2. Do Arab or Jewish players seem to face more discrimination? Why might this be the case?

3. What are some of the obstacles the coaches and players face in order to play within their league? Where do those obstacles come from?

4. What reasons, if any, might the interviewed players have to downplay ethnic differences and the experiences of playing in sometimes hostile and violent environments?

**COMPARATIVE QUESTIONS**

1. How does each document in this chapter fit in an international context—drawing comparisons with, seeking independence from, or resolving conflicts between multiple countries? In each case, how is the author's own country situated among other countries, and why?

2. How do capitalism and religion work together—or against one another—in the Punjab and Shavit documents? How does the intersection of capitalism and religion affect the tone and content of each document?

3. What is the connection between nationalism and socialism evident in the Vietnamese declaration of independence and in Nasser's speech on the Suez Canal? How does nationalism work with or against socialism in each case?

4. What do the documents on China during and after Mao Zedong's rule—"Away from Madness" and "Building Socialism with Chinese Characteristics"—indicate about developments in modern Chinese history? How do you explain these developments?

5. Which of these documents seem most concerned with individual lives, and which with grand-scale geopolitics? Do any combine the two? Does each author seem to be more or less in control of his or her environment and self? How does this personal/political balance affect your reading of each document?

6. Each of the documents focuses on a particular aspect or aspects of modern identity. What are they in each case? What similarities and differences in the definition of citizen or human being do you detect across the documents?

---

**CHAPTER 33**

**The Global South: Latin America and Africa**

1945 to the Present

Following the global depression and the Second World War, a variety of Latin American movements and Africa nations sought to end Western colonial rule and regain control of their social, political, and economic futures. Some movements embraced new nationalist identities, while others focused on regional or even global alliances. In either case, Latin Americans and Africans fought for freedom from the colonial oppression of governments and multinational corporations who had long exploited their vast natural resources. Despite their inherently anticolonial nature, these movements were often embroiled in the global logic of the Cold War, as former colonies struggled to create independent identities between the poles of communist and capitalist influence. And while colonial governments have begun to accept the realities of decolonization, the legacy of dependence and conflict sown by Western imperialism continues to trouble Latin American and African nations today.

---

**DOCUMENT 33-1**

**PABLO NERUDA**

*From Canto General: “Standard Oil Co.” and “United Fruit Co.”*  
1950

behalf of the Chilean government to assist Spanish émigrés to Chile fleeing Fascism in their native country. His membership in the Chilean Communist Party and his support for Soviet leader Joseph Stalin (which he later recanted) won him as many enemies as supporters. Similarly, his support for the 1970 election of Marxist Salvador Allende as president of Chile earned him political persecution when Allende died in a coup d'état supported by the U.S. government and corporate interests. The two poems here, taken from his epic collection Canto General, present his attack on the multinational corporations that, along with U.S. government policy, played a major role in modern Latin American history.

**Standard Oil Co.**

When the drill bored down toward the story fissures and plunged its implacable intestine into the subterranean estates, and dead years, eyes of the ages, imprisoned plants' roots and scaly systems became strata of water, fire shot up through the tubes transformed into cold liquid, in the customs house of the heights, issuing from its world of sinister depth, it encountered a pale engineer and a title deed.

However entangled the petroleum's arteries may be, however the layers may change their silent site and move their sovereignty amid the earth's bowels, when the fountain gushes its paraffin foliage, Standard Oil arrived beforehand with its checks and its guns, with its governments and its prisoners.

Their obese emperors from New York are suave smiling assassins who buy silk, nylon, cigars, petty tyrants and dictators. They buy countries, people, seas, police, county councils, distant regions where the poor hoard their corn like misers their gold: Standard Oil awakens them, clothes them in uniforms, designates which brother is the enemy. The Paraguayan fights its war, and the Bolivian wastes away in the jungle with its machine gun.

A President assassinated for a drop of petroleum, a million-acre mortgage, a swift execution on a morning mortal with light, petrified, a new prison camp for subversives, in Patagonia, a betrayal, scattered shots beneath a petrolierous moon, a subtle change of ministers in the capital, a whisper like an oil tide, and zap, you'll see how Standard Oil's letters shine above the clouds, above the seas, in your home, illuminating their dominions.

