AFRICA

No "Dialogue" With Racists

The recent 8th Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (O.A.U.) in Addis Ababa adopted a declaration rejecting any "dialogue" with the white South African racists. This was a heavy blow to U.S.-headed old and new colonialism and to the fascist Pretoria regime.

What does "dialogue" with South Africa mean? It means getting the African countries to have “contact” with the South African racist regime. The purpose, as the declaration points out, is "to divide African states, confuse world public opinion, relieve South Africa from international ostracism and isolation and obtain an acceptance of the status quo in southern Africa." U.S. imperialism has been trying to sell this scheme in Africa for more than a year.

The African people’s struggle against colonialism and racial discrimination is mounting daily. More and more independent African states have supported the struggle of the people in southern Africa, especially the growing armed struggle in the region. At the same time, in the course of the struggle, the African countries and people are steadily strengthening their unity. The resolution adopted by the African summit conference condemning South Africa’s policy of racial discrimination and calling on all independent African countries to boycott the South African regime has isolated it even further. Confronted by this, U.S. imperialism beat the drums for a "peaceful settlement of the tension" in the southern part of Africa and even got South African "prime minister" Vorster to engage in "smiling diplomacy" towards the African countries and call for "dialogues" between South Africa and Black African states. But the African people were not taken in. Heads of state in some African countries and public opinion in Africa have repeatedly exposed South Africa’s plot. The recent Addis Ababa conference has dealt a further blow to this imperialist scheme.

Everyone knows that the South African regime practises apartheid at home to savagely persecute and suppress the African and other coloured people who constitute the overwhelming majority of the population while, externally, it threatens the security of neighbouring independent African countries. But what people are often not too clear about is that this product of colonialism can exist and is able to oppress the African people because it has the behind-the-scenes support of U.S. and British imperialism. South Africa’s economic life-line is controlled by foreign monopoly capital, first and foremost, U.S. and British capital. There are more than 250 U.S. corporations with investments in South Africa and 490 British firms have subsidiaries there. U.S. trade with South Africa accounts for one-third of total U.S. exports to Africa and one-fourth of its imports from that continent. Investments in South Africa by U.S. and British monopoly capital exceed 4,000 million U.S. dollars, which produces huge profits each year.

Another thing worth noting is that the United States recently called a ministerial council meeting of the NATO bloc in Lisbon to try and boost the morale of the Portuguese colonialists and encourage them to continue their criminal colonial wars in Africa. Meanwhile, the United States and some of its partners in the NATO bloc have made big arms deals with the South African regime and instigated it to join the Rhodesian white settlers’ regime and the Portuguese colonialists in suppressing the African people’s armed struggle and even to use political blackmail and the threat of force against Guinea, Zambia and Tanzania. All this is being done in the midst of an uproar for “dialogues”!

ANDEAN PACT ORGANIZATION

Foreign Investment Rules Go Into Effect

The common rules of the Andean Pact Organization for the treatment of foreign capital went into effect on July 1.

The rules were adopted last December at a conference in Lima, capital of Peru, attended by the foreign ministers of Chile, Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador and Colombia.

Under the rules, profits remitted abroad each year by foreign concerns shall not exceed 14 per cent of their direct investment and certain sectors are barred from foreign investment. The rules also provide for the conversion within a certain period of existing foreign companies into mixed companies with national capital in a dominant position, by means of selling at least 51 per cent of their shares to domestic investors of the five countries. “One of the fundamental objectives of the common rules should be the strengthening of national enterprises,” the rules pointed out, and the common policy of the Andean Pact nations is “to give preference in the economic development of the sub-region to authentic national capital and enterprises of the member countries.”

Speaking at the ceremony held in Santiago to enforce the rules, Chilean Foreign Minister Clodomiro Almeida said that the history of Latin America “charges us with a task which is not yet fulfilled: to fight in unity so as to create societies free from foreign domination.” By implementing these rules, he emphasized, “we are going to consolidate our economic independence.” He warned that such a cause would be looked upon with disfavour by the reactionaries. “We must be prepared to close our ranks whenever necessary,” he added. Similar ceremonies took place in the Peruvian and Bolivian capitals.

U.S. investments in the five Andean Pact nations have totalled well
over 2,000 million U.S. dollars, accounting for more than two-thirds of all foreign investments in this region. Through them U.S. imperialism has plundered huge amounts of natural resources and gouged fabulous profits out of the sweat and blood of the working people there. The five Andean Pact nations have in recent years adopted measures to restrict foreign investments or nationalize U.S.-owned firms. Since President Allende sponsored a constitutional amendment bill last December for the nationalization of U.S.-owned copper mines, the Chilean Government has taken over the administration of three U.S.-owned copper mines and put copper sales under government control instead of under U.S.-owned firms. In addition, the Chilean Government has bought out the U.S.-owned Bethlehem Iron Mines Company and expropriated or purchased other U.S.-owned companies. Since coming to power in 1968, Velasco's Peruvian Government has expropriated the U.S.-owned International Petroleum Corporation, taken back a number of big copper concessions from U.S. firms and taken over other U.S.-owned enterprises. The Government has also promulgated general laws on industry, fisheries and mining which restrict foreign investment in these sectors. In Bolivia, the U.S.-owned Matilde Mining Co. was nationalized last April after another U.S.-owned firm, Bolivia Gulf, a subsidiary of the U.S. Gulf Oil Company, was taken over by the state in October 1969. Ecuador and Colombia have also adopted measures to take back some U.S. enterprises.

