forced labour cotton plantations in Kibata and spread like wild fire to the central and southern German possessions. The insurgents destroyed several military garrisons, they took over the plantations of the German colonists and drove out the officials and missionaries.

The colonial authorities lost control over a greater part of the country. The Governor's appeal to Germany for aid brought two cruisers and a fully-armed punitive detachment to Dar es Salaam. Despite their inferior arms and a lack of support from the population of the northern and western

parts of the country, the insurgents fought valiantly for nearly two years.

The Germans resorted to fire, burning entire villages, crops and cattle. The casualties numbered no less than 120,000 Africans. Several tribes were wiped out entirely, women and children were never spared in these massacres.

The peasants of Buganda (Uganda) resented being deprived of their community lands by the colonialists, who turned these lands over to the feudal lords. The Uganda Agreement of 1900 deprived the peasants of Buganda of their inherent rights to the land and made them tenants on this land instead. Though this resentment had not yet evolved into an organised uprising before the First World War, the British imperialists, like the German imperialists, were very uneasy. Not a year passed without rebellion in some part of the country. The King's African Rifles, which were established in the British colonies to suppress anti-colonial movements, were constantly on the march to hold down the peoples of Uganda, the British East Africa Protectorate, the Sudan, etc.

World War I

East Africa became an arena of fierce struggle during the First World War. Both the British and the German imperialists forced the Africans to take sides in the interests of the foreign monopolies. Tens of thousands of Africans from German East Africa, the British East Africa Protectorate

and Uganda were mobilised and served in the armies and labour detachments. Several thousand Africans gave their lives defending the interests of the German and British financial and industrial magnates.

The population of German East Africa suffered greatly from the military operations carried out on its territory. On investigating the country, the Ormsby-Gore Commission of 1924 concluded that not a single region of Africa had suffered from the devastation of the Great War as Tanganyika had. Incessant battles were waged over the greater part of the country for four years. Casualties, particularly among the native population, and property losses were very great.

The Africans suffered even greater oppression and exploitation during the war years than before. In the British East Africa Protectorate, for example, the colonial authorities instigated a series of measures known among the Africans as "the vile labour laws". In 1915 a decree was issued making registration obligatory for all Africans over sixteen years of age. Its aim was to impose higher taxes on the population. The decree of 1916 introduced the so-called "squatter system", according to which a European planter or farmer allotted a plot of land to an African living outside the reservation, for which the latter had to work for him without receiving wages from 180 to 240 days a year. In this way the colonists were provided with a permanent and gratuitous labour force.

The war consolidated the position of British imperialism in East Africa. In 1919 the Versailles Peace Conference passed a decree giving German East Africa to Britain. In 1922 the British imperialists received a League of Nations Mandate for control of the former German colonies, thereafter known as Tanganyika. At last, Britain's cherished dream of having a chain of colonies from Cairo to Capetown had come true.

II. THE NATIONAL-LIBERATION MOVEMENT BETWEEN THE TWO WORLD WARS

Intensification of economic exploitation

The foundation for "developing" East Africa was laid long before World War I. In the post-war years the imperialists embarked upon an intensified system of economic exploitation. Their policy and methods did not change. Railways and highways went deeper and deeper into the continent. Foreign capital was pouring in to exploit new areas and new groups of the African population. In 1928 the Uganda Railway reached Jinja and in 1931 it reached Kampala. A network of highways connected the major railway depots with the chief producers of cotton, coffee, sisal and pyrethrum, draining valuable raw materials and food products from the country through Mombasa, Dar es Salaam and Tanga to the markets of Europe and the British Empire.

East Africa was fast becoming a huge plantation of export crops.

The areas under cotton in Uganda increased from 140,000 to 1,270,000 acres between 1914 and

1939, comprising a 9-fold increase. As a cotton-growing country, Uganda now ranked second among the British colonies. Coffee was introduced into the economy of the Protectorate after World War I, and by 1939 there were 55,000 acres of coffee plantations. The situation was the same in Tanganyika, where the production of sisal had increased 4 to 5 times, coffee 17 times, peanuts 9 times and cotton production had doubled between 1913 and 1938. In Kenya the area under sisal increased from 37,000 acres in 1922 to 92,000 acres in 1928 and that under coffee from 43,300 acres in 1922 to 80,000 acres in 1929.

The interests of monopoly capital in the home country steered the economic life of the East African colonies. Export crops were the chief product of their economy, which, in turn, was entirely dependent upon the fluctuations of the world market. This made it highly unstable, under constant threat of a price slump. After World War I the economy of East Africa was shaken by two severe economic crises.

In 1920 and 1921 the post-war boom gave way to a disastrous slump in prices on export crops. The colonial authorities used every means to protect the European settlers and proprietors and decided to shift the burden of the crisis on to the shoulders of the Africans. The population of Kenya was especially hard-hit.

The authorities prohibited the African population from cultivating such export crops as coffee and sisal, in particular. This was done to protect

the European planters and farmers from any competition on the part of the African peasants. The forced labour "rent" of squatters was increased to 240 days a year.

According to the 1919 "Instructions" all provincial and district commissioners and local African chiefs subordinate to them were obligated to "encourage" in every way the native population to work on the plantations and farms and in the enterprises of the Europeans.

In 1920 the *kipande* (employment card) was issued to all Africans. It had the person's fingerprints on it and was kept by his employer until the term of his contract expired. It was impossible for an African to find a job without producing his *kipande*. If an African worker left his place of work he was captured, sentenced to jail and, after serving his sentence, was returned to his former master.

A 1920 decree allowed local authorities to recruit low-paid labour for a term of up to 60 days. This decree legalised a camouflaged form of slavery in Kenya.

As a result of these measures, the number of African plantation workers soared from 12,000 in 1912 to 90,000 in 1920, and to 185,500 in 1927. Thirty-four per cent of the male population worked away from their villages. In the Kikuyu and Nandi Reservations this figure reached 75 per cent. Peasant households were soon brought to ruin, which was in the interests of the European colonists.

These anti-African laws adopted in Kenya were crowned by a decision of the Kenya Colonists Association of 1921 which cut all wages by one-third.

In Tanganyika, the Labour Decree of 1924 labelled an unwarranted departure from work a criminal offence. The deserter was sentenced to a whipping, followed by a fine of 100 shillings or imprisonment of six months. In 1927 the number of Africans working on Tanganyika plantations reached 180,000 as compared to 92,000 in 1913.

Unlike Kenya and Tanganyika, where the Africans were forbidden to grow coffee in 1926, African peasants were the chief suppliers of export crops in Uganda. However, they were only allowed to grow the crops. The procedures for buying, processing and marketing cotton, coffee and tobacco were set forth in special decrees passed in 1926 and 1930. According to these decrees, the peasants had to sell their crops within a fixed period of time, in definite zones and at a previously set price, which was five or six times below that of the world market. Besides, cotton and coffee export taxes were introduced in 1919, thus depriving the peasants of from 25 to 30 per cent of their incomes. In 1920 the luvalo system was introduced in Uganda, forcing every adult African to work without wages for a period of 30 days a year on road construction. Landowners or paid labourers could escape this duty by paying a tax of 10 shillings.

However, the European planters and proprietors of Uganda demanded that the colonial administration also provide them with cheap labour. This problem was solved in two ways. First, a ban was put on the production of export crops in all the northern areas of the Protectorate, turning them into a stable source of labour power. Secondly, the immigration of workers from Ruanda-Urundi, Tanganyika and Kenya was encouraged in every way. In 1925 Uganda had 17,000 immigrant workers; by 1931 the number stood at 45,000 and reached 100,000 by 1936. They were paid half the wages of Uganda workers which kept them at a bare subsistence standard.

Taxes levelled on the native East African population were increased after World War I. In 1924 taxes in Uganda reached 12-15 shillings (35 in Buganda), 12-20 shillings in Kenya and 10 shillings in Tanganyika.

Land expropriation in Kenya continued at a faster pace. In 1923 Europeans owned nearly 4 million acres of Kenya's lands; by 1928 they had taken possession of over one million acres more.

Only 6 to 10 per cent of these lands were cultivated. In 1926 the colonial authorities finally issued a decree on the African Reserves, fixing their exact boundaries. This made the Africans believe that their lands were now inviolable to further European expropriation. However, these illusions were rapidly dispelled. Government Land Commissions were set up in the National Reserves and they were empowered to grant these lands to

European settlers on long-term leases. Finally, a decree of 1932 provided for the "temporary" appropriation of these lands for mining their mineral resources.

The Africans protested. The British Government responded by sending the Carter Commission to Kenya in 1934. Instead of aiding the Africans, this Commission rendered the European colonists an invaluable service. Two laws were adopted in 1938 on its recommendation, placing the Kenya Highlands in the hands of the Europeans. Thus, that part of Kenya was finally converted into "white man's territory".

One often reads in the capitalist press of the tremendous service foreign capital has rendered in "developing" East Africa. The advocates of imperialism contend that foreign capital alone made possible the construction of railways and highways, port cities and towns, industrial enterprises and social establishments, and that Africans, having been given an opportunity to produce export crops, thus learned the meaning of money and were introduced to European goods.

One cannot deny that the construction of railways and factories was objectively a progressive factor, but it should always be remembered that they were built on the bones of tens of thousands of Africans. Finally, in investing their capital, the imperialists were not interested in developing the African countries or in raising the economic, social and cultural level of the African peoples; their aims were much more prosaic and were centered

on extorting profits. This was the driving force behind their interest in "developing" the colonies. Thus, over £9,000,000 was spent on the construction of the Kenya-Uganda Railway. This sum was taken from State funds, i.e., from the British tax-payers, and private banks. Over 50 per cent of this sum was spent on orders and commissions in Britain. Hence, from the very beginning British financiers were assured of tremendous profits.

The British Government issued several loans: a £5,000,000 loan for Kenya in 1921 and a £10,000,000 loan for the whole of East Africa in 1926. The burden of these loans fell to the British tax-payer, but the profits went to British private banks.

These two examples reveal beyond doubt the parties most interested in "developing" East Africa.

True to form, neither the bankers nor the industrial companies bothered about the actual development of Africa; what they sought were profitable orders and high commissions. The activity of foreign capital in East Africa provides a still more vivid example.

The East Africa Stock Company, with a capital of £260,000, owned 350,000 acres of land. It held all the shares of the Central Company of Coffee Plantations, which had bought up 20,000 acres of fertile land in the Kenya Highlands. Viscount Cobham, who held 15,608 shares, and the Duke of Plymouth, who held 36,610 shares, were among the

largest shareholders. With expenses running below £1 per acre, the company made a profit of from £25 to 75 per acre after the coffee crop was sold on the world market.

The Ambali Plantations Company of Tanganyika had 60,000 acres of land. In 1923 its dividends stood at 10 per cent and reached 15 per cent in 1924 and 1925. In 1925 the company made a net profit of £51,000, or 42 per cent, from an original investment of £120,000. After two or three crops were in and sold, the company fully returned its original investment, and everything received after that was net profit.

The Uganda Company was concerned with the production of cotton, coffee and rubber and leather; it was engaged in brokerage and owned a series of shops. With a fixed capital of £100,000 it made an annual net profit of nearly £23,000 between 1918 and 1924. The company regularly paid 10 to 15 per cent dividends to its shareholders and issued premium shares.

Cheap African labour was the source of all these profits. For example, in 1924 wages paid out to sisal plantation workers in Tanganyika comprised only 10 per cent of the market value of the crops. Consequently, the planters' profits were ten times the wages of the workers.

Thus, the policy pursued by the British imperialists transformed the countries of East Africa into hell for the Africans and paradise for all foreign exploiters.

Political and national oppression

After World War I certain changes were made in the administrative system for the East African colonies.

The system of "direct administration" practised by the German imperialists in Tanganyika gave way to that of "indirect administration", typical of the British rule. However, though the British imperialists ruled the country on the basis of the League of Nations Mandate, the lot of the native population was hardly better than that of their compatriots in Kenya and Uganda. The colonialists exploited and oppressed the peoples of all the East African territories, without regard for the given country's status of Protectorate, Mandate Territory or Colony. All power was concentrated in the hands of the British Governors and Resident in Zanzibar. But in 1920 the governors were given "assistants", the Executive and Legislative Councils,* which were set up in Uganda, Tanganyika and Zanzibar after the example of Kenya.

