AFRICAN IDEOLOGIES AND PARTY STRUCTURE

by

Onésimo Silveira
SCHEME

INTRODUCTION

I. PRE-IDEOLOGICAL PERIOD

II. IDEOLOGIES
   Messianic Movements
   Panafrikanism
   Du Bois and Panafrikanism
   The Manchester Congress (1945)
   Panafrikanism and Consciencism: Nkrumah
   Cultural Panafrikanism: Azikiwe & Kenyatta
INTRODUCTION

The subject of African ideologies and Party structure has absorbed the attention of many experts, both African and non-African, especially since the end of the last World War. The results achieved so far, in our opinion, are far from doing justice to such an important subject. The present essay, because of its brevity, cannot be exhaustive and even if it were, we would not claim that we were able to achieve better results than those which had been obtained by previous research. The literature we will use is that already known to students of African problems. In spite of this, we will force ourselves to use a new approach. This approach takes into consideration not only political doctrines and ideologies forged in Western countries, but also deals with, what seems to us, to be a characteristically African approach to Politics.

In the era when the African peoples are, for the first time, obliged to live within new political contexts and territorial areas, in a new form of social relationship, which is to say, they are living as nations, totally new factors are brought into play.
I - PRE-IDEOLOGICAL PERIOD

In his work *Brève Histoire Contemporaine de l'Afrique Noire*, the author Louis C.D. Joos presents us with a periodisation of African history which is not lacking in interest to an African.¹ According to Joos, the history of Africa is to be divided as follows:

(1) The dark centuries 1603-1804
(2) The African resurgence 1804-1876
(3) Africa shared out 1876-1890
(4) Colonialism conquers 1890-1907
(5) The success of colonialism 1907-1937
(6) Colonialism disturbed 1937-1956
(7) Towards independence 1956-1963

According to such a periodisation, the history of Africa began with the arrival of the first European settlers, an idea which is quite different from the concept of European history, including Ancient Greece and Rome. Europeans completely accept the idea that their cultural heritage, consists not only, of their own European values, but also, those which they absorbed from the Greeks, Romans, Arabs, Indians and others.
Apart from these reasons for contesting the above periodisation, the following one can also be advanced: a lack of objectivity in the relationship of the structure of the periodisation to the facts it presumes to classify. This lack of objectivity has a dual aspect. Firstly, the periodisation is patterned on the model of European history and one invoking "darkness", "renaissance", "centralisation" and "decay" which has been rejected by recent historians at that. Secondly, the above periodisation differs from the basis of the periodisation of the history of Europe, in that European history is intrinsically described in terms of Europe i.e. of itself, while African history is described in European terms i.e. extrinsically.

The most elementary logic would make it at least reasonable to expect that a European historian would profit from a study of the historical stages of European development and then, in turn, to apply them to Africa. This has not happened, and it is clear that if it has not, it is because Joos feels in a strong enough position to construct an African history and even to decide when such a history began. In spite of the shortcomings of the periodisation which we are discussing and which is not only reactionary in its conception, but also, in its method of approaching the realities of the African situation, we will
existence of very reliable works on African "prehistory" which have been written in the last few decades by honest European intellectuals, for whom the destiny of Africa, is no longer correlated to the idea of "discovery", but to the very idea of studying a given man in his given environment. The works of Sheik Anta Diop, an African, Hubert Deschamps and Basil Davidson are reliable sources for an objective study of Africa, although they do not cover the problems of the pre-colonial history of all the continent. The pre-ideological Africa to which we refer in this essay, is to some extent Africa south of the Sahara, which more or less corresponds to the geographical areas which had never known any other form of political organisation than the tribe before the arrival of the colonialists. There are, of course, the important exceptions of the kingdoms of Ghana, Benin and Mali, significant examples of "pre-developed" countries. Africa north of the Sahara, under the rule of Islam, in the form of a loose federation of Caliphas, knew well a form of state constituting a sort of supranation long before the arrival of the colonialists.

In the history of pre-colonial Africa, the period beginning with the arrival of the first European settlers is very important. This period is characterised by the super-imposition of
basis of their racial "superiority" and "civilising mission".