YUGOSLAVIA

All-People's Defence Stressed

Strengthening Yugoslavia's defensive forces and developing an all-people's defence were stressed at a joint session held recently by the Foreign Policy Committees and the National Defence Committees of the Chamber of Nationalities and the Social Political Chamber of the Yugoslav Federal Assembly.

Novinska Agencija Tanjug reported that the session discussed Yugoslavia's international position and security in the light of the latest world developments, especially in the Middle East, the Mediterranean and the Balkan Peninsula area. The session stressed the need for Yugoslavia to continue efforts in the field of non-aligned policy and the development of constructive relations with all countries, especially neighbouring ones, in accordance with the principles of non-interference in internal affairs, respect for independence and territorial integrity.

It was reported that concern was expressed over events that hamper the stabilization of international relations and the consolidation of peace and threaten the small and medium-sized countries. Therefore, Yugoslavia must continually strengthen its defensive forces and develop an all-people's defence. The session emphatically pointed out that Yugoslavia must also in future firmly oppose attempts to threaten its independence and territorial integrity.

Tanjug also reported that Yugoslav Prime Minister Mitja Ribicic told a mass rally at Kranj in Slovenia that "European security means security of all European frontiers, and the full responsibility of all European states inside and outside the blocs. It means rejection of various unacceptable doctrines about limited sovereignty or a gray zone."

"All actions and preparations for general people's defence made in all structures of our society, including the armed forces, have developed into a powerful general people's movement which has enormous political significance," said Colonel General Viktor Bubanj, Chief of Staff of the Yugoslav People's Army, in a recent interview to the editor-in-chief of Belgrade Radio. Bubanj emphasized: "The crucial role will be played by man, his determination, skill and willingness to defend his country, as well as the readiness of our people and capability of our armed forces for defence." He said that armed struggle against technically strong aggressors "may confront our working people, particularly the young."

U.S.-WEST GERMANY

Fruitless Financial Talks

The third round of the Washington-Bonn talks on West Germany helping to offset the foreign currency costs of keeping U.S. troops stationed there again came to a fruitless end recently. This reflects in some aspects that U.S. imperialism's baton is getting less and less effective in Western Europe.

The bone of contention during the talks which started as early as last September was that Washington wanted West Germany to pay more hard cash and purchase more military hardware from the United States to make up for the foreign exchange costs of maintaining U.S. troops in West Germany while Bonn haggled for all it was worth and hedged on the question.

At present, there are 310,000 American troops in Western Europe of which 200,000 are stationed in West Germany. These troops are an important instrument for U.S. imperialism to control Western Europe and to contend and collude in Europe with the other superpower. To keep so large a number of troops abroad, however, the United States has to spend a huge amount of foreign currency and this becomes a heavy burden for U.S. imperialism already in the grip of a deepening financial and economic crisis. To lighten its burden, the United States has taken advantage of every opportunity to get its West European "allies" to pay more for the "common defence"; it has put pressure on West Germany in particular to provide more foreign exchange for the United States.

A two-year agreement signed between West Germany and the United States which expired on June 30 provided that Bonn contributed 750 million U.S. dollars annually, mainly through military purchases, to the maintenance of the U.S. troops.
stationed in West Germany. The current talks dating back to last September was to hammer out a new agreement. The United States demanded that West Germany increase the annual amount of its foreign exchange compensation to $60 million dollars, part of it gratuitous cash grants. Western news agency reports disclosed that the U.S. delegate to the negotiations asked West Germany to grant the United States an interest-free loan to help the latter solve the problem of its foreign exchange costs. But, to date, West Germany has only agreed to supply the United States with 500 million dollars in foreign exchange compensation annually through the purchase of U.S. military hardware and by other means.

With the long-drawn-out negotiations failing to produce results, the issue became one of the topics in the talks between West German Chancellor Willy Brandt and Nixon when Brandt visited the United States in mid-June. In the talks, Nixon stressed on June 15 that the European countries must voluntarily do something towards the maintenance of U.S. troops in Europe. But the same day, Brandt emphasized in a speech that the U.S. troops are in Europe “not only to defend the allies but also the United States.” Brandt indicated that the United States had no reason to ask for a greater contribution from its “allies.” AP reported that the issue was “so complex” that Nixon and Brandt could only agree not to discuss it and leave it to the experts. In a recent interview by a West German radio, Brandt again expressed discontent with the U.S. demand for a West German contribution. He said, “I cannot believe that the United States wants to give up its role as a world power. The fact of being a world power imposes, willy-nilly, certain burdens.”

West Germany is the United States’ “closest partner” in Western Europe. But the fact that negotiations between the two on foreign exchange compensation have been so prolonged shows that even West Germany, which used to follow hard on the heels of the United States, does not heed its voice so much today. This is a sharp decline in U.S. imperialism’s hegemony in Western Europe.