An Executive Council was made up of senior colonial officers. A Legislative Council comprised both the colonial officers and foreign capitalists, white planters, farmers and manufacturers, who demanded representation.

Both Councils functioned only as consultative bodies. The colonies (Protectorates or Mandate

* In Kenya which had a larger European population these bodies were set up in 1907.

Territories) were ruled as before by Governors, who were responsible only to their respective governments. These bulwarks of imperialist rule were in existence until the peoples of East Africa finally gained their independence.

British colonial policy underwent no principal change, despite minor reforms in respect to medical care or education. The first doctors and hospitals finally appeared in East Africa, but their number was too small and the medical care they provided was chiefly for the non-African population.

There was an increase in the number of schools and pupils, but education was still in the hands of the missionaries. The teaching was extremely primitive, there were no qualified teachers. These schools and Makerere College (Uganda) founded in 1921 did not give their pupils an education in the true sense of the word. What they did was to provide educated African servants for the colonialists. Only the graduates of such a privileged school as the King's School, Budo (Uganda), which was set up for the sons of African chieftains, received adequate training and were able to continue their studies in secondary and higher schools of Britain or India.

However, a secondary or higher education did not open the door to a good job in the colonial administration or even in a local African office for an African intellectual. The colonialists preferred British or Indian specialists, while local African administration posts were held by feudal lords and tribal chiefs who had no desire to make

way for young educated Africans; they were fully backed in this respect by the colonial authorities. Nor could the young African intellectual apply his knowledge and energy in the field of national culture, for the colonialists and missionaries declared African culture to be pure savagery and did their best to destroy it, supplanting it with bourgeois culture and Western imperialist ideology, which were alien to the Africans, both in spirit and content.

The greatest "achievement" of the British "carriers of civilisation" in East Africa was the propagation of their theory of race supremacy. By making the African population feel inferior they justified their policy of racial discrimination, which gradually took hold in every aspect of African life and became the focal point of all British action.

Discrimination took on atrocious proportions in Kenya, where it became legally protected. Africans were openly proclaimed to be "third-class citizens" (immigrants from Asia were labelled "second-class citizens"). Their intellectual capacities were questioned, and this served as a useful excuse to bar Africans from important jobs and representative bodies.

Africans were forbidden to grow export crops in Kenya. Coffee or sisal were claimed to lose their value if grown by Africans. The colonists chose to "forget" that the very same crops, grown by Africans in Tanganyika and Uganda, were highly valued on the world market.

The same discrimination governed trade and industry. In order to protect the British businessman from his dangerous African competitors, the colonial authorities forbade the Africans to take part in foreign trade and in wholesale home trade, to process or market export crops; they were also refused financial aid.

But the barbarous policy of segregation knew no equal. Human conscience can never be reconciled to a system which prohibits Africans from settling next to Europeans or Indians, from using the same car or bus, or the same entrance to a shop, etc. In Kenya "Whites only" notices were hung out in all public places and vehicles.

In Tanganyika and Uganda discrimination was not sanctioned by law. This was due to the fact that these countries had an insignificant European population and there was no need to safeguard their privileges. Nevertheless, racial discrimination was the accepted rule in public offices, the administration and the economy.

At first discrimination, introduced and perpetrated by the imperialists, evoked the spontaneous resentment of the African peoples. Gradually, it assumed an organised form.

The first political organisations of the African peoples

As the imperialists plundered and exploited East Africa, they were unconsciously creating their own grave-diggers.

Foreign planters and manufacturers were in need of cheap labour. This created the first East African workers.

The colonial administration required a large staff of junior clerks. This created the first cadres of African intellectuals.

The introduction of export crops, the development of trade and the expansion of the home market gave rise to the African bourgeoisie.

These groups were violently opposed to the imperialists. As the new social forces gained in numbers and strength, as their national and political consciousness evolved, these contradictions became more acute. These new forces were the pioneers in the anti-imperialist movement in the East African countries. The young African intellectuals headed their people's struggle.

The October Revolution of 1917 in Russia ushered in a new epoch in the history of mankind and provided powerful impetus to the national-liberation movements of the world. The wave of revolutionary uprisings that swept Europe and the national-liberation movements that took Asia by storm did not by-pass the African Continent. Progressive Africans were fired with the idea of national revolution and scientific socialism. The first African political organisations emerged in Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika.

Colonialist literature states that the national-liberation movement in East Africa did not begin until after the Second World War. The period between the two world wars is usually depicted as

"a time of concord" between the ruling powers and the "grateful" populace, as a time of mutual trust and harmony.

In reality, the whole history of colonialism is one of the peoples' continuous struggle against oppression. The growing national resentment that gained momentum prior to World War I and was expressed in local uprisings, developed in the interim between the two wars into an organised anti-colonial movement which drew up its first liberation programme and searched for a most effective tactical weapon. The victory of the Soviet people and of the other freedom-loving nations over German fascism and Japanese militarism brought on the storm that destroyed the hateful system of colonial slavery.

In East Africa the national-liberation movement was centered in Kenya. This was only natural, since imperialism gave vent to its most brutal patterns of exploitation in this colony.

As the First World War came to a close, the Kenya tribes, and the Kikuyu and Kavirondo, in particular, began to show open resentment to land eviction, forced labour and the all but impossible conditions of employment and low wages.

In 1920 the Kikuyu set up their first organisation, the Kikuyu Association, which was composed of chiefs moderate in their views and loyal to the Colonial Government. This organisation was more of a shock-absorber mitigating the acute criticism waged against the imperialists than a champion of Kikuyu interests.

Thus it proved incapable of leading the Africans against their imperialist rulers and was never popular with the masses.

In 1921 a group of African intellectuals established the Young Kikuyu Association headed by Harry Thuku, a post-office clerk. Its members refused to co-operate with the previous association and considered its chiefs to be colonial agents. The African people learned of the organisation at a mass meeting in Nairobi, called to protest against an intended one-third wage-cut. Members of the Association drew up a list of demands and despatched it to the colonial authorities. A telegram of the same content was simultaneously sent by Thuku to the British Government.

The Association decided to extend its activities beyond the Kikuyu tribe. It established local branches and started a campaign against land expropriation. Harry Thuku was a frequent speaker at meetings in Kavirondo District and in other localities.

The activities of the Association were of great concern to the authorities and the European colonists. In March 1922 Thuku was arrested. A political demonstration, the first of its kind in East Africa, followed. The demonstrators gathered in front of Nairobi Prison and demanded the liberation of the President of the Association. The colonial authorities responded by shooting down the unarmed, unsuspecting demonstrators. Many Africans were killed and over a hundred were wounded.

The authorities retaliated by banning all mass meetings and all political organisations; there were mass arrests; they forced the chiefs to expose all supporters of the Association and hand them over to the police. Harry Thuku and two of his relatives were deported, without trial, to a remote part of Kenya.

The repressions against the Young Kikuyu Association did not intimidate the patriotic forces inside Kenya. They were determined to carry on the struggle against the imperialists. Jomo Kenyatta, the future head of the Kenya Government, recalled: "The idea of union had taken hold of the people's imagination. . . ."

Soon after Thuku's arrest the members of the Young Kikuyu Association joined the ranks of a new organisation, the Kikuyu Central Association, headed by Joseph Kangethe, Jesse Kariuki and Jomo Kenyatta. Its aim was to put an end to land appropriation, to give Africans political rights and representation in the Legislative Council, to have elected chiefs and local administration bodies, to provide equal rights for African workers and employees, etc. In its petition to the Colonial administration in 1925 the Kikuyu Central Association demanded that Africans be allowed to raise coffee crops, that Kenya laws be published in the Kikuyu language and that Harry Thuku be set free.

The Association, composed of young, energetic African intellectuals, soon gained great influence in the masses. Its members used traditional holi-

days for campaigning among the people. *Mwigwithania* (The Conciliator), a journal edited by Jomo Kenyatta, played an important part in uniting and politically educating the masses.

The colonialists realised that the Association was a serious threat to their rule. In October 1929, speaking to the Legislative Council, the Governor of Kenya warned the "agitators" that they would be punished for undermining the "constitutional authorities"; in December of that year the colonial authorities banned mass performances of traditional songs and dances, the motive for this being that holidays created a favourable atmosphere for subversive activities.

The petitions and declarations of the Association were disregarded by the authorities. The leaders then sought support abroad. They sent Jomo Kenyatta, their Secretary-General, to Britain, where he carried on intensive work in the interests of the African population of Kenya.

Harry Thuku was set free in 1930 as a result of pressure from the African peoples and public opinion in Britain. In 1932 he was elected President of the Association. However, the years of exile had made Thuku more moderate in his views. This was one of the causes that eventually led to a split in the Association. Thuku left it to create his own organisation.

Every attempt on the part of the Kikuyu Central Association to collaborate with the other Kenyan organisations was unsuccessful. Local interests still

had the upper hand over the national task of challenging imperialism.

The Young Buganda Association, which was the first political organisation in Uganda, was founded in 1918 by a group of young African intellectuals. Its chief goal was to achieve a democratic reform of the Lukiko, the local Buganda Council. In 1921 most of its members joined the Bataka Association, which was pledged to return the communal lands that were expropriated from the Buganda peasants in 1900 and given to the feudal lords. Having acquired a leader in the Association, the peasants, in turn, became more active. The colonial authorities became frightened at the prospect of social outbreaks, and forced the Buganda feudal lords to curtail their exploitation of the peasantry. The Busulu and Nvuju Law of 1927 legalised the right of a peasant to inherit tenancy and reduced the feudal rent.

The establishment of mass peasants' and workers' organisations was a sign of the growing anti-imperialist movement in Tanganyika. In 1929 a marketing co-operative was set up to protect the peasants from being swindled by the foreign export-crop buyers. In 1939 the Kilimanjaro Co-operative Union consisted of 27 co-operative societies with 25,700 members.

In the early thirties the African workers made an attempt to establish a trade union. In January 1933, 12,000 miners of the Lupa gold mines waged a week-long strike for higher wages and better working and living conditions. They

resumed work only after the police were brought to the scene. Now the colonial authorities banned all trade unions and strikes. But this did not stop the working masses. The 1939 strike at the Tanga docks was suppressed by gunfire.

Many political and social outbreaks began as religious protests. The Malakite movement spread throughout Uganda in 1921. This heretical sect, established in 1913, was named for its founder, Malaki Musa Jakawa. By 1921 it had 90,000 followers. The movement was against the Christian Church and the colonial authorities. After Malaki's arrest and exile (he died in 1929) the activities of the Malakite sect diminished, although in 1934 it still numbered 50,000 supporters.

In Kenya the protest against the Christian Church and the missionaries who wholeheartedly supported the imperialists also materialised as heretical sects. The Watu wa Mungu (People of God) sect, which was founded in 1931, repudiated everything of European origin. The sects were anti-colonial in character and served to undermine imperialist rule in East Africa.

Between the two wars a popular movement was launched in East Africa, embracing all of its territories and all the various groups of the African population. The British Government fully supported the imperialist plan of creating a racial state patterned after South Africa in Kenya. This plan, put forward in 1921 by the ruling colonialist clique, was blocked by the unprecedented

resistance of the African people, who united their forces in this struggle.

The Ormsby-Gore Commission of 1925 drew up a draft for uniting Kenya, Tanganyika and Uganda in a political federation. As a first step it proposed to create the East African Governors' Conference as an authoritative body for implementing this plan. This body was established in 1927.

However, this first racist plan for Kenya met with such resistance on the part of the African population that the British Government was forced to retreat and temporarily abandon its dream of a Federation. According to the Hilton Young Commission, a new attempt to revive this plan in 1930 once more ended in failure.

In resisting the Federation plan, Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika united their forces in the struggle against British imperialism.

Thus the foundation was laid for the powerful anti-imperialist movement of the East African peoples that gained momentum after World War II, becoming organised and headed by national, political and class organisations which had programmes of action that reflected the interests of all progressive groups of Africa.

At that time, however, the political and national consciousness of the masses had not really been awakened. The political organisations were still in the making; tribal interests still overshadowed national interests. The political organisations still had faith in petitions, declarations and Royal Com-

missions. They had not yet come out against the colonial regime as such, they were still fighting against its various aspects.