The role played by force in causing the submission of the African populations throws further light on the nature of "discovery", for the very fact that force was exerted, shows that the African populations did offer resistance, albeit ineffectively, and, apart from any considerations of dignity, this ineffective resistance is a clear resistance of a society against a force opposing the dynamic of its development. Portuguese, English, German and finally Belgian colonialists offered many rationalisations for their colonial enterprise but religion, force and exploitation, both of man and resources, are their common denominators.

Politically, the history of pre-ideological Africa is not only the history of tribal organisation and development. The kingdoms of the Congo, Mali and Ghana in the West, and the city states of the Eastern seaboard, such as Mombasa and Kilwa are examples of advanced political organisations, which for centuries, resisted foreign domination, in spite of their lack of power in military terms. This lack of military power is, to some extent, evidence of the high state of culture attained in Africa, because the form of social organisation prevalent in the Eastern seaboard is
The distinction between several so-called types of colonialism regarding the role of violence in forcing the populations to submit, though it does not fulfil any useful analytical function in distinguishing, say Portuguese colonialism from British or Belgian, does demonstrate very clearly socio-economic differences in the structures and strengths of the colonialist countries themselves. Here again African history is a mirror of European history, but in this case, the mirror shows a true image and not one as seen in a distorting mirror.

It is quite irrelevant to know which country first began colonising Africa. However, it is highly relevant to study the relationship between the colonising countries with the colonised people on one hand, and among the colonising countries on the other. As we stated before, pre-ideological Africa was in a state of dynamic political development before the arrival of the colonisers. Money, although it was not quite unknown in Africa, had a totally different function there than it had in Europe. A system of exchange of commodities constituting a barter economy was successfully practised. In the political hierarchy, the links between chiefs and the people were kept harmonious and the solution of problems between different tribes was carried out, in most cases, in a manner which respected the
In this nexus the usual symbol of colonialism, the sword and the cross, is in our opinion, and after a careful thought about its underlying purpose, only partially true. We do not accept that the sword was aimed at pacification and the cross at religious conversion. Above all, there is no conflict of religions, no conflict of races. In all cases, these two types of pseudo-conflicts, implicitly or explicitly, mask an underlying economic conflict. It is not for nothing that all oppressors claim the superiority of their races and of their religions.

These European economic motives were, that large urban conglomerations of people faced the national governments with the novel problems posed by the development of the market economy. This created new demands for semi-precious commodities, such as spices on one hand, and the need for an accelerated circulation of money, in the interests of the new rising merchant class, on the other.

Let us take a still more concrete example of the predominance of economic necessity as the basic motivation of colonialism. It is beyond doubt that Great Britain was economically, and consequently, given European conditions, militarily the most powerful colonial power from the seventeenth century onwards.
tion for colonial "liberalism" aiming at the preparation for the colonised peoples for self-government illustrates the self-confidence of British colonial power in its military strength.

The ferocity of colonial repression in Africa or another colony, is proportional to the military weakness of the colonising power at home in Europe, and conversely, restraint in the use of colonial repression is proportional to the military strength that a given power wielded in Europe. He who was a lamb in Europe, became a lion in Africa.

This, is the all too visible psychological response to an economic stimulus. Here, we have a clear demonstration of the instability of religion and race as factors in colonisation. The colonisers give different manifestations, of their religious or racial convictions, according to whether, they are at home, or whether they are in the colonies. So, we see, that the myth of so-called White Man’s Burden, which makes him take on the responsibility, of civilising the coloured pagan savage, is a clear instance of the psychological mechanism known as projection. The construct of this myth, once again constitutes, an example of Africa, as a mirror for Europe. It is a mirror which shows the European the savage and "pagan" side of himself,
At the time it was thought, that the resistance of the colonised, had been broken, and that the colonising powers, were entering the Golden Age of Exploitation. European laissez-faire capitalism, had reached its zenith at home, both in terms of breath and depth, so that it had only one possibility of further increasing the volume of its surplus value. This only possibility, in effect, was to add to the number of the exploited, in terms of quantity, by, in effect, recruiting the colonial population to the ranks of the proletariat. Such a "proletariat" presented qualitative possibilities of exploitation beyond the capitalists wildest dreams.