---

1 Standard Oil Co.: A major U.S. oil and energy company at the end of the nineteenth century, considered a prime example of monopoly capitalism.

2 Paraguayan fights... Bolivian wastes away: Neruda refers to the Chaco War (1932-1935) between Paraguay and Bolivia and the role oil exploration and oil companies played therein.
United Fruit Co. 1
When the trumpet blared everything
on earth was prepared
and Jehovah [God] distributed the world
to Coca-Cola Inc., Anaconda,
Ford Motors and other entities:
United Fruit Inc.
reserved for itself the juiciest,
the central seaboard of my land,
America's sweet waist.
It rebaptized its lands
the "Banana Republics,"
and upon the slumbering corpses,
upon the restless heroes
who conquered renown,
freedom and flags,
it established the comic opera:
it alienated self-destiny,
regaled Caesar's crowns,
unsheathed envy, drew
the dictatorship of flies:
Trujillo flies, Tacho flies,
Carías flies, Martínez flies,
Ubico flies, 1 flies soaked
in humble blood and jam,
drunk flies that drone

over the common graves,
circus flies, clever flies
versed in tyranny.

Among the bloodthirsty flies
the Fruit Co. disembarks,
raiding coffee and fruits
for its ships that spirit away
our submerged lands' treasures
like serving trays.

Meanwhile, in the seaports' sugary abysses,
Indians collapsed, buried
in the morning mist:
a body rolls down, a nameless
thing, a fallen number,
a bunch of lifeless fruit
dumped in the rubbish heap.

READING AND DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. How does Neruda portray the representatives of the two companies? How does he portray the companies themselves?

2. How does the poet present citizens of Latin American countries? What about Latin American leaders?

3. How might Neruda's political affiliations color his presentation of foreign investment in Latin American economies? Does he seem to be writing from a political or a regional point of view — as a Communist, as a Latin American citizen, or both?

---

1 United Fruit Co.: An American producer of bananas, founded in 1899, that became a massive commercial and political presence in Central and South America. The company's influence on host governments — sometimes in cooperation with the U.S. government — inspired American author H. L. Mencken to coin the term 'banana republic.'

2 "Banana Republics": Countries that are heavily dependent on foreign capital and the production of one or a few exports. They are usually characterized by a corrupt government and exploitative labor practices.

3 Trujillo . . . Ubico: Rafael Trujillo (1891–1961), Anastasio ("Tacho") Somoza García (1896–1956), Tiburcio Carías Andino (1876–1909), Maximiliano Hernández Martínez (1882–1966), and Jorge Ubico (1878–1946) were all mid-twentieth-century Central American dictators who symbolized corruption, collusion with foreign business interests, brutal suppression of dissent, and often mass killings of citizens perceived to be a threat to their political interests.
That's not the problem, it really isn't. Why has the crisis been created? I have the following to say: That Soviet military personnel, which the U.S. government calls a brigade and we call Training Center Number 12, is a military installation which has been in Cuba for seventeen years—seventeen years! Their number and nature are similar to what they were seventeen years ago. This installation was set up after the October Crisis, in keeping with the spirit of the solution of the October Crisis and in line with the status quo created during the October Crisis. That is, it isn't anything new....

RATHER: Has there been any change in the nature of the Soviet troops in this country since that time?

CASTRO: There has been no change in the nature nor in the functions of the Soviet personnel in Cuba in the last seventeen years. That is the key to the matter.

Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and Ford were perfectly aware of the existence of this installation, and Carter had to know about it. It's impossible for them to have been unaware of it given that it's an installation which has existed for seventeen years in a country over which they have carried out hundreds of flights, where they have sent hundreds of espionage agents, a country in which the United States has used all its electronic means to discover what's going on. Who do they think is going to believe that they were unaware of the existence of this installation for seventeen years? Who do they expect to believe this? That's why I challenge Carter to explain the truth to the people of the United States and to world opinion and to say since when this alleged brigade has been here. Since when? He should say if it was set up under his own administration, during the Ford administration in 1976, during the Nixon administration in 1970, during the Johnson administration in 1965, or whether it has been here since October 1962. I think this is the key to the matter, and this is where the falsehood lies; in trying to make world opinion and U.S. opinion believe that the Soviet Union and Cuba have taken steps of a military nature to create a problem and create a crisis. That is the key to the issue.