However, despite its serious shortcomings, the national-liberation movement was beginning to undermine colonialism in East Africa.

III. THE NATIONAL-LIBERATION MOVEMENT IN THE POST-WAR PERIOD

East Africa during the Second World War

During World War II British propaganda claimed that the war against the fascist powers was being waged to liberate the oppressed nations and to ensure their right to self-determination. The Atlantic Charter, signed in 1941 by Britain and the U.S.A., acknowledged the right of all nations to self-government and independence. The imperialists needed this Charter to secure the support of the colonial peoples for the duration of the war; they had no intention of keeping their promise.

During the war years the British Government made full use of the raw materials and agricultural products of the East African colonies. It was hesitant about recruiting Africans into the army, for fear that the arms they received would later be used against the British colonists and colonial rule. The majority of Africans serving in the Armed Forces were in the Auxiliary Corps or labour units. They built roads and air-fields and did other jobs of military significance. Units of the predominantly East African Auxiliary Pioneer Corps were assigned to the 8th Army in North

Africa, where they were on the service staffs of the military bases, built roads and unloaded ships in Tobruk. They were similarly employed wherever they served.

However, the manpower shortage eventually forced the British Government to form African fighting units, which played an important part in the battles in East Africa, Ethiopia, Madagascar and Burma.

After Italy entered the war, troops from East, West and Central Africa were drawn to Kenya. African troops played a decisive role in the battle for East Africa in 1940-1941. On February 14, 1941 the 11th and 12th African Divisions liberated Kismayu. On February 25 they entered Mogadishu, and continued on to Ethiopia. On March 26 the African Divisions gained hold of Harar, and on April 6 they liberated Addis Ababa, capital of Ethiopia.

After the final liberation of Ethiopia, the 21st East African Brigade was transferred to Ceylon, while the 22nd Brigade went on to liberate Madagascar.

During 1944-1945 the East African units took an active part in military operations in Burma. Newly-formed units—the 25th, 26th and 28th Brigades, made up of batallions from Kenya, Tanganyika and Uganda—joined the other East African brigades in Burma. There were 374,000 African soldiers serving in regular and auxiliary formations of the British Army by May 1945. Of this number, 228,000 (60 per cent) were East Africans.

According to the British War Office, the number of losses among African troops from the onset of war to October 1945 was 11,938 men.

African soldiers fighting in the ranks of the British Army like all the soldiers of the Allied Forces had great respect for the Soviet Armed Forces, which were carrying the burden of the fight against fascism and whose contribution had been decisive in liberating the peoples from Nazi oppression. The African soldiers shed their blood in the struggle against the common enemy and hoped that the end of the war would also bring an end to the disgraceful colonial system. As they returned to Africa, many were eager to fight for the liberation and independence of their peoples, to put an end to colonialism.

Socio-economic changes

The Second World War brought certain socio-economic changes to the countries of East Africa. During the war trade was virtually suspended between Britain and her colonies, resulting in a slump in the import of industrial goods and produce. This, in turn, stimulated the growth of certain branches of industry in Africa. New soap works, saw mills, meat-packing plants and vegetable processing factories were built to supply the needs of the Army and the population. Canned meat production in East Africa rose 7 times and timber 4 times by 1942.

The mining industry was hard-hit by the man-

power shortage, and the British Government stressed the importance of raising the output of such strategic materials as diamonds and wolfram. Tanganyika increased its export of diamonds from 6,000 carats to 115,200 carats between 1940 and 1945. Wolfram was first mined in Uganda during the war. Special measures were taken to increase Tanganyika's output of mica. From 1942 to 1945 all mica produced in East Africa was purchased by the British Ministry of Supply. Britain used every means to stimulate agriculture and the production of strategic raw materials; during this time sisal, rubber and pyrethrum production also rose.

In the post-war years the role of the African colonies in the capitalist economy increased further. The emergence of a number of socialist states in East Europe and Asia and the disintegration of the colonial system in Asia narrowed the sphere of imperialist exploitation and concentrated imperialism's efforts on Africa. Cotton crops in Tanganyika increased 232 per cent between 1947 and 1956, while diamond production increased 289 per cent; the coffee output of Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika increased from 61,000 tons in 1948 to 105,000 tons in 1957. Despite their economic growth, East African colonies remained, as before, no more than suppliers of cheap raw materials for the home country.

However, certain changes took place in the social structure of African society. Improved living conditions resulted in a new outlook, and in the decision to end the hateful colonial rule once and

for all. As a rule, the African intellectuals who had come from the masses and had a common destiny with them were the harbingers of revolutionary ideas. The intellectuals who served their people loyally did much to rally the masses for the struggle against imperialist rule. There were also some who betrayed their people and served the imperialists.

The demobilised African soldiers played an important part in firing the national-liberation movement. The working class, which had set up its first trade unions during the war, was now an active revolutionary force in the anti-colonial struggle. Seasonal workers made up the great majority of the African working class. After working on a plantation or in a factory, a migrant worker returned to his native village as an active agitator against the colonial regime. The union of workers and peasants formed the nucleus of the broad national-liberation front.

The bourgeois elements also played an active part in the national-liberation movement. Economically, the national bourgeoisie was extremely weak. Foreign monopolies were in full control of industry and foreign trade. The imperialists gave some representatives of the African bourgeoisie a chance to make a small profit in agriculture, the crafts and small-scale home trade. Nevertheless, the African small-property owner was not much better off than the masses under the colonial regime. This made him an active participant in the national-liberation movement. Political parties

that had sprung up in Africa after the war were usually led by African intellectuals or by members of the petty bourgeoisie.

National political parties

There were local and tribal political organisations in East Africa before the Second World War, but the first steps towards creating national political parties were taken during and after the war. In 1940 the United Council was founded in Kenya, uniting the Kikuyu Central Association, the Ukamba Members Association and the Teita Hills Association. This organisation aimed at uniting the peoples of Kenya in their struggle against colonialism. However, its activities were cut short by the British authorities, who arrested 23 members of the Council. Even the Kikuyu Central Association, the most popular organisation in Kenya, was banned. Thousands of its members were deported to forced-labour camps.

There were local organisations in Tanganyika and Uganda as well, but there, too, every attempt to create a national political party was blocked by the authorities. The first national political party was only founded in 1944. This was the Kenya Africans' Association, known as the Kenya African Union after 1946. Jomo Kenyatta was the leader of this party.

The Kenya African Union united workers, peasants, office workers and intellectuals. The Party's goal was to give land to those peasants who had

little or no land, to extend the political rights of the local population and increase African representation in the Legislative Council, to abolish racial discrimination, obtain freedom of activity for the trade unions and develop an educational system.

Bataka, the first national political party of Uganda, was founded in 1946. It fought for the political rights of the Africans, opposed the planned East Africa Federation and demanded independence for Uganda. In a letter dated April 20, 1949 and addressed to the Governor of Uganda, Semakula Mulumba, leader of the Bataka Party, wrote that the people of Uganda rejected the one-sided Anglo-Uganda Agreements that the British had concluded in 1900 with the then illiterate Africans and that the people demanded a democratic African Government.

In 1949 the Bataka Party was outlawed. Three years later, in 1952, a new national party, the Uganda National Congress (U.N.C.), was founded.

In Tanganyika the national-liberation movement was headed by the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU), founded in 1954.

The first steps of the working-class movement

The trade unions played an active part in the anti-imperialist struggle. In East Africa the trade union movement became a mass movement only after the Second World War, though the African Motor Drivers Association (Uganda) was an active

organisation in 1939. The war years gave rise to the railway workers' unions in Kenya and Tanganyika. In 1944 an African office workers' union was founded in Kenya.

The struggle of the working class for the improvement of its economic position was closely linked with its struggle against colonialism. Thus, the class struggle of the East African proletariat was an integral part of its struggle against the colonial regime and for the freedom and independence of its country. The working class resorted to strikes as a means of achieving its goal. The Mombasa dockers' strike for better living conditions was one of the biggest during the war. The members of the Kikuyu Central Association were the strike leaders. The commission that investigated the strike agreed that the workers' demands were just and recommended that their living conditions be improved.

There were several railway strikes in Kenya in the mid-forties. They were caused by extremely low wages which had remained stable during the war, although the cost of living had soared.

In October 1942 the Mombasa railway workers went on a three-day strike, demanding a basic pay rise and a cost-of-living increase. These demands were partially satisfied by arbitration. This victory had direct bearing on the improvement of railway workers' living conditions in other parts of Kenya. The Nairobi Court of Arbitration was compelled to accept the railway workers' demands for wage increases.

Two dockers' strikes in Dar es Salaam and Lindi (Tanganyika) in 1943 played an important part in the general strike movement. The dockers of Dar es Salaam began their well-organised 12-day strike on August 23rd. All work came to a standstill. The situation grew tense, and the colonial authorities stepped in. The Court of Arbitration, under the Supreme Justice of Tanganyika, investigated the strike and found it to have been caused by extremely poor living conditions. The workers demanded a pay rise, a cost-of-living increase, an end to unjust pay cuts, the right to medical services, and severance pay. The Court of Arbitration had to admit that these demands were just. The strike ended in the workers' victory.

The Lindi strike was similar in every respect, and here, too, the basic demands of the workers were met.

The Uganda general strike of 1945

When the allied victory was close at hand, the people of Uganda first attempted to exercise their right to independence. The strike movement had become widespread in Uganda during the war. In 1943 the Department of Labour had investigated 184 grievances. The general strike of Janury 1945 turned into an armed uprising. The underlying reasons for the general strike were not only extremely low wages, but, more important, the crisis of colonialism, hastened by the war.

Despite the sharp raise in the cost of living, the

employers refused to increase wages. The employees of the Social Works Department went on strike on January 5, 1945. They were the first to begin the fight for a wage increase.

Three days later they were joined by the Entebbe workers. On January 10th the strike spread to Kampala and its environs, and from January 17th to 20th the workers of Kioga, Jinja, Mbale, Iganga, Lugazi, Mubende and Mbarara went on strike.

Their demands were: wage increases, the dismissal of Serwano Kulubya, Treasurer of the Buganda Government, hated for his subservience to the colonialists, an increase of African representation in the Lukiko. These demands proved that the general strike had exceeded the scope of all other East African strikes and had become a true political demonstration.

The general strike evoked the warmest sympathy and support of the peasants, artisans and intellectuals.

The colonial authorities were alarmed by the Uganda events. Faced with the task of suppressing the general strike, they called in armed troops of Europeans and Indians. Regular army units were transferred to Kampala, where the strike movement had become particularly widespread. On January 17th there was a clash between the Africans and the troops. As a result, there were 4 killed and 10 wounded. The troops were then dispatched to Masaka. Here, too, African blood flowed. In many other parts of the country the uprising was suppressed by armed force. It is difficult to name the exact figure for all the victims of the British colonialists. The report of the Secretary of State for the Colonies in the House of Commons set this figure at 8 killed during the "disorder" and 15 wounded. In reality, the number of casualties was much greater. The Governor of Uganda's report set the figures at 8 and 12 respectively for Kioga alone. Arms were also used against the strikers in many other districts. By January 24, 1945 the Uganda uprising had been suppressed, although individual strikes continued in Toro into February. The suppression of the general strike was followed by mass repressions. In Kampala, for example, 319 persons were arrested. Several chiefs who sympathised with the national-liberation movement were also subjected to repressions.

The bloody events in Uganda showed the whole world that, contrary to their solemn declarations that all nations had the right to self-determination, the British imperialists had no intention of satisfying the just demands of the colonial peoples. They realised they would not be able to retain power by repressions and so were ready to make some minor concessions. None of these reforms, however, changed the essence of the colonial regime. The Legislative Council reform of 1945 brought the first three Africans to the legislature. Obviously, this in no way affected the dominant position of the British in this body.

The general strike of 1945 had a tremendous impact on the national-liberation movements of

the other East African countries. The people of Uganda consider the 1945 strike to be the beginning of their national revolution.

The numerous strikes during World War II indicate that the East African working class had become an important social force in the struggle against colonialism, for freedom and independence.