It is by no means co-incidental, that the advent of a "liberal" laissez-faire capitalism, was followed by the abolition of slavery. It is obvious, that the changes introduced into the European economy, would be followed up by the concomitant involvement of the colonial population within the framework of the European economy. From being a simple token of exchanges, in the beginning, to becoming a simple producer later, it is clear, that in the face of a laissez-faire market, the best use that could be made of the colonial African, was to convert him into a consumer. It is this that basically explains the abolition of slavery and not the alleged liberal and humanitarian reasons,
Those, who advanced the theory that the development of Christianity was the basis of abolition of slavery, forget that such a development, was in itself but a mere development of the economic process of European countries.

It is widely held e.g. by Joos⁴ that the main role in the abolition of slavery was played by the Christian religion, and that economic consideration, were also contributing factors. We must take care not to, in the words of George Bernard Shaw, empty the baby out with the bath water, by rejecting this explanation out of hand, and without further examination, or, on the other hand, by uncritically accepting the above view.

A careful examination of the nexus between the economy, the state, and the Church, shows us that it was considerations of economic expediency which motivated the state, which in turn used the Church as its instrument, in the work of eliminating a worn-out mode of production, namely slavery. The Church-before-economic theory is a typical example of what in Marxist terminology, is regarded, as the inversion of the roles of the suprastructure and the infrastructure in the language of the bourgeoisie, a form of words which is the reversed image of the nations such language is alleged to describe.
regarded as enemies, in the spirit of: no fraternity, then no equality or liberty for you either, brother.

These ideas of the French Revolution, Liberty, Fraternity, Equality, could never change the economy, of whose internal conditions, they were a consequence. This is proved by the fact that the French Revolution and the infant United States, which directly imitated its principles, (except for the one vital fact that it maintained the institutions of slavery, because, for the time being, it was economically forced to) were able, within a quarter of a century, to sign the Louisiana Purchase, which sold the territory of Louisiana and the people in it, in flagrant violation of the allegedly "humanitarian" principles of the constitutions of both liberal countries. It must, however, be underlined, that this breach between theory and practice occurred without the slightest discontinuity, in the political evolution of either state. Moreover, from this historical situation to the institution of French colonialism and subsequent Imperialism, in one case, and to the present role of the USA, in becoming custodian of the Japanese Empire of the Second World War in the other case, is but a tiny step along a logical path of political evolution. The historical lesson being: that, bourgeois revolution, is evolution, and is not
The first contacts between the European colonising powers and the African peoples are an extraordinary source of historical insights, the profundity of which transcends the understanding of even the most fervent opponents of domination of man by man, in a word of exploitation. Many approaches by conservatives, to the analysis of the evolutionary path towards revolution, have been made, in order to explain the colonial phenomenon in Africa. It is nevertheless our conviction, that the use of an African as a piece of money, in the early stages of Afro-European contact, later as a slave, and in the third stage as a "free" colonised man, are graphic examples of the development of colonised countries. The abolition of slavery, which, as we said earlier, marks the first stage of colonisation in Africa, is far from being a gift, very far. To return something one has stolen, from someone, can never be a donation to him.

Ever since Greek and Roman times, slavery has never, for long, proved to be a successful enterprise, whether in its economic, social or cultural implications. Max Weber (1864-1920) in his *General Economic History* analyses the institution of slavery in Greece and Rome and suggests that some of the underlying economic causes of the collapses of both societies, can be attributed, to the failure of slavery. Slavery, having become the cornerstone of the Roman economy, deteriorated as a result of the economic depression.
of the collapse of the Roman Empire. The situation in Greece was similar, ending in the disastrous economic pressure to cross the Indus.