RATHER: I agree that that's the key, and I can assure you that I believe President Carter tomorrow night is going to say to the American people...

---

*October Crisis: Also known as the Cuban Missile Crisis. In October 1962, the U.S. government became aware of the presence of Soviet nuclear weapons in Cuba. After a U.S. naval blockade and the negotiated secret reduction in U.S. missiles elsewhere, the crisis ended and the missiles in Cuba were removed.*
that the nature of the Soviet presence in Cuba has changed. That for the first time in his knowledge there is a Soviet combat brigade in Cuba—not a training brigade, but a combat brigade.

CASTRO: Well, if President Carter says tomorrow that there has been a change in the number, nature, or functions of the Soviet military personnel in Cuba since 1962, he will be telling a big lie to U.S. public opinion and to world opinion. Because I assert that there has been no change in their number, nature, or functions in the last seventeen years.

RATHER: There are reports circulating in Washington tonight that President Carter is sending a contingent of U.S. marines to Guantanamo, and the possibility of sending a U.S. aircraft carrier to the Caribbean Sea. This may be what President Carter will announce tomorrow night. Now, do you have any intelligence information indicating this is true?

CASTRO: My information is what has appeared in newspapers, in dispatches. We haven’t detected military movements with our means for some time.

RATHER: What is your reaction to that kind of attitude?

CASTRO: First of all, I think that what the United States should do, what Carter should do, is not create a crisis with no legal basis—no legal basis!—and no moral basis. I think the only thing the U.S. government should do is refrain from doing that, refrain from doing it because it means heading for conflicts and crises.

I think it would be much more constructive for Carter to announce the contrary: the willingness of the U.S. government to respect Cuba’s sovereignty; to end the economic blockade, which includes medicine, that it has maintained for twenty years; and to express its willingness to dismantle the Guantanamo base and withdraw its ships and troops from our waters and territory.

Now, what’s our reaction? We aren’t frightened by any of this. We’ve been subjected to this hostility on the

United States’s part for twenty years. They’re going to send soldiers to Puerto Rico? I don’t think Puerto Ricans will like that. They’re going to send soldiers to Key West? The tourists won’t like that. They’re going to send soldiers to Guantanamo? That will cost U.S. taxpayers more money. None of that will affect us; we won’t let ourselves be intimidated and we aren’t going to get nervous about the situation . . .

RATHER: Mr. President, I want to make very clear: you have flatly denied that there is a Soviet combat brigade in Cuba?

CASTRO: I’m not denying that there is Soviet military personnel in our country. What I’m saying is that it is exactly the same personnel, organized in the same way, as seventeen years ago. That is what I’m stating clearly and categorically. You call that Soviet personnel, or part of that Soviet personnel, a brigade and we call it a training center.

RATHER: Mr. President, how is the situation right now different from the October Crisis of 1962, if it is different?

CASTRO: It’s different in every sense.

First, during the 1962 crisis there was a real and objective danger of nuclear conflict; and that’s not the case now.

The October Crisis was a real crisis; this is a fabricated crisis. The October Crisis could have been a tragedy; this is a comedy.

Now then, during the October Crisis there were dozens of nuclear missiles here; there were more than forty thousand Soviet soldiers in Cuba, there were squadrons of IL-28 bombers. That’s the case now.

When a settlement of the October Crisis was reached, an agreement between the USSR and the United States—an agreement in which we did not participate and therefore to which we do not feel committed—when that agreement was reached, by virtue of which the Soviet Union decided to withdraw all those weapons in exchange for a guarantee that Cuba would not be invaded, the situation was different from what it is now. None of these problems exist now.

When Kennedy reached those agreements with Khrushchev, he was satisfied with the withdrawal of those weapons. It isn’t that he was right or that he had any right! Those are two different things. We didn’t agree then, but it was a different problem: there was a real threat to peace at that time. Kennedy was satisfied, Kennedy wasn’t concerned about the 2,000 or 3,000 Soviet military personnel left behind. Do you understand? He didn’t attach any importance to that.