Changes in the international situation after World War II

The defeat of German fascism and Japanese militarism consolidated the democratic forces of the world. Of greatest significance in the post-war period was the emergence of the socialist states in Europe and Asia. Together with the USSR, they formed the mighty socialist camp. The formation of a world socialist system was a historic event. From then on the national-liberation movements in the colonies had the moral and material support of the great socialist community which stretched from the banks of the Elbe to the South China Sea and numbered 900,000,000 people in all. The imperialist powers could no longer use force in suppressing the anti-colonial movement as they had in the past.

The struggle to abolish the colonial regime and give the colonies independence had the sympathy and support of the international communist and working-class movement. The Communist Parties in the capitalist countries gained strength in the post-war years, and began to mobilise the working class and all working people to support the just demands of the colonial peoples, thus rendering considerable aid to the liberation movement.

The enslaved peoples of Africa were inspired by the successful struggle of the Asian peoples who had achieved their independence soon after the war. The establishment of Afro-Asian solidarity strengthened the peoples' hand in their fight for freedom. The victory of the October Revolution in Russia was the spark that set off the crisis of the entire colonial system. The upsurge of the national-liberation movement after the Second World War brought this system to its final collapse. This holds true for the remnants of the system that remained in East Africa.

The anti-imperialist uprising in Uganda in 1949

The 1945 general strike in Uganda was only the beginning of the peoples' struggle for independence. After the war, the national-liberation movement spread rapidly throughout the country. During April and May 1949 a series of demonstrations swept the country. The African people demanded a democratic Legislative Council and Lukiko, the establishment of fair prices for agricultural products and a wage increase.

These demands were set forth in a petition to the Kabaka of Buganda on April 25, 1949. As news of the Kabaka's refusal spread, the people began

to express their dissatisfaction openly. On April 26 there was a bloody clash between the people and the police in front of the Kabaka's palace. From Kampala the movement spread to other towns. A general uprising swept the country. In many places the people attacked the local administration offices and prisons. They set the prisoners free, established control posts along the highways, confiscated all vehicles and wrecked telegraph and telephone lines. By April 27th they had gained full control of Kampala and its environs.

The colonial authorities declared a state of emergency in Buganda and the Eastern Province. The Bataka Party and the African Farmers' Union, the leaders of the movement, were outlawed and their property was seized. A terroristic police regime was established in the country. Official statistics set the number of arrests during the uprising at 1,700. Regular troops were sent from Kenya to reinforce the local police. By the middle of May colonial "order" and control were once again established in Uganda.

It is noteworthy that the British working class expressed its solidarity with the people of Uganda and against British imperialism. The communist *Daily Worker* and the Left-wing Labour press published materials exposing the brutalities of the British in Uganda and demanding an immediate end to the reign of terror.

Representatives of the Bataka Party sought to focus world public opinion on the Uganda events through the United Nations. Semakula Mulumba,

leader of the Bataka Party, sent a Memorandum on the situation in Uganda to the United Nations through the Soviet delegation. However, Britain and its supporters refused to discuss it.

The main reason for the defeat of the 1949 uprising was the absence of an organised body capable of leading the movement, which was in many respects spontaneous. The Bataka Party had not yet become a mass organisation, it had no programme for achieving national independence. As in 1945, the 1949 uprising centered in Buganda and did not spread to the other provinces. It must also be noted that the Uganda uprising did not receive the support of the other African countries, for at the time the national-liberation movement had not yet spread to many parts of the Continent. All these factors favoured the colonialists, who suppressed the uprising without difficulty. However, in spite of its failure, the 1949 uprising was a school for the revolutionary education of the masses, it brought new groups of the population into the national-liberation movement.

The anti-imperialist uprising in Kenya (1952-1956)

The struggle against the British rule gained force in Kenya, led by the Kenya African Union which carried on its educational work among the population. In October 1951 the Party organised a mass meeting in Nairobi, attended by 30,000 persons; in July 1952, 30,000 peasants from different parts

of the country rallied at a mass meeting in Githunguri.

The colonialists were worried by the growing national-liberation movement and devised plans to suppress it. In their search for something that would serve as a pretext and give them an opportunity to arrest the most active participants of the anti-colonial movement and the KAU, they fabricated a charge and invented the existence of a secret terrorist organisation called the Mau Mau, which, they claimed, intended to massacre every European in Kenya.

Indeed, there were a number of small secret organisations in Kenya, but nothing was known of an organisation of that name prior to 1952. African experts claim that the word Mau Mau is utterly meaningless. The British were confronted with a grave threat to their rule, not in the secret sects whose influence among the population was negligible, but in the KAU, a mass legal organisation which was the driving force of the national-liberation movement in Kenya. The colonialists needed the Mau Mau story to justify their terrorist regime and their reprisals against the more active participants of the national-liberation movement.

As to the stories of mass murders and attacks by the Mau Mau, they are completely disqualified by the following simple fact: only one European was killed in Kenya from April 1952 to the introduction of the state of emergency in October of the same year. This death could just as

well have occurred during any other period of time.

A campaign was started to spread the story of the alleged Mau Mau's terrorist activities which served as the necessary pretext for declaring a state of emergency in Kenya in October 1952. The authorities began a series of mass arrests of KAU members who were accused of belonging to the Mau Mau. Jomo Kenyatta, leader of the national-liberation movement, was arrested and imprisoned, charged with being the head of the Mau Mau organisation. Six years later, in November 1958, Macharia, the chief witness for the prosecution, confessed that he had been bribed by the colonial authorities and had received money for giving false evidence against Kenyatta.

In April 1953 the KAU leaders were sentenced to long years of imprisonment, hard labour and detention in remote districts of the country. The Union itself was outlawed. A reign of terror began for the Kikuyu people, the most numerous ethnic group in the country. Under the pretext of wiping out the Mau Mau, tens of thousands of members of the national-liberation movement were thrown into prisons and concentration camps. Armed police detachments raided African villages, arrested innocent people and confiscated whatever property and cattle they had. No wonder then that the African people began to seek refuge from these atrocities in the jungles, where they banded together and formed guerrilla detachments which were then called Mau Mau. This was no longer

a mythical organisation. It became a real armed force that waged an offensive against the British rule.

This uprising was a spontaneous peasant outbreak, its goal was to drive the colonists from the country and regain land that had once belonged to the communities.

From a military point of view, the uprising was poorly organised, lacked the necessary arms and military leaders, a great drawback in confronting the well-equipped British Army.

Despite the unequal forces, the Kenya guerrillas waged a courageous four-year struggle for the freedom and independence of their country. In 1953 British troops launched a series of military operations intended to destroy the guerrilla army active in the Highlands. However, they resulted in failure. The guerrillas had the full support of the population, they were always informed beforehand of the British manoeuvres, and thus not only preserved their fighting strength, but launched successful counter-attacks.

In time the guerrillas acquired experience in waging war against a superior enemy; the isolated groups were united, their numbers increased considerably from 1953 to 1954. The "Land Freedom Armies", as they called themselves, consisted of three formations. One, headed by Dedan Kimathi, fought in the Aberdare Mountains, the second in the Kenya Mountain District and the third in Nairobi.

In 1954 the British Government sent additional

troops and planes from Britain and Rhodesia. The jungle regions that provided cover for the guerrillas were surrounded and bombed. The White terrorists hoped that hunger would force the insurgents to surrender. However, the guerrillas continued to fight courageously against the superior British forces until 1956. Some units remained in the jungles until the end of the colonial regime. On December 12, 1963, Kenya Independence Day, the guerrillas marched solemnly down the streets of Nairobi, proud and happy that the cause they served had triumphed at last.

British statistics quote the number of Africans killed in the liberation movement between 1952 and 1956 as 11,500. In reality, this figure was much higher, for no less than 30,000 people were killed in the struggle. Close to 80,000 Africans were thrown into detention camps during the time the emergency laws were in force. A brutal regime of penal servitude was established for these prisoners. The death of eleven prisoners in the Hola Detention Camp (Coastal Province) revealed these atrocious facts to the world. An investigation brought to light the terrible arbitrariness and brutality that reigned in the camp. The inquest showed that prisoners were beaten with clubs to make them work or as punishment for refusing to work. This was the accepted law of the camps. The beatings at the Hola Camp were so sadistic that eleven prisoners died from injuries on March 3, 1959.

M. G. Sullivan, the Commandant of the Hola Detention Camp, and his assistants, who were directly responsible for the murders, were either retired or given light sentences. The fact that the guilty ones were made to pay for their crime did not remove the blame from the many responsible persons who went unpunished. Gikonyo Kiano was right when, speaking at the Kenya Legislative Council, he said that not only Cowan, Sullivan and Coutts were responsible for the deaths, but that everyone from the jail guards to the Governor was also responsible. An article in the May 10, 1959 *Observer* states that "the killing of eleven prisoners at the Hola Detention Camp in Kenya is one of the worst episodes in the long history of British administration in Africa, ... the blot of Hola can never be entirely erased."

The collapse of the imperialist plan for creating an East African Federation

In the post-war years, having as its objective the consolidation of British imperialism in Central and East Africa, the British Government revived its plan for uniting its colonies. Economically, the unification was to create more favourable conditions for exploiting the natural resources, while political unity would strengthen the position of British imperialism.

The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was formed in 1953. The formation of the East African Federation was to follow. But the flame

that flickered in Central Africa went out in East Africa, where the national-liberation movement was gaining strength. The Africans opposed this colonial plan, for they realised a Federation would consolidate the position of the Europeans in East Africa and thwart the developing independence movement.

In Uganda, the entire population resisted all plans for a Federation. The National Congress demanded independence for Uganda. Edward Frederick Mutesa II, Kabaka of Buganda, was against a scheme for uniting the East African colonies. The Buganda chiefs and the Lukiko, however, wished only to secure independence for Buganda, and not for the rest of the country, for these feudal lords were concerned with their own personal interests and cared not for the future of their people.

In November the British Government attempted to override the Kabaka's opposition to federation, but he staunchly defended the African point of view in this issue. This was why the Kabaka was finally deposed by the British Government on November 30, 1953. He was arrested and deported to London, where he remained a prisoner until 1955.

The arrogance of the colonists resulted in a new wave of resentment in Uganda and the other East African colonies. World public opinion was aroused. The national-liberation movement in Uganda gained strength. "A Declaration of the Will of the People of Uganda for Total Indepen-

dence by 1960", presented by the delegation of the Uganda National Congress on its arrival in London in May 1955, proclaimed that it was the desire of the people of Uganda to achieve independence as a sovereign national state by 1960 at the latest.

* * *

The workers were the most active force in the anti-imperialist strikes. Between 1952 and 1955 the number of strikes and strikers in Uganda rose from 8,600 strikers in 1952 to 14,700 in 1953 and 18,300 in 1955. Ten thousand sugar plantation workers of Lugazi struck in 1956. The strike was suppressed by police detachments who used guns and tear-gas on the strikers.

One form of struggle against the colonists was the mass boycott of non-African goods, which was a sharp blow to the foreign contractors.

An agreement between the Lukiko and the British Government ended the 1953-55 crisis. A number of constitutional reforms were to be put into force. The 1953-55 crisis in East Africa caused the British Government to abandon its plan for an East African Federation.

IV. DISINTEGRATION OF THE COLONIAL SYSTEM OF IMPERIALISM IN EAST AFRICA

The decisive stage in the national-liberation movement

A decisive attack was launched against the colonial system after 1955, the impetus arising from the further consolidation of the world socialist system, now a major factor in world history, and a further strengthening of the world communist and working-class movement. Imperialism was no longer able to resort to violence in suppressing national-liberation movements. The Suez crisis serves as a striking example, for Britain and France were compelled to renounce their plans of intervention in Egypt. The firm position of the USSR and the other socialist countries in declaring their readiness to uphold Egypt's just demands to nationalise the Suez Canal blocked this imperialist venture.

The success of the national-liberation movements in North and West Africa and the victories gained by the peoples of Ghana and Guinea served as inspiring examples for the peoples of East Africa.

The African peoples were joining forces against imperialism and colonialism. A series of confer-

ences of African peoples' representatives were begun in 1958. They played an important part in furthering the national-liberation movements in all the African colonies.

In 1960, on the initiative of the Soviet Government, the United Nations' General Assembly adopted its historical Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It solemnly proclaimed the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. Once the Declaration was adopted, the problem of overcoming the remnants of colonialism became a permanent item on the agendas of the UN Committees and the General Assembly. The socialist countries were strongly in favour of the immediate liquidation of all existing colonial regimes.