Slavery was and will be always everywhere, in Lenin's words, a colossus with feet of clay; a selfdestructive dragon which sows the seeds of its own destruction.
II - IDEOLOGIES

Most students of African problems: anthropologists, sociologists, politicians and historians in general, all over the World, agree, in assigning to the political awakening of Africa, an important place in World affairs of the first half of our century. This fact, is due to the tremendous political changes, that since 1945, have continually shaken every corner of Africa, at a speed never before observed in the history of any other continent. In order to understand the facts connected with these changes, it is not only necessary, but indispensible, to study every implication of the currents of thought observed in the first half of our century. With them or without them, the historical processes of change in Africa would still be a reality, because, as a matter of fact, we are here confronted by a historical process, which can be retarded or accelerated, but never stopped. But the consequences of the political changes in Europe and of the revolution and evolution seen in Europe, in the first half of this century, influenced Africa tremendously, in the sense that these European events have been responsible for the increase in the political consciousness of the population of Africa. This increase in the level of political consciousness in Africa is one of the most powerful driving forces in the direction of achieving both freedom and dignity.
independently of their own wishes, willy-nilly, resulted in an alienation which was at once superficial and profound. The very shallowness of the European gloss they acquired had an effect on themselves and their relationships with Africans who were not "been tos", which was, to use the terminology of Physics, a resonance effect, in that a small cause had a colossal effect. This was manifested in a relationship with the people in the colonies, whom they were to defend, of charismatic and aristocratic leaders, a relationship in which the people would see in their own leaders white superiority in a black skin.

The parallelism so generated and developed between the aspirations for independence of those Africans living in the colonies and the leaders, educated in European university towns, would later prove to be a gap, which even the most brilliant and best prepared leaders would be quite unable to bridge. African leaders and intellectuals, have very frequently, been blamed for this fact. But if we go beyond any form of prejudice towards them, favourable or otherwise, we must state that if we take a historical view of acculturation, i.e. cultural conditioning, we cannot see how it would be possible for them to escape the influence of the environment into which they were transplanted, or how they could avoid the historical determinism implicit in it.
dialectical experience by isolating them within the limits of the green grass of the academy.

On the whole, the reaction of the intellectuals, as individuals, and the reaction of the African population as such, are integrated in a broad attitude of rejection which shows that since the beginning of the century there have been clear signs of the need for reconstructing, in order to allow the elimination of colonialism to be put into effect. In order to grasp the genesis of several anti-colonial ideologies which bloom in a more or less organised form, we need to go back to 1890, which date marks the appearance of the so called African Separatist Church.

**Messianic Movements**

Students of African politics, have, until now, paid very limited attention to the phenomenon of the African Separatist Church. Either they are ignorant of it, or if they know of it, they almost totally ignore it. However, the appearance of the Negro Church is intrinsically related to the messianic movements, which, until now, have been widespread in South and in Central Africa and, sporadically, among the people of the Gulf of Guinea. So far, it is only students of social anthropology, who have
messianic movements are of a subversive nature and receive their inspiration from ideas which are alien to the African continent.

The viewpoint of Georges Balandier, which Silva Cunha quotes several times, is quite different. Balandier offers the following penetrating insights: "One of the most characteristic phenomena of socio-cultural change occurring during the colonial period in numerous societies of Christian Black Africa is the appearance of messianic Christian movements which gave rise to a more or less ephemeral Negro Church. Although they are outwardly religious, these movements rapidly develop a political aspect; they are at the origin of nationalisms which are still unsophisticated but unequivocal in their expression. For example, the Zulu revolt in 1906 in South Africa revealed the connection between Bantu prophetism and the rise of national consciousness".7

The approach of Silva Cunha is that of a scholar emprisoned within the ideological framework of a governmental machine, that of Lisbon in this case, to which nationalism is nothing less than a subversive word. On reading his book, the reader can detect the labyrinth of contradiction that constitutes the intellectual world of the author. After saying that...
The messianic movements within the Negro Church constitute a peculiar separatism. Here, Blacks and Whites, i.e. colonised and colonialists are both presumed to be confronted by a divine code, the Bible, transgression against which, is supposed to be beyond the scope of the colonialist code. The differences and similarities of the two interpretations of this common divine code which the Bible constitutes are most revealing. Both the Mission Church and the Negro Church set the Bible in their home environment and populate it with themselves. The Negro Church has a literal belief in the Bible, preaches damnation, preaches racial equality or black superiority, regards the Mission Church as, so to speak, revisionist and, above all, the Negro Church believes in a delivery from suffering in this life, i.e. now. On the other hand, the Mission Church regards the Bible as too difficult for the understanding of the layman, i.e. regards its parishioners as too stupid to understand it, at least tacitly accepts the construct of white superiority and supremacy, believes in pardon, regards the Negro Church as, so to speak, a simplest form of infantile leftism and preaches the idea of salvation in Heaven, i.e. later.