I ask myself why Carter has revived the issue, why he has created a crisis. Why has Carter staged this comedy over 2,000 or 3,000
Soviet military personnel in Cuba? I want him to explain why, if Kennedy didn’t do so, nor Johnson, nor Nixon, nor Ford, why has Carter done so? How can he explain this? What’s the reason? What’s the justification?

He won’t get the people of the United States to believe that no U.S. president was aware of this. That’s like saying that the CIA doesn’t exist, that the government of the United States is absolutely misinformed about all problems.

There are two factors that explain this. First, the attempt to sabotage... the Sixth Summit. Second, the effort to improve Carter’s image and overcome the problems he is facing to be reelected. That, in my opinion, is the only explanation of why Carter has created this problem...

RATHER: Thank you, Mr. President, if you ask the Soviet troops to leave Cuba—all the troops—would they leave?

CAGSTRO: You talk of troops, I speak of Soviet military personnel. You speak of brigades and I of a training center, of a military installation.

Now that I’ve made this point what is your question?

RATHER: If you asked all the Russians on this island to leave—whatever you want to call them, military trainers—if you asked them to leave, would they leave?

CAGSTRO: Of course, there’s no doubt about it.

RATHER: You see, so many people in the United States question that.

CAGSTRO: But why?

RATHER: For one thing, President Carter has said that it isn’t true, that you’re a Soviet puppet, a satellite.

CAGSTRO: And in order to prove we’re not we have to ask the Soviet personnel to leave?

I think this is absurd. That statement is completely absurd. We have no intention of asking the Soviet personnel to leave Cuba, but it would be absurd to think that if we were to ask them to leave, they would want to stay.

That’s absurd. That’s inconceivable... What I am sure of, though, is that we have told the U.S. forces to leave Guantánamo and they haven’t. They are the only ones who are capable of staying in the territory of another country against the will of the people...

RATHER: Another question. This is a quote from a newspaper. I quote: “The Soviets have assumed that the presence of their troops in Cuba will discourage the United States from stopping any of Fidel Castro’s military adventures in this hemisphere.”

CAGSTRO: And what are Fidel Castro’s adventures in Latin America?

RATHER: Nicaragua.

CAGSTRO: What is it that makes Nicaragua Castro’s adventure? It was an adventure of the United States. It was the United States that intervened in Nicaragua, that set up the National Guard and installed Somoza in power and kept him there for forty years. It was the United States’ big adventure, not Cuba’s.

It wasn’t Cuba nor was it Cuban soldiers that overthrew the government of Nicaragua, that is, the Somoza dictatorship. It was the Sandinistas, the people of Nicaragua. And the United States itself recognizes this: President Carter recently met with representatives of the Nicaraguan government.

RATHER: Were you the principal arms supplier for the Nicaraguan rebels?

CAGSTRO: There is absolutely no proof of that. But I have no intention of answering that question.

RATHER: You asked what are Fidel Castro’s adventures in the Western Hemisphere referred to here. El Salvador?

CAGSTRO: I ask myself what they are referring to. What’s happening in El Salvador? There is a corrupt, tyrannical, genocidal government, and the people are no longer willing to tolerate the regime. Why must we be blamed for that?

RATHER: Because you were training the people, you are supplying the arms, the money...

CAGSTRO: I think that the United States is the one that has trained all those armies— the one in Chile that murders the people, the one in Uruguay that has killed thousands of Uruguayans, Somoza’s army, and that of El Salvador—the United States has trained and equipped all the genocidal governments in this hemisphere, not Cuba.

---

*Nicaragua: In July 1979, then-president of Nicaragua, Anastasio Somoza, was overthrown by the Sandinista Socialist Party. The Somoza family, which exercised repressive power and was criticized for brutal human rights abuses and corruption, had ruled Nicaragua since the 1930s with the strong backing of the U.S. government, although Carter withdrew some support for Somoza during his term in office.

Sixth Summit: The Sixth Conference of Heads of State of Nemaigned Countries, held September 3–9, 1979, in Havana, Cuba.
If we were to help the revolutionaries we would have the right to do so, but I'm not going to say here that we are doing so. That is our affair and not a matter to be discussed on television.

CASTRO: I neither confirm it nor deny it; I proclaim it as a right, furthermore, as a duty.