The African political parties increased their activities in the late fifties and began mobilising the masses for the impending struggle against colonialism and for independence. In Uganda a number of parties vied for leadership, unlike Tanganyika, where the national-liberation movement had only one leader, the Tanganyika African National Union. Zanzibar had three political parties. Prior to 1960, all national political parties were banned in Kenya by the state-of-emergence laws, but many local political organisations remained. When the state of emergency in Kenya was repealed, two rival parties came into being.

The existence of the various political parties split the united front of the national-liberation movement. The colonialists made use of this discord to postpone the date of independence.

At this time the trade union movement in East Africa, as in the other African countries, began to develop rapidly. The workers, led by the unions, took an active part in the national-liberation struggle. The East African Trades Union Congress was formed in 1949, uniting 10,000 workers. But this first trade union centre of East Africa had a short life span. It was banned in 1950 and its leaders, Fred Kubai and Makhan Singh, were arrested. After the state of emergency was proclaimed in Kenya, the trade union movement continued to develop in an atmosphere of terror and repressions, but it was not in the colonists' power to suppress it. The Kenya Federation of Labour was formed to replace the disbanded East African Congress. The K.F.L. united 44 trade unions with a total membership of 45,700. In 1955 the Tanganyika Federation of Labour was founded, and by 1959 it had 60,000 members. The trade union movement in Uganda was not revived until the fifties after the first drivers' union had been disbanded in 1945. In 1956 the Uganda Trades Union Congress was formed, amalgamating 13 trade unions with a total membership of close to 6,000. In Zanzibar the trade union movement developed much later, but here, too, there were 18 trade unions with a total membership of 3,500 by 1958.

The trade unions' fight for better living and working conditions was closely linked to the general offensive against the colonial regime, for freedom and independence, and the working class was the most active and militant force in the national-liberation movement. Though the strike was their main form of struggle, the workers, led by the trade unions, took an active part in every political campaign.

The trade unions of Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika condemned the brutal murder of Patrice Lumumba, heroic son of Africa. In 1961 the Dar es Salaam dockers refused to unload cargoes bound for Katanga, where Tshombe's separatist government was in power. There had been 580 strikes in which 118,000 workers had taken part between 1947 and 1957. By comparison, there were 203 strikes involving 89,500 workers and employees in 1960. Tanganyika was certainly the strike centre of Africa.

The trade unions of Tanganyika had been very successful in organising the agricultural workers. Thus, there were 134 strikes of agricultural workers in 1960. The ban on national political parties in Kenya which was in effect until 1960 was decisive in placing the trade unions in the forefront of the national-liberation movement. Since they were the sole legal national organisations of the African people during this period, they fought to improve the working and living conditions of the working class. Many strikes turned into true political demonstrations. Thus,

the railway workers' strike, one of the biggest in the country, with 23,000 participants, was brought on by the dismissal of two African workers and the arrogant discrimination against Africans on the part of the officials of the Railway Administration Board.

The number of strikers in Kenya increased annually. In the three-year period prior to winning its independence (1960-62) there were 679 strikes with a total of 231,700 participants. By comparison, there were 314 strikes with 108,800 participants in the preceding five-year period (1955-59).

In the last two years before Uganda became an independent nation it had a recorded monthly average of from six to seven strikes, both economic and political in character.

The rapid growth of the national-liberation movement forced the British colonialists to resort to various manoeuvres. The numerous constitutional reforms which were effected in the colonies in the post-war years were actually forced concessions, resulting from the pressure of the mass anti-imperialist struggle.

Tanganyika calls for an end to Trusteeship

As a UN Trust Territory, Tanganyika was put under British rule in 1946. The United Nations Charter obliged the British Government to see to it that socio-economic and political conditions

favourable to preparing Tanganyika for future independence were created in the Territory. It was the British Government's direct duty to encourage the development of free political institutions in the country and to stimulate the participation of Africans in central and local administrative bodies.

However, the British Government ignored these issues. Moreover, it did its best to preserve Tanganyika's economic dependence and political immaturity for this assured the necessity of retaining the Trusteeship.

The national-liberation movement gained force under the leadership of TANU. Its slogans were: an end to Trusteeship, and independence. At a meeting of the Trusteeship Council in 1957, TANU leader Julius Kambaraga Nyerere spoke of Tanganyika's development as a democratic African state and demanded that a date be fixed for an end of the Trusteeship. This issue was brought up again and again. The Soviet representatives on the Trusteeship Council rendered invariable support to the just demands of Tanganyika, while the British Government continued to assert that the country was not yet ready for self-government.

The British authorities did everything in their power to preserve their Trusteeship. Thus, in 1953 the Governor of Tanganyika banned state employees from joining or belonging to political organisations. The authorities thwarted TANU's activities in every possible way. In 1957 they

refused to register ten of the Party's branches. Julius Nyerere was often denied the right to speak at meetings and public gatherings. In 1958 he was brought to trial and fined, his crime being that he exposed the illegal actions of the British administration.

Despite these persecutions, TANU's influence was growing steadily. By 1957 the Party numbered 200,000 members.

The colonialists manoeuvre

The colonial authorities effected a number of constitutional reforms in Tanganyika in the fifties. However, in no way did they change the essence of the colonial regime, for they simply brought several more Africans to the Legislative and Executive Councils, both of which were only consultative bodies with (until 1958) a nominated, not elected, membership. The first three Africans were given seats in the Legislative Council in 1947; the first African representative appeared in the Executive Council in 1951 and by 1958 the number had only increased to three.

The first elections to the Legislative Council were held as late as 1958-59, though this did not make the Council a representative African body. Guided by their desire to preserve their supremacy the British colonists established an election system which gave equal representation in the Legislative Council to each of the three groups of the population, the Africans, Europeans and

Asians. The British called this a "balanced" representation system which would pursue a policy of "partnership" and "racial harmony". In reality, this was a policy of pronounced racial discrimination. Indeed, the overwhelming majority of the African population, 98.5 per cent, to be exact, was given equal representation with the Europeans, who constituted only 0.2 per cent of the population, and the Asians, who comprised 1.3 per cent. Of the 67 members of the Legislative Council, only 33 had been elected; 34 were officially appointed by the Governor, another move to strengthen the hand of the colonialists.

Obviously, this system of representation was a far from democratic one, for it left the African population, as before, without any legal rights. Consequently, it could not satisfy the people. After the elections to the Legislative Council (1958-1959), the African population of Tanganyika called for a reorganisation of the Council that would abolish the so-called system of "balanced" representation and replace it by an elective body. This would make the Council a truly representative body that would defend the interests of the overwhelming majority of the population.

The British Government was compelled, under pressure, to agree to a new constitutional reform. In August 1960 new elections to the Legislative Council were held, guaranteeing an African majority. Only 10 of its 71 seats were filled by representatives of the European minority.

However, the reform of 1960 was only a step towards full political independence. Although the 1960 elections had made the Legislative Council an African majority body, with TANU leader Julius Nyerere as the Council President, the British Governor still ruled the country. Besides, British colonial officials still ran the key Ministries of Defence, Finances, Foreign Affairs and Justice. In a speech over the radio on September 3, 1960 Nyerere declared that his Government would press for Tanganyika's full independence within the framework of the British Commonwealth in 1961.

Nyerere's government immediately began negotiations on this question with the British Government, and in March 1961 an agreement was reached for granting Tanganyika its independence in December 1961.

Thus, it would seem that Tanganyika gained its independence by means of constitutional reforms which gradually extended African participation in the government. However, one must never forget that these reforms would not have been possible without the active struggle of the masses against the colonial regime. It was only the national-liberation movement, under the leadership of TANU, that forced the colonialists to retreat, step by step, and finally consent to full political independence for Tanganyika.

The political situation and the 1958 elections in Uganda

The suppression of a number of outbreaks in Uganda in the late fifties caused a powerful upsurge in the national-liberation movement. In 1955 several new political parties were formed. A breakaway group of the Uganda National Congress, under the leadership of E. Mulira, founded the Progressive Party. In 1956 M. Mugwanya and his followers founded the Democratic Party. The group of E. Muwazi and G. Binaisa established the United National Congress. The emergence of these new parties brought about a split in the united front in the struggle for independence.

The parties' chief differences centered on the future state structure of an independent Uganda. The Democratic Party was influential among the African Catholics. It advocated religious separation and thus undermined the unity of the peoples, weakening the national-liberation movement as well. Small wonder then that the British authorities gave their wholehearted support to the Democratic Party.

There were serious contradictions between the progressive forces and the feudal lords of Buganda, who demanded an extension of the Kabaka's rule throughout the country or, as an alternative, the cessation of Buganda as an independent state. There were separatists active in Toro, Bunyoro and Ankole as well.

One of the results of the 1953-1955 crisis was the reform of the Legislative and Executive

Councils of Uganda. The Legislative Council was to have 60 members, only half of whom were to be elected. Africans were given 18 elective seats in the Council. The Cabinet, which now would include three Africans, was the executive body.

As in Tanganyika, the constitutional reform of 1956 provided minimal African representation without changing the essence of the colonial regime, and here, too, the people were dissatisfied. The Uganda National Congress called for a revision of the Constitution to make the Legislative Council a genuinely representative body chosen by direct, and universal elections.

In 1957, when Frederick Crawford was appointed Governor of Uganda, the Uganda National Congress organised a mass meeting at the Nakiwubo Stadium to coincide with the inauguration. "No more British rule!" "No more British Governors!" were the slogans the demonstrators carried.

In view of the coming 1958 elections there was a sharp rise in the political activity of the masses. The colonial authorities were also preparing for the event: they began by persecuting the most progressive political leaders. J. Engur, Vice-President of the U.N.C., was arrested in October 1957. He had campaigned against the British reign of terror in Kenya and drew three years of imprisonment.

The election of African deputies to the Legislative Council was to be held in October 1958. The Buganda Lukiko, representing the feudal elements, abstained from the election, while the

Buganda Government demanded that a feudal system headed by the Kabaka be established in Uganda and that Buganda have the right to negotiate for self-government on behalf of the entire Protectorate. These aspirations of the Buganda feudal lords met with the opposition of the other political parties and the chiefs of Toro, Ankole and Bunyoro.

The 1958 elections proved the political awareness of the African people. In all, 534,000 voters, or 85 per cent of the electorate, went to the polls. Since Buganda had refused to take part in the elections, ten African candidates were on the ballot instead of eighteen. The Uganda National Congress and the Democratic Party were the chief rivals. The platform of the National Congress called for an all-out fight against autocracy and feudalism, an end to infringements on democracy and for the solidarity of all the peoples of Uganda; it called for more Africans in the State legislature and in the economy.

The election returns proved that this programme enjoyed the full support of the masses. The National Congress Party won 5 seats, the Democratic Party won 1 seat, and 4 seats went to "Independents", proving once again that the National Congress Party was the most popular of all. Not long after, however, the Party split. During the Mbale Conference (January 1959) a group of moderate leaders, headed by I. Musazi, was expelled from the Party for violating Party rules and disregarding its programme and policy. New

Party leaders were chosen. Milton Obote was elected President, Joseph Kiwanuka became Chairman, and Barnabas Kununka, Secretary-General.

After the split Musazi's group joined the Buganda separatists and feudal elements. The Party core, headed by Milton Obote, continued its progressive course towards creating a united, democratic Uganda and combating imperialism and colonialism.

Uganda wins independence

A boycott of foreign goods swept Uganda in 1959 in protest against the colonial authorities' attempt to secure special privileges for the non-African population. A number of political organisations, united in the National Movement, took part in this campaign. The Uganda National Congress and the Democratic Party refused to support the boycott, considering it a barrier to the anticipated constitutional reforms.

The boycott was closely linked with the struggle for immediate independence for Uganda. There were large-scale repressions to suppress the movement. At the end of May the colonial authorities outlawed the National Movement and arrested Mulira, Musazi and other leaders. On June 4 the police opened fire on a demonstration in Kampala.

In anticipation of the conference that was to revise Uganda's Constitution, the Uganda National Congress demanded independence in 1961. The programme of the Democratic Party was more

moderate, calling for self-government in 1961 and full political independence by 1966. Their differences became aggravated and brought about a new split in the National Congress Party in the end of 1959. Joseph Kiwanuka and Barnabas Kununka found themselves in the minority, while the radical wing of the Party followed Milton Obote. The latter group called for stepped-up action against imperialism and for independence. It undertook a number of decisive steps towards consolidating the various political organisations in a united front against imperialism.

In March 1960 this group joined the Uganda People's Union to form a new party, the Uganda People's Congress. Its programme called for immediate, complete independence for Uganda and the formation of a uniform state with an authoritative central government. Milton Obote was elected Secretary-General of the Uganda People's Congress.

In March 1961 a general election was held in Uganda. Close to 1,300,000 voters went to the polls. The Government and Lukiko of Buganda boycotted these elections as well, and this accounts for the small number of voters in that Province. The Uganda People's Congress won a clear majority, having received 695,000 votes. The Democratic Party received 494,000 votes, while the Uganda National Congress (Kiwanuka's group) received 40,000 votes.

However, the seats in the Legislative Council were not distributed according to party influence.

Thus, the Democratic Party (494,000 votes) had 43 Council seats, while the Uganda People's Congress (695,000 votes) had only 35. This is explained by the fact that the Democratic Party won 20 of Buganda's 21 seats by a fluke (only 1 per cent of the electorate came to the polls), gaining much by the Buganda feudal government's boycott of the elections.

In April 1961 a national Uganda Government was formed, with 9 African seats going to the Democratic Party, 3 seats to Europeans and one seat to an Indian. Benedicto Kiwanuka, President of the Democratic Party, was assigned the post of Minister Without Portfolio and Leader of the Legislative Council. He became Chief Minister in June 1961. The Government functioned as an executive council under the Governor and was still far from being the government of an independent state.

A Constitutional Conference was called for September 1961 to work out a constitution and fix the date of Uganda's independence.

The Buganda feudal elements proved to be the chief problem in planning the future state structure. Since their hopes for national prominence had been shattered, they were determined to defend their position and demanded cessation or, as an alternative, autonomy for Uganda.

The position of the Buganda chiefs threatened to wreck the scheduled constitutional talks in London and put off the issue of granting the country immediate independence. The London

Conference (September 18-October 9, 1961) fixed March 1, 1962 as the date for self-government for Uganda to go into effect and October 9, 1962, for Uganda's complete political independence. This was an important victory in the drawn-out struggle of the African peoples against colonialism. Commenting on the results of the Conference, the President of the Uganda People's Congress said: "...We have got all we wanted from the Conference."

Buganda's ruling circles were quite pleased with the outcome, for all their demands had been satisfied. Buganda was given the status of a federal monarchy, with a Government, Parliament (Lukiko) and Supreme Court. The Buganda Government had private sources of income and its own police force.

However, the Conference did not satisfy the rulers of Toro, Ankole and Bunyoro, who had also been striving for autonomy. Besides, the Bunyoro chiefs demanded the restoration of their "lost provinces" which the British colonists had expropriated in favour of Buganda many years before.

Uganda began preparing for the elections to the National Assembly; they would be decisive in determining the future of the new independent state.

In November 1961 the separatist elements of Buganda formed their own organisation, which they named Kabaka Yekka ("Only the King"). It called for the preservation of their traditional

institutions and monarchy in the province. Later, the Kabaka Yekka organisation acquired the status of a political party.

In the pre-election period the Uganda People's Congress and the Kabaka Yekka joined forces to overthrow the Democratic Party government. The elections, which were held in April 1962, gave the Uganda People's Congress and the "specially elected members" 43 seats in the National Assembly, the Kabaka Yekka Party 24 seats and the Democratic Party 24 seats.

This was a sweeping victory for the Uganda People's Congress, but it did not have an absolute majority in the National Assembly. In order to create a stable government, the U.P.C. formed a coalition with the Kabaka Yekka. On May 1, 1962 the coalition cabinet was made public. It included 12 representatives of the People's Congress and 4 representatives of the Kabaka Yekka. The new government was headed by M. Obote, U.P.C. leader.

On October 9, 1962 the national flag of Uganda replaced the Union Jack, ushering in a new period of independent development.

Constitutional reforms in Kenya

The suppression of the 1952-1956 uprising could not strangle the national-liberation movement in Kenya. A new revolutionary outbreak was imminent. In order to pacify the masses the British Government decided upon so-called constitutional reforms. The reforms that followed were no more

than an insignificant increase in African representation on the Legislative and Executive Councils, but they provided Britain with grounds for claiming that progress was being made towards self-government. In 1954 the number of seats for African representatives on the Legislative Council was raised from 4 to 6. In 1957 a new reform increased this number to 8, and in 1958 to 14 seats. Reforms of this kind affected neither the essence of the colonial regime, nor the ruling position of the British. Supreme power remained with the Governor, while the Legislative and Executive Councils, which were predominantly European, defended the interests of the British monopolies and the very small European minority, not those of the African people.

These meagre reforms could not satisfy the African organisations that were fighting for self-government. In the late fifties they increased their struggle for universal suffrage, an African majority on the Legislative Council, the abolition of the state of emergency and the legalisation of all-national African political parties. Following the 1958 elections, the African representatives on the Legislative Council refused to collaborate with the Government and rejected the two Cabinet posts they had been offered. They called for a conference to revise Kenya's Constitution.

All these attempts to achieve self-government and independence were blocked by the British Government, which had no intention of making any far-reaching concessions. . . . Alan Lennox-

Boyd, Colonial Secretary, speaking in the House of Commons on British policy in Kenya said: "For a long time there will have to be Colonial Office control. I do not foresee a date at this moment when it would be possible for the Colonial Office to relinquish control."

Increasing repressions

This unyielding position on the part of the British Government resulted in a further upsurge of the national-liberation struggle in Kenya. Early in 1958 a new political party, the Kiama Kia Muingi, was formed. Since the state of emergency regulations banned all national political parties, the Kiama Kia Muingi carried on its activities underground.

The British authorities outlawed the new party, claiming that it pursued aims similar to the Mau Mau, and began a series of mass arrests. Mr. Norman Harris, a Cabinet Minister of Kenya, testified that from January 1958 to April 1959 a total of 2,137 persons were accused of membership in the Kiama Kia Muingi.

The absence of national political parties increased the role of the African representatives on the Legislative Council in the political life of the country. They did not hesitate to expose the policy of the colonialists and called upon the masses to fight for their rights. In April 1958, 7 African representatives on the Legislative Council were arrested for speeches in which they condemned Africans who collaborated with the colonialists

and for campaigning against the Lennox-Boyd Constitution.

However, the colonial authorities were afraid of a new outbreak and did not dare mete out heavy sentences. They were brought to trial in May 1958 and fined 75 pounds each. On leaving the court house, the accused were hailed by a huge crowd carrying slogans which read: "Down with the British imperialists!", "Down with the Lennox-Boyd Constitution!"

In March 1959 the colonial authorities began repressions against one of the most powerful provincial parties, the Nairobi People's Convention Party, although its activities had never been questioned before. Thirty-four Party leaders were arrested, among them Ulo Agar, Organisational Secretary and editor of the party paper *Uhuru*. The charge was organising disturbances. Most of the leaders were sentenced to detention in African Reservations. *Uhuru* was suppressed.

The colonial authorities' attempts to suppress the national-liberation movement by terror and repressions aroused the indignation of Kenya's population and of Britain's progressive forces as well. The Left wing of the Labour Party repeatedly made inquiries into the disgraceful evidence of terror and persecution in Kenya. In April 1958 the British Communist Party published an exposé of British policy in Kenya. It stated that "Kenya has had emergency regulations for over five years. 10,000 Africans are still in detention camps, political meetings banned, and the colour bar

exercised in all forms. It is time to end this long record of suppression and to stop these new attacks". The Communist Party called upon the British people to "demand the withdrawal of the prosecutions" and "the release of all Africans still in detention". It urged the people to "support the African demand for universal suffrage and equal democratic rights".

The fight to abolish the state of emergency and free Jomo Kenyatta

The growing national-liberation movement in Kenya and the support it received from the progressive forces of Britain and the entire world forced the British Government to resort to new manoeuvres. In 1959 it agreed to a Constitutional Conference to be held in London.

In anticipation of the coming conference, the political struggle in Kenya was intensified. The African organisations called for the immediate abolition of the state of emergency and the liberation of thousands of Africans held prisoner in detention camps and jails. A powerful campaign was launched in Kenya and many other countries in 1958-1959, demanding the immediate liberation of Jomo Kenyatta, recognised leader of the national-liberation movement. Under popular pressure he was formally released on April 14, 1959, but he was refused freedom of movement within Kenya and was banned from all political activity. Imprisonment was replaced by exile to the waste-

lands of the Northern Province of Lodwar. Instead of appeasing the fighters for Kenyatta's freedom, this gave new impetus to the struggle. All the African organisations demanded his complete freedom, in order that he might represent the people of Kenya at the forthcoming Constitutional Conference.

The British Government feared that Kenyatta's liberation would lead to greater consolidation of the radical forces and frustrate its expectations in regard to the coming London Conference. A declaration made by the Governor of Kenya on May 9, 1959 maintained that Kenyatta's immediate return to political activity would lead to disturbances, which made his complete liberation undesirable.

In order to create a favourable climate for the London Conference, the British Government abolished the state of emergency in Kenya early in 1960. This was followed by a general amnesty, which was to free numerous Africans who had been accused of membership in the Mau Mau or of sympathising with that organisation. The amnesty, however, did not prevent the authorities from keeping over 1,000 of the most active participants in the anti-colonial struggle under arrest. Under the pretext of maintaining order, the Governor still had the right to control the activities of the political parties and the Africans still could not hold meetings without having first gained official permission. This made the repeal of the state of emergency a rather formal act.

While preparations were under way for the London Conference, two political trends became apparent among the African representatives on the Legislative Council. Their opinions differed seriously with regard to the future state structure of Kenya. The British colonialists, who spared no effort in aggravating the split between the African leaders, were quite successful.

The moderate group, led by Masinde Muliro, founded the Kenya National Party. The more radical members, led by Oginga Odinga, founded the Kenya Independent Movement, which declared that it would place the following demands before the London Constitutional Conference: universal suffrage, based on the principle "one person–one vote"; a government formed by the party that received the majority of votes; independence for Kenya in the immediate future; freedom for Jomo Kenyatta. These demands reflected the innermost hopes of the people of Kenya.

The demands of the Kenya National Party were more moderate. It did not insist on immediate independence and was ready to consent to colonial rule until 1968. No wonder the Africans considered such a position to be treachery.

When members of the National Party attempted to speak at a meeting in Mombasa in September 1959 they were run off the platform by a hail of stones and cries of "Freedom!" The Conference of the Pan-African Freedom Movement for East

and Central Africa, held in September 1959 in Moshi, refused to recognise the authority of the Kenya National Party representatives.

The reactionary elements, which consisted of the European colonists, did their utmost to preserve colonial rule in Kenya. They were also preparing for the London Conference. In August 1959 they founded the Kenya United Party. Its programme envisaged preservation of the colonial rule in Kenya for an indefinite period. According to its leaders, self-government for Kenya within the next fifty years was out of the question. The United Party proposed to extend the powers of the local administrative bodies, a step that would consolidate the rule of the European minority, and increase its chances for "dividing and ruling". Kenya's ex-Governor, Edward Grigg (later Lord Altrincham) advocated the same idea in his book *Kenya's Opportunity*.

The Kenya United Party demanded that the Kenya Highlands be reserved for European colonists and that segregation in schools be continued.

The more moderate among the European colonists were aware of the futility of trying to preserve the status quo of colonial order. They realised that the popularity of the national-liberation movement demanded greater flexibility on the part of the authorities, who were now compelled to resort to concessions in order to preserve their hold in Kenya. In October 1959, ex-Secretary of Agriculture Michael Blundell founded the New Kenya Party, which united the liberal European

colonists. Unlike the Kenya United Party, the New Kenya Party called for a slight increase in African representation in government bodies; it held that African farmers should be given access to the Highlands. Blundell suggested creating a group of big African farmers who would become the social support of the colonialists. Despite its apparent liberalism, the New Kenya Party was actually no different than the United Party. Both protested against universal suffrage and opposed the idea of independence in the near future. Both strove to increase the role of the European monopolies and to preserve the privileges of the European minority.