RATHER: So many Americans — set aside the government — not President Carter, not Mr. Brezhinski, but American people, rank-and-file people, believe, many of them believe, that Cuba is a nuclear pistol pointed at their heads.

CASTRO: A nuclear pistol?

RATHER: Pointed at their heads.

CASTRO: I think the people of the United States are too intelligent to believe such a thing. Who could have convinced the people to believe such a thing?

We have no nuclear weapons. I said that on Friday. It's not that we don't have the right to; we don't relinquish that right. We'll relinquish that right when all countries of the world renounce nuclear weapons.

But the only country that could supply us with nuclear weapons is the Soviet Union, and on this issue the Soviet Union worked out an agreement with the United States. As a result, we have no possibility of having nuclear weapons.

REFERENCES

Mr. Brezhinski: Zbigniew Kazimierz Brezhinski (b. 1928) was Jimmy Carter's National Security Advisor from 1977 to 1981.


I SHOULD LIKE IT TO BE WELL UNDERSTOOD THAT IN FRANCE'S POLICY TOWARD ALGERIA, THE FOLLOWING ESSENTIAL IDEA MUST BE FACED SQUARELY: IN THE WORLD OF TODAY AND IN THE TIMES IN WHICH WE LIVE, FRANCE HAS NO INTEREST WHATSOEVER IN MAINTAINING UNDER HER JURISDICTION AND UNDER HER DEPENDENCE AN ALGERIA WHICH WOULD CHOOSE ANOTHER DESTINY, AND IT WOULD NOT BE IN FRANCE'S INTEREST TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE POPULATION OF AN ALGERIA WHICH WOULD HAVE BECOME MASTER OF ITS OWN FATE AND WOULD HAVE NOTHING TO OFFER IN EXCHANGE FOR WHAT IT WOULD ASK. THE FACT IS THAT, TO SAY THE LEAST, ALGERIA COSTS US MUCH MORE THAN IT IS WORTH TO US. WHETHER IN THE MATTER OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, ECONOMIC INVESTMENTS, SOCIAL WELFARE, CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT, OR THE MANY OBLIGATIONS WITH REGARD TO THE MAINTENANCE OF LAW AND ORDER — WHAT WE FURNISHED TO IT IN EFFORT, MONEY, AND HUMAN ABILITY HAS NO Counterpart THAT ANYWHERE NEARLY APPROACHES IT.

It must in the same way be realized that France’s present responsibilities in Algeria constitute heavy military and diplomatic burdens for her. And that is why France would consider today with the greatest calm a solution whereby Algeria would cease to be a part of France — a solution which in former times might have seemed disastrous for us but which, I say it again, we consider with a perfectly calm mind.

There are people who will say: “But it is the rebellion which leads you to think in this way.” . . . It is not this that makes me speak as I do; I do not deny that the events which have occurred, which are occurring in Algeria have confirmed what I have thought and demonstrated for more than twenty years, without any joy of course — and you can well understand why — but with the certainty of serving France well.

Since Brazzaville, I have not ceased to affirm that the populations dependent on us should have the right to self-determination. In 1941, I granted independence to the mandated States of Syria and Lebanon. In 1945, I gave all Africans, including Algerian Moslems, the right to vote. In 1947, I approved the Statute of Algeria which, if it had been applied, would probably have led to the progressive institution of an Algerian State Associated with France. I agreed that the protectorate treaties concerning Tunisia and Morocco should be approved. In 1958, having resumed leadership, I, along with my Government, created the Community and later recognized and aided the independence of the young States in Black Africa and Madagascar. Not having returned to power in time to prevent the Algerian insurrection, immediately upon my return I proposed to its leader to conclude the peace of the brave and to open political talks . . . and I and my government have not ceased to act in order to promote a Moslem leadership in Algeria and to put the Moslems in a position to take local affairs into their own hands, until such time as they are able to take over on the government level . . .

In conclusion, what does this add up to: to decolonization. But if I have undertaken and pursued this task for a long time, it is not only because we could foresee and later because we witnessed the vast movement toward freedom which the world war and its aftermath unleashed in every corner of the globe, and which the rival bids of the Soviet Union and America did not fail to emphasize. I have done it also, and especially, because it seemed to me contrary to France’s present interests and new ambition to remain bound by obligations and burdens which are no longer in keeping with the requirements of her strength and influence . . .