The London Conference of 1960

The Conference that was to revise Kenya's Constitution opened in London on January 18, 1960 and was in session for over a month. Under pressure from the masses, the representatives of the Kenya National Party reached an agreement with the representatives of the Kenya Independence Movement. Thus, the African delegates presented a united front at the Conference. They demanded universal suffrage; one vote to each voter; a government responsible to Parliament; independence for Kenya in 1960. Both the British Government and the European colonists' parties in Kenya opposed these demands.

The Conference closed on February 21, after declining universal suffrage and independence for

Kenya, the two basic demands of the African representatives. The Conference, however, agreed to a predominantly African Legislative Council (37 seats out of 65) and four Cabinet seats from a total of twelve.

Although the Constitution of 1960 worked out at the Conference was a definite step forward, it could not satisfy the African people. The political situation in the country was becoming more tense. Everywhere the people were demanding immediate independence for Kenya.

As in 1952, the reactionary colonial elements began to spread rumours of a Mau Mau revival in the Central Province and in Rift Valley with reports of police attacks on Kikuyu villages. In July 1960 the British Government began sending additional troops to Kenya. The construction of a military base in Kahawa, begun in 1959, proceeded rapidly.

Taking into account the growing dissatisfaction of the masses and the danger of popular action, Governor Patrick Renison, speaking over the radio, declared that nothing would prevent him from employing the most decisive means if the existing order were threatened.

The KANU and the KADU

Elections to the new Legislative Council were scheduled for February 1961. After the state of emergency had been repealed, two rival national parties were formed in Kenya: the Kenya African

National Union (KANU) and the Kenya African Democratic Union (KADU). The KANU, founded in March 1960, united the most revolutionary forces of Kenya and called for immediate independence. Jomo Kenyatta was elected Chairman of the KANU in May 1960, but the colonial authorities refused to register the Party if Kenyatta was its leader, since he had been banned from all political activity. It was decided that James Gichuru would temporarily be the Chairman of the KANU, in order not to hamper the Party's pre-election activities. Oginga Odinga was elected Vice-Chairman and Tom Mboya became Secretary-General.

The KADU was formed in June 1960. It embraced several local political organisations with separatist tendencies: the Kalenjin Political Alliance, the Masai United Front, the Kenya African People's Party, the Coast African Political Union and the Somali National Association. The party was headed by M. Muliro.

Contrary to the KANU, which demanded a centralised state, the KADU's plan would divide Kenya into several autonomous districts. In October 1961 the KADU published its plan for the country's future administrative structure. It called for the establishment of 5 districts, each with its own government and parliament. This plan had much in common with the propositions previously suggested by the United Party, which was also in favour of consolidating the local administrative bodies. There was reason why the London

Times wrote that the KADU's regional plan had been drawn up with the help of the colonists.

On the eve of the 1961 elections the insolvent United Party was replaced by the colonists' Kenya Coalition Party, with Cavendish Bentinck as its leader. Its aim was to preserve all the privileges of the colonists and, first and foremost, their right to own land.

The elections to the Legislative Council, held in March 1961, brought the KANU a sweeping victory. It got 460,000 votes as compared to the KADU's 140,000. The New Kenya Party got 28,000 votes and the Kenya Coalition 8,000. Both African parties demanded independence for Kenya in 1961. They agreed to boycott the Government as long as Kenyatta was held prisoner. That is why the KANU's elected candidates rejected the Governor's invitation to fill their legal Cabinet posts. The KADU candidates, on the other hand, broke their agreement with the KANU and accepted Cabinet posts. Thus, the African people were represented by a party that had collected one-third the amount of votes that the KANU had.

To increase the KADU popularity, the colonial authorities agreed to transfer Jomo Kenyatta from Lodwar to Maralal, where he was still kept in custody, however. Not until August 1961 was he allowed to resume his political activities.

In vain did Jomo Kenyatta seek to unite the activities of both African parties on the basis of a common programme. The KADU leaders were

intent on their regional plan. On October 28, 1961 Kenyatta became the official leader of the KANU. The Party fixed February 1962 as the time for Kenya's independence. In November 1961 a KANU delegation headed by Kenyatta arrived in London to place before the British Government the issue of convening a new Constitutional Conference to give Kenya immediate independence. During his visit to Kenya in November 1961, Reginald Maudling, Secretary of State for the Colonies, declared that a Constitutional Conference for Kenya would be held in February 1962.

The separatist movement

The colonial authorities spared no effort to consolidate the KADU's position at the coming Conference. By giving full support to its regional plan, they encouraged the separatist movement in every way. In 1961 the British instigated a campaign for the secession of the Coastal area from the rest of Kenya, stating that it had formally belonged to the Sultan of Zanzibar. The British Government used this argument to strengthen its position in this important area and deprive the future independent state of Kenya of the coastal area and Mombasa, the largest port of East Africa. An editorial in the *Times* of November 3, 1961 supported this scheme as is clear from the following quote: "The case for coastal autonomy rests on a treaty right, and legally it [the Protectorate—*Ed.*] is unassailable." However, strong opposition

on the part of the people foiled the colonialists' plan.

In 1961 a separatist movement was begun in the Northern Province, where the Somali population demanded annexation to the Somali Republic. The Democratic Party of the Northern Frontier called for a referendum to resolve the dispute in accordance with the wishes of the population.

In the South the Masai also began to put forth demands of secession from Kenya to become an independent state that would include territories inhabited by Masai minorities in Kenya and Tanganyika. The *East Africa and Rhodesia* reported that the District Commissioner presided over the meeting in Garissa which produced the secession plan, while the telegram incorporating it was composed by administration clerks. This leaves no doubt as to the true instigators of separatist ideas.

The 1962 London Conference

The Kenya Constitutional Conference was held in London from February 14 to April 6, 1962. The British Government gave its wholehearted support to the KADU regional plan which envisaged the division of Kenya into six autonomous districts. The KANU representatives opposed this plan most vigorously, for they stood for a stable, centralised state with sweeping powers for its central government.

A struggle ensued between the two parties with regard to Kenya's future state structure. The British Government, which fully supported the KADU's regional plan, tried to wreck the Conference and once again postpone the issue of Kenya's independence, this time under the pretext of the existing differences between the two major African political parties. However, a compromise was finally reached. The resulting Constitution provided for a bicameral Parliament with a House of Representatives, elected by universal suffrage in all the electoral districts, and a Senate, made up of representatives from the six future districts. Executive power was vested in the Central Government, which was to decide on foreign affairs, defence, foreign trade and industrial development. Under pressure from the KADU, the Draft Constitution provided for six Provincial Assemblies endowed with local legislative powers. Each Province was to have an autonomous government.

Thus, the decisions of the 1962 London Conference were worked out on the basis of a compromise. The final text of the Constitution was to be completed during subsequent negotiations between the two political parties, prior to the new elections to the Legislative Council, fixed for May 1963.

The chief issue—the target date for Kenya's independence—remained undecided. The London Conference came to an agreement to the effect that a coalition government of KANU and KADU representatives be formed prior to the elections.

Each Party was given 7 Cabinet posts; their respective leaders, Jomo Kenyatta and Ronald Ngala, were made Ministers of State for Constitutional Affairs and Administration. The colonists held the chief offices of Defence, Justice and Agriculture. Supreme power remained with the Governor.

Kenya becomes an independent state

The 1963 elections to the Legislative Council were of major political importance to Kenya, for their outcome would have a far-reaching influence on the country's development.

The elections were held in May 1963 and showed that the KANU programme enjoyed nation-wide support, having 64 candidates elected to the House of Representatives and 19 to the Senate; 32 and 16 KADU candidates, respectively, were elected.

The sweeping victory at the polls made the KANU the ruling party. After the elections it further strengthened its position by uniting forces with the Kenya African People's Party and the independent deputies in the House of Representatives.

The Governor was obliged to give the KANU leader, Jomo Kenyatta, the right to form a Government. Thus, the regional plan had suffered final defeat; no longer would the colonialists profit by the contradictions between the two political parties, no longer could they put off Kenya's independence. Jomo Kenyatta declared that his Government would demand independence for Kenya in 1963.

Kenyatta called upon the people of Kenya to unite. The KADU leaders, however, continued to advocate their separatist schemes and even put forth a plan to split Kenya into two states. Another Constitutional Conference was held in London in September-October 1963. Despite the KADU opposition, Kenyatta's Government put through a revision of the last London Conference decisions extending the authority of the Central Government bodies.

The London Conference fixed December 12, 1963 as the date for Kenya's independence. On his return from the Conference, Kenyatta stated that the imperialists were intent on turning Kenya into a second Congo, but that they were doomed to failure.

On December 12, 1963 Kenya became an independent state.

The national-liberation movement in Zanzibar

The national-liberation movement in Zanzibar did not achieve wide scope until the late fifties. Two political parties were formed. The Zanzibar Nationalist Party, founded in 1955, represented the interests of the wealthier Arab circles, the big landowners and merchants. At the same time, its activities were keyed to achieving popularity

among the African masses. In 1957 the Afro-Shirazi Party was founded to represent the interests of the overwhelming African majority of the island. Both parties embarked upon the struggle for Zanzibar's independence. The trade union movement was rapidly gaining force. The Zanzibar and Pemba Federation of Labour was established in 1959, becoming the rallying centre of this movement.

Led by the political parties and trade unions, a movement for abolishing the Protectorate and winning independence spread throughout the country.

The British colonialists were forced to concede to a reform of the Legislative Council, in 1956, extending the number of its members to 25. However, only 12 were representative members and of these only 6 were elected. The British Resident remained, as before, President of the Legislative Council.

British colonial officials occupied 7 of the 10 seats on the Executive Council. Obviously, this reform did nothing to change the essence of the colonial administration.

However, elections for the 6 representative members to the Legislative Council, held in July 1957, stimulated the masses to political activity: more than 35,000 voters went to the polls. The Afro-Shirazi Party was victorious. Its candidates won in 5 electoral districts.

The national-liberation movement in Zanzibar gained even wider scope after the elections, campaigning under the slogan of full political independence. The British colonialists opposed this demand most vigorously, falling back on their old argument that the people were "not ready" for independence. In order to pacify the masses and create an illusion of gradual transition towards independence, the British authorities sponsored another constitutional reform in 1960. This set the number of elective Legislative Council members at 22; of this number three were ex-officio members and 5 were appointed by the Sultan. The Executive Council, still ruled by the British Resident, had 3 colonial officials; 5 of its members were ex-officio Ministers, one of whom was appointed Chief Minister by the Resident. New elections were set for January 1961. The 1960 reform did not satisfy the political parties of Zanzibar, which regarded it only as a step towards independence.

In anticipation of the coming elections, political activities in the country were stepped up. A new party emerged—the Zanzibar and Pemba People's Party.

Nearly 100,000 people voted in the elections. The Afro-Shirazi Party was once again victorious receiving 10 seats on the Legislative Council. The Zanzibar Nationalist Party received 9 and the Zanzibar and Pemba People's Party 3. The Afro-Shirazi Party, however, could not utilise its victory, for 2 deputies of the Zanzibar and Pemba People's Party sided with the Nationalist deputies while only one sided with the Afro-Shirazi Party. Hence,

neither of the two major parties was able to form a majority government. The colonial authorities resolved the crisis by announcing new elections to be held on June 1, 1961. To avoid another tied vote, the number of seats on the Legislative Council was increased to 23.

The pre-election campaign was extremely heated, and the results of the June elections were practically unchanged. The Afro-Shirazi Party received 10 seats, the Nationalists also 10, and 3 seats went to the Zanzibar and Pemba People's Party. The latter two formed a coalition, which gave them a majority on the Legislative Council. Mohammad Shamte Hamadi, leader of the Zanzibar and Pemba People's Party, became head of the Government, but all political affairs were in the hands of the Nationalist Party. The distribution of seats on the Legislative Council was contrary to the true wishes of the voters. The Afro-Shirazi Party claimed that the election results had been falsified. There were clashes between the followers of the different parties in many parts of the country, and the bloody events of June 8, 1961 produced a toll of 67 dead and over 300 wounded.