Moreover, this is true for others as well. It must be recognized that in the great transformation which is taking place from one end of the universe to the other, the itchings for independence of erstwhile dominated peoples and also the incitements thrown out by all the demagogues of the world are not the only motivating forces. There is another which is not always very clearly perceived. . . . We French built our empire at a time when our internal activities had reached a sort of ceiling — an industry which was not breaking any new ground, an agriculture which was not making any changes, trade channels which were fixed, salaries and wages unchanged, practically stereotyped budgets, gold currency, interest rates at 3%, etc. On the other hand, our old ambitions of European hegemony and natural frontiers were countered by the treaties of 1815 and, after 1870, by the unity and strength of a threatening Germany. Then we sought in distant extensions a new role for the surplus of our enterprising abilities, a complement to our prestige and soldiers for our defense.

France does not have to be at all sorry for what she has achieved overseas in this capacity and in this form. I have said it often and I repeat: it constitutes a great human accomplishment which — notwithstanding certain abuses and errors and despite all the endless spotting of all sorts of worthless demagogues — will forever be a credit to France. But how many things have changed today.

Now our great national ambition is our own national progress, constituting a real source of power and influence. Now the modern era permits

---

8 Brazzaville: De Gaulle and some forty colonial administrators attended the Brazzaville Conference in French West Africa in 1944. No Africans participated, and independence was not discussed. The conference proposed a number of reforms in the French African colonies.

9 Statute of Algeria . . . France: Algerians were given the right to vote for members of the three assemblies that met in 1946 to determine the constitutional framework of postwar Algeria. However, voting was weighted in such a way as to guarantee French dominance of the assemblies.

10 Having resumed leadership in June 1958, French president René Coty asked de Gaulle to handle the Algerian situation.

11 The Community: The French Community was a plan proposed by de Gaulle in 1958, according to which French colonies, primarily in Africa, would continue to receive French economic and technical aid and would gain control of their internal affairs.

12 Treaties of 1815 . . . 1870: A treaty approved at the Congress of Vienna (1815) essentially returned France to its preservational borders. The Treaty of Paris (1870), which followed the French defeat by the Germans in the Franco-Prussian War, resulted in the French loss of the border region of Alsace and most of Lorraine.
us, compels us, to undertake a vast development. Now for this development to succeed we must first of all employ the means and resources at our disposal on our own behalf, in our own country. All the more so as we need these means and resources to ensure our own defense and that of our neighbors against the greatest imperialism that the world has ever known — the imperialism of the Soviet Union. We also need these means to win out in the tremendous economic, technical, and social struggle now under way between the forces of humanity and the forces of slavery [i.e., the Cold War].

It is a fact: our interest, and consequently our policy, lies in decolonization. Why should we continue to cling to costly, bloody, and fruitless domination when our country has to undergo complete renovation, when all the underdeveloped countries, beginning with those which yesterday were our dependencies and which today are our favorite friends, ask for our aid and our assistance? But this aid and this assistance — why should we extend them if it is not worthwhile, if there is no cooperation, if what we give finds no return? Yes, it is a matter of exchange, because of what is due us, but also because of the dignity of those with whom we are dealing...

Some people say, "What would happen to these territories if France withdrew? They would straightaway fall into misery and chaos, until Communism took over." That is, no doubt, what would happen to them, but then we would no longer have any duty toward them other than to pity them.

Some people say also, "Either the Soviet Union or the United States -- or both at once -- would try to take France's place in the territories from which she withdrew." My answer is: I wish both of them a lot of fun.

But it is also possible that the Algerian populations — through self-determination, while deciding on the institution of a sovereign State — will express their desire to see the new Algeria associated with the new France. In such an event, it would have to be known on both sides what this actually meant. That is why a solution should be submitted to the vote of the Algerian people — pending ratification by the French people — a solution agreed upon beforehand by the Government and the different political elements in Algeria, the rebels in particular. France would undoubtedly be willing to lend her economic, administrative, financial, cultural, military, and technical aid to the young Mediterranean State, provided the organic cooperation between the Algerian communities, preferential conditions for economic and cultural exchange, and finally the bases and facilities necessary for our defense, are assured and guaranteed....

Naturally we are anxious that, once peace has been re-established and civil liberties restored, the populations may sincerely choose their destiny. After which, if it is not in vain, France will undoubtedly be led, by her heart and her reason, to give her aid and friendship.

That is what I wanted to say about Algeria.

READING AND DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. What reasons does de Gaulle present to support his statement that it is not in France's interest to hold on to Algeria?
2. How does de Gaulle counter charges that his decision to support independence was prompted by Algerian insurrections?
3. What role does de Gaulle say World War II played in decolonization?
4. According to de Gaulle, what are the differences between France's goals in building its overseas empire and the country's goals in 1961?

---

**Kwame Nkrumah**

*Speech on the Tenth Anniversary of the Convention People's Party*

1960

Kwame Nkrumah (1909–1972) was the first president of the Republic of Ghana. While an important voice for Ghanaian nationalism, he stressed the larger ideal of pan-Africanism and was a founding member of the Organization of African Unity. In 1949, Nkrumah founded the Convention People's Party to mobilize for the independence of Ghana, then called the Gold Coast. Nkrumah practiced increasingly autocratic rule; he imprisoned political enemies and declared himself president for life in 1964. He lost his position in a coup d'état in 1966. Despite this, he continues to be upheld as

*Selected Speeches of Kwame Nkrumah*, ed. Samuel Obeng. 3 vols. (Accra, Ghana: Afram, 1997), 1-4–12,
a powerful voice for African unity and development. The speech excerpted here, which was delivered to his Convention People's Party, reflects his sense of the challenges and opportunities facing the African continent in the post-colonial era.

Coming to the international scene, I must emphasise that our Party's foreign policy continues to be based upon positive neutrality and non-alignment. We are convinced that by our policy of non-alignment we are able to speak our minds frankly and without fear or favour on issues as they arise. Our policy is not a negative one. Positive neutrality and non-alignment does not mean keeping aloof from the conflicts of the world powers. On the contrary, it means a positive stand based on our own convictions completely uninfluenced by any of the power blocs. We believe that we could help to bridge the unfortunate and undesirable gap between the so-called East and West blocs by not aligning ourselves to either side. We hold the view that as to the issues between them, neither bloc can claim to be permanently right or permanently wrong. As such, it will not be in the interest of international understanding and unity for us and the other independent states of Africa to involve ourselves in the disputes of the power blocs by taking sides. We should be free to take our stand without previously commiting ourselves to any bloc on any matters which affect the peace, progress and, indeed, the destiny of Africa. We believe that it would be suicidal to involve ourselves in the disputes of the great powers by taking sides. We will continue to cultivate and maintain friendly relations with all countries, and to be enemy to none.

Concerning Africa, the Convention People's Party has shown the light and the people will surely find the way. We are proud of our achievements in this regard, and we make no apologies whatsoever to anyone for the role the Party has played, and continues to play, in pursing the cause of independence and unity of Africa. We shall continue to give encouragement, comfort and support to the nationalist movements for independence, which are now developing in many parts of the African continent.

One of the cardinal tenets of our policy is to see all Africa free from foreign rule, for we believe that freedom for Africans on their native continent of Africa is essential for world peace. The great wave of nationalism at present sweeping Africa is a fact which should be recognised; it is a force that no one can hold in check.

To meet the challenge of nationalism and to prepare colonial territories on a planned basis for independence based on the principle of "one man one vote," it is important that target dates acceptable to the countries concerned should be agreed upon as soon as possible. Ghana believes that the peoples of the territories will measure up to the responsibilities demanded by the prospects of self-rule and that they themselves will propose a realistic timetable.

Whether the protagonists of colonialism like it or not, and whatever will be their machinations, African nationalism will not budge an inch until the whole of Africa is free from foreign domination. Africa is in rebellion against oppression and discrimination and is now a continent to be reckoned with. It will be even more so in the next decade before us....

All over the continent of Africa, the Africans are beginning to assert their right to govern themselves, and everywhere in Africa today there is a determined demand for complete independence and unity.

The colonial powers have now been compelled to recognise the force of African nationalism and they have now realised that it is absolutely impossible and, in fact, unrealistic on their part to resist the rising tide of nationalism in Africa.