Zanzibar gains independence

Since the Nationalist Government was eager to consolidate its victory, it demanded that the British Government immediately grant Zanzibar its independence. A Constitutional Conference was held in London in March 1962 to fix the date for

the country's independence. Mohammad Shamte Hamadi, the Chief Minister, insisted that it be set for October 1962. Having nothing against immediate independence, the Afro-Shirazi representatives demanded that new elections to the Legislative Council be held prior to this historical date to provide a Government that would be truly representative of the people. The issue of new elections disrupted the Conference, for the British Government used the differences between the two major political parties as a pretext for closing the Conference on April 6, 1962. No decision had been made as to a date for Zanzibar's independence.

Speaking at a press-conference about British plans for the future, Reginald Maudling, Secretary of State for the Colonies, said: "Whether and when it will be possible to make any further advance to that goal must depend on the success of the political leaders and people of Zanzibar in reducing the existing tensions and the differences which divide them."

In June 1963 the British Government granted administrative self-government to Zanzibar. In July general elections were held to the Legislative Council. The Afro-Shirazi Party received 54 per cent of the vote, while the Nationalists and Zanzibar and Pemba People's Party received 46 per cent. Once again these parties united to form a coalition government, for they had received 18 seats on the Legislative Council, while the Afro-Shirazi Party had only 13.

In September 1963 a new Conference was held in London, which finally fixed December 10, 1963 as the date for Zanzibar's independence. This was a sweeping victory for the national-liberation movement. True, the majority of the people were dissatisfied with a Government that was made up of representatives from a minor feudal stratum, on the one hand, and a wealthy section of the Arab population on the other. However, temporary sacrifices had to be made if independence were to be achieved.

On December 10, 1963 Zanzibar was solemnly proclaimed an independent state, and a constitutional monarchy was established.

The revolution of January 12, 1964

Now the anti-popular policy of the ruling Nationalist Party became more evident than ever. The Party defended the interests of the feudal elements and did nothing to alleviate the lot of the masses. The more liberal Nationalists soon realised this and left the Party to create the Umma Party.

On January 12, 1964, a month after independence had been proclaimed, an armed uprising supported by the masses overthrew Sultan Seyyid Jamshid Bin Abdullah and the Nationalist Government. The Zanzibar Revolutionary Council came to power and proclaimed the Republic. It formed a new Government of members of the Afro-Shirazi Party and the recently established Umma Party.

Abeid Karume, leader of the Afro-Shirazi Party, was named President; Abdullah Kassim Hanga headed the Government, while Umma leader Abdul Rahman Muhammad Babi became Minister of Foreign Affairs.

British and American imperialists were ready to intervene in Zanzibar's domestic affairs in order to restore the Sultan's reactionary regime. However, their plans were foiled, for it was quite evident that Zanzibar's new Government enjoyed the full support of the people. Then again, the imperialists had the position of the Soviet Union to contend with, for it had stated that it would not allow any interference on the part of the imperialist powers in Zanzibar's internal affairs. A Statement issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR and dated January 27, 1964 reads in part: "Any violence taken against the sovereign and independent State of the People's Republic of Zanzibar and Pemba by those who do not wish to abandon their former colonial privileges would be an act of international arbitrariness with all the ensuing dangerous repercussions."

The Soviet Government was one of the first to recognise the People's Republic of Zanzibar and Pemba. Within the very first days of its existence the new Government carried out a number of important measures in the interests of the people. Among them was a decree on the nationalisation of land.

The United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar—Tanzania

On April 22, 1964 Julius Nyerere, President of Tanganyika, and Abeid Karume, President of Zanzibar, signed an Agreement, uniting the two states in the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar to be known as Tanzania. On April 25 the Agreement was ratified by the National Assembly of Tanganyika and the Zanzibar Revolutionary Council. Julius Nyerere was named President and Abeid Karume, Vice-President. Five members of the Zanzibar Revolutionary Council received seats in the new Government.

V. EAST AFRICA LOOKS TO THE FUTURE

Socio-economic development

Political independence has given the East African peoples great possibilities for independent economic and cultural development and for a substantial rise in the standard of living. The road taken by the East African States will determine the outcome of these major tasks.

Imperialism, forced to abandon its time-honoured "classical" form of colonialism, seeks to prolong its rule by resorting to a new type of colonial policy. Its aim is to preserve its ruling economic position and the ties that have been firmly established between the home country and the colonies; it needs to preserve the agrarian economies and the cheap raw-material sources of the East African countries.

However, the young African States are fighting not only for political, but for economic independence as well. Discussing the Five-Year Development Plan for Tanganyika in May 1964, Julius Nyerere said: "We must have an industrial base to our economy. Only when we have achieved this will our future be to some extent safeguarded."

The imperialists are intent upon retaining their former colonies within the world capitalist economic system. This is contrary to the wishes and plans of the East African States, who want to develop their economies along socialist lines. At present, capitalism is incapable of ensuring the rapid progress of developing countries. This is most evident in East Africa, where the national bourgeoisie is too poor to develop the country's industry. A capitalist system can develop in East Africa only if there is an influx of foreign capital. And this would inevitably make these states economically dependent upon imperialism. Rapid independent economic progress in East Africa can only be achieved by strengthening the state-owned sector of industry and developing socialist production.

The Five-Year Development Plans of Uganda and Tanganyika call for precedence in the development of the state-owned sector of the economy. Private foreign capital investments are permitted only if they are in the national interests of the countries. The governments of the East African States are determined to develop their own national industries and free themselves of the necessity to import goods they can produce themselves. This would reduce foreign currency expenditures and increase the accumulation of funds necessary for furthering their national economies.

Uganda and Tanganyika are major cotton producers. However, they continue to import large quantities of textile goods. In his address to the

National Assembly of Tanganyika in May 1964 President Nyerere said, speaking of the Five-Year Development Plan: "... In the next five years we intend greatly to speed up industrialisation and we are aiming at a rate of growth of the industrial sector which is more than twice as fast as that of agriculture." Uganda's 1963-64 budget increased funds earmarked for industrial development from 10 per cent to 20 per cent. In order to raise the necessary amounts the Government increased profit taxes of foreign enterprises and shareholders to 45 per cent. In 1963 construction of a second textile factory, a paper-mill, a match factory, a large flour mill and a major meat-processing plant was begun in Uganda.

The absence of privately owned lands, and the traditional spirit of collectivism and mutual aid all favour the establishment of socialist relations in agriculture. Today, a rise in agricultural production can only be achieved by the establishment of large-scale modern farms, where modern machinery and progressive methods for improving the soil can be used. This is why the governments of all the East African States said they would encourage the development of agricultural co-operatives and create state-owned farms on fallow lands.

The Five-Year Development Plan for Tanganyika calls for the construction of irrigation canals and the wide-scale use of agricultural machinery. New lands in the Kilombero, Pangani and Vala basins will be cultivated by introducing modern

agricultural methods. The Uganda Government is also financing a project for developing 11,000 acres of fallow lands in the Northern regions and Buganda; it encourages the establishment of production co-operatives and intends to set up tractor renting stations.

The governments of the East African States are very concerned with raising the living standard. Minimum wages in Uganda were raised by 45 to 50 per cent in 1963. Low-rent housing projects for workers and employees are under construction. In 1964 the Government of Kenya took measures to curtail unemployment. That same year an Agreement signed by Government officials, the Kenya Federation of Employers and the Kenya Federation of Labour increased the number of persons employed in State enterprises by 15 per cent and of those working in private enterprises by 10 per cent. Under the Sultan's rule Zanzibar had 9,000 unemployed. In May 1964 Abeid Karume, Vice-President of the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar, declared that unemployment had been completely erased.

The young East African States are faced with yet another important task, that of raising the literacy standard and training specialists for industrial and agricultural management and administrative posts. The Governments of all these states are increasing the networks of elementary and secondary schools. Thus, 368 new schools were built in Tanganyika during the first year of independence, with the population taking an active

part in the construction on a voluntary basis. The first university in the country has opened in Dar es Salaam. The Uganda Government plans an annual increase of 8,000 elementary school and 5,000 secondary school pupils, while the Three-Year Development Plan for Zanzibar calls for the construction of 20 elementary schools, 3 secondary schools and a National university.

The East African States have an acute shortage of qualified specialists for managing the national economy. This problem is being solved with the help of the socialist countries, which have opened the doors of their colleges and universities to African students, and are carrying out a large-scale programme for improving medical care and social security in East Africa.

The progressive forces of East Africa believe that the many existing socio-economic and political problems will be easier to solve if the East African States unite in a Federation. On June 5, 1963 a meeting of East African State leaders, held in Nairobi, adopted a Declaration on the creation of the Federation of East Africa; a Working Group was set up to draft a Constitution for the Federation. The Declaration reads, in part, "Now that we are once again free, or are on the point of regaining our freedom,* we believe the time has come to consolidate our unity and provide it with a constitutional basis."

---

* When the Declaration was signed Kenya had not yet been granted its independence.

The united independent East African States will play a progressive role if the Federation is based on the principles of anti-imperialist, anti-colonial struggle, democracy and socialism. These were the guiding principles of the progressive forces of Tanganyika and Zanzibar when they created the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar.

Foreign policy

In their foreign affairs the East African States are pursuing a policy of positive neutrality, of establishing friendly relations with all countries of the world. This policy has put an end to the artificial barrier created by the imperialists to isolate the East African States from the USSR and the other socialist countries. This policy of positive neutrality does not mean that the African States will refrain from taking part in solving important international problems.

Their economic and cultural development, their political independence and sovereignty are possible only under peaceful conditions. That is why the East African States have become the champions for easing international tension, for achieving universal and complete disarmament, that is why they are for banning nuclear weapons, for proclaiming Africa an atom-free zone and eliminating all military bases in Africa.

The East African States have signed the Moscow Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water.

Though they have achieved independence, the East African States are well aware that not all African peoples have cast off the yoke of colonial oppression. Jointly with the progressive forces of the world they are fighting for the complete and final liquidation of colonialism. The independent African States realise that their freedom cannot be fully guaranteed until every single African colony has won its independence. That is why they are supporting the national-liberation movement in the Portuguese colonies both materially and morally; that is why they are demanding that effective means be used to check the reactionary-fascist Government of the South African Republic and its brutal policy of persecution and racial discrimination; that is why they demand that the British Government give the Africans of Southern Rhodesia the right to manage their own country independently.

Speaking at the Cairo Conference of the Heads of the African States, Jomo Kenyatta said: "It is our duty to destroy all the spring-boards of imperialism that still exist on our Continent." At the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, held in London in July 1964, the leaders of the East African States demanded that the British Government guarantee the African population of Southern Rhodesia their democratic rights, that it effect a constitutional reform, introduce universal suffrage based on the "one man–one vote" principle and free the imprisoned leaders of the national-liberation movement.

The Governments of the East African nations warned the British Government in no uncertain terms that if it did not provide a democratic majority government in Southern Rhodesia, then they would be forced to take up the question of their further membership in the British Commonwealth.

The East African States are boycotting South African goods. The Governments of Tanzania, Uganda and Kenya have broken off trade relations with South Africa and are demanding that it be expelled from the United Nations. At the July 1964 Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in London, the leaders of the African Governments demanded that Britain use economic sanctions against South Africa and place an embargo on all arms deliveries.

The position of the East African States at the United Nations is firmly anti-colonial, they are to be reckoned with in all major international problems.

* * *

Imperialism has brought immeasurable suffering to the peoples of East Africa. The colonial period is the most dismal period in their history. The economic, social, cultural and political life of the East African countries was subordinated to the interests of the foreign monopolies. Full responsibility for the retarded development of the East African peoples lies with the imperialists.

However, the Africans were never reconciled to imperialist rule. They have waged a long and bitter struggle against foreign invaders and their struggle for freedom and independence is an integral part of the world revolutionary process aimed against the capitalist system. The powerful socialist camp, the working classes of the capitalist countries and progressive forces throughout the world have supported and continue to support the national-liberation movement of colonial peoples and dependent countries.

Political independence is but the first stage of the anti-imperialist revolution. Imperialism, forced to abandon direct economic and political rule, is striving to preserve its power through neo-colonialism. Thus, only a persistent struggle for complete economic and political independence will guarantee true freedom and independence to the peoples of East Africa.

Today, they are building a new society, a society that will know no exploitation of man by man, a society that will ensure economic and cultural development and guarantee all its members the right to work, study and to social security. The African peoples and their leaders know that this will be possible only through socialist development.