The imperialists faced with this new situation in Africa are now talking about the granting of independence to "our overseas territories." But we must be sure that the independence which they now promise is the real one — for any independence which makes the territory still economically dependent on the colonial power is not real.

We must be vigilant, for colonialism and imperialism may come to Africa in different guises. We must therefore alert ourselves to be able to recognise this whenever and wherever it rears its head, and prepare ourselves to fight against it, for it is only with the complete interment of imperialism and colonialism that Africa will be free from menace and able to live and breathe in full liberty where not only men of colour everywhere but also men of all races shall walk with their heads high in human dignity.

As I have said, the colonial powers and their imperialist allies are beginning to advance a new subtle theory — and a disguised one, at that — to safeguard their position in Africa and to beguile and bamboozle the Africans. They are prepared to grant political independence but, at the same time, they are also planning to continue to dominate the African territories in the economic field by establishing control over the economic life of the newly independent African countries. There is no difference between political imperialism and economic imperialism.

By these methods, the enemies of African freedom hope to be able to use the new African States as puppets to continue to dominate Africa,
while, at the same time, making the Africans to believe that they are, in fact, free and independent.

This new type or concept of independence has been described as “international independence” and it is now the new slogan which is being preached in many colonial territories in Africa.

Under certain conditions, the colonial powers are prepared even now to grant independence to many of their territories. As independent states, these territories are supposed to acquire international personality and establish diplomatic relations with other states and also have representation in the various international organisations, including the United Nations.

Once this stage has been reached, the devil of colonialism will put all its energies into establishing control over the foreign relations and policies of the new African States, and thus make it difficult or even impossible for the African people to work together to establish a Union of African States.

The new policy or concept of “conditional independence,” which the colonial powers are now planning to adopt, is a policy which is intended to create several weak independent states in Africa. These States are designed to be so weak and unstable in the organisation of their national economies and administrations that they will be compelled by internal as well as external pressures to continue to depend upon the colonial powers who have ruled them for several years. The weaker and the less stable an African State is, the easier it is for the colonial power concerned to continue to dominate the affairs and fortunes of the new State, even though it is supposed to have gained independence.

This policy of creating several unstable and weak, but none-the-less independent states in Africa, was the same policy adopted by the Great Powers at the Congress of Vienna which balkanised Eastern Europe. It is now an indisputable historical fact that the creation of the small independent States in Europe provided the fertile soil out of which developed the national jealousies, dissensions and disputes which culminated in the First and Second World Wars....

We believe that considerations of mutual security and prosperity of our people demand that all the independent States in Africa should work together to create a Union of African States. We are aware of the various plans of the colonial powers and the enemies of African freedom to check the movement for independence and unity of Africa. We are determined not to fall victims to these plans.

We ask all African nationalists, wherever they are throughout the continent, to be vigilant and to watch out for the new forces of colonial domination, which are now being released to stem the tide of African nationalism and to destroy the efforts of the African movements for independence and unity...

The imperialists know that a union of independent States of Africa will be a force to be reckoned with in world politics. They are aware of the tremendous impact a free and united Africa can have on all aspects of world affairs.

They would prefer an Africa balkanised into small states which will dissipate their energies and efforts in fruitless rivalries among themselves. For they know that independence without unity can still give them room in our continent to perpetuate economic imperialism and racial discrimination. It is therefore plain common sense and in Africa’s own interest that the attainment of national independence by new African nations should be accompanied by the evolution of an African personality within an African community...

In this connection I appeal to you, the people of Ghana — especially to the youth — to play our dutiful part in this crusade to liberate and unite Africa. We must learn to love and serve Ghana and Africa. We must be imbued with a deep sense of patriotism for our country and inspired by an equally deep sense of mission to work for Africa’s emancipation.

What must be in the long run unite Africa is not only the ultimate but certain victory over the common foreign domination of our continent. What should unite Africa is the deep love for our continent and our determination to serve it loyally. What must unite the continent of Africa is an ideology — our common Africanism.

READING AND DISCUSSION QUESTIONS
1. How does Nkrumah link Ghanaian policies with world affairs?
2. What threats from the international community does Nkrumah identify?
3. How might political independence be a negative thing for African nations?