Apparently, and only apparently, this conflict is religious, or for that matter racial. Religion has become a platform which offers the contenders the following opportunities: for the
Negro Church taught that of damnation, which had the consequence, that the teaching of the Negro Church, in all moments of their daily life, governed the behaviour of its members outside church, while, the Mission Church, for so many of its members, was a Sunday affair, of washing the hands of the blood they had shed during the rest of the week.

The force that the colonial establishment systematically used against the Negro Church, was never presented in the light of a measure for the protection of religion, but only, as a means for the preservation of "law & order", i.e. for maintaining the status quo. If on the other hand, the Negro Church was never seen by the colonial powers as a manifestation of nationalism (a refusal shared by most students of African affairs), it is because it was not in their interests to recognise a fact whose consequences they refused to accept and act upon.

The problem of messianic movements is not restricted to Africa. In his study of *Acculturation in seven Amerindian Tribes*, the anthropologist Ralph Linton describes such movements "as a relatively common consequence of relations of domination and submission". Max Weber, in his analyses of prophetic messianism interprets the phenomenon "as a reaction against frustration". But it is Georges Balandier who offers an explanation which
cultur: in order to take a stand \textit{vis-à-vis} the Europeans. As we stated above, the subject of messianism has not until now, received the attention it merits from politicians. But as visionary theorising (and as an ideology in itself) it is only logical to regard it as underlying all other African ideologies.

**Panafriicanism**

From 1850 onwards the socio-economic situation of the North of the United States began to undergo a slight transformation of its form. In 1852 Harriet Beecher Stowe published \textit{Uncle Tom's cabin} or \textit{Life among the Lowly} in book form. It had previously been published serially in the magazine \textit{National Era}, an anti-slavery periodical published in Washington D.C. John Brown, the hero of the famous song, who was a settler from Kansas was hanged in 1859 because he appealed to the Virginian slaves to revolt. The anti-slavery ideas of Lincoln were blowing in the wind. Even before the end of the War of Secession (1861-1866) Congress in Washington in 1865 voted the famous 13th Amendment to the Constitution, which (in principle) definitively abolished slavery throughout the United States. The 14th and 15th Amendments, introduced in 1866 and 1870 respectively, (in principle) gave the Negro equal rights to Whites.
Virginia plantation, was the creator of a political defection, a philosophy according to which the Negro society was cut off from the World and that they should compensate by means of the things which could be bought for money. Once again the role of consumer is offered as a compensation to the ex-slave.

2. The second form of reaction was generated among the Negro intellectuals of the North who faced the problem in a radically different way. Among these intellectuals was one erstwhile disciple of B.T. Washington named William Edward Burghardt Du Bois (1868-1963). The popularity of Du Bois dates from 1903 when the congregation of the African Methodist Episcopal Church of Zion jeered Booker. (The name of the church is significantly messianic). Du Bois was to become one of the greatest theoreticians of the Panafrikanist movement, to which he was to dedicate all of his long life and all the brilliance of his intelligence.

Panafricanism as an ideology, with its romantic idea of the unity of all Negroes, has its origins in the fertile humus of rejection laid down in the USA in the middle of the nineteenth century. Panafricanism as an ideological motive-force within a political context is a word that was uttered for the first time
The birth of Panafrocanism in the United States was immediately followed by the spread of this ideological force to Africa and by its acceptance by the European powers. The acceptance of Panafrocanism by Africans occurred not only because of their agreement on the causes but because they found in the fact of all being negroes, a racial instrument, and one which was to be used in the future.

The language of their revindication was, as we have pointed out, in spite of itself, impregnated with the liberal humanitarianism of the European metropolitan powers. In the post *laissez-faire* economic period, i.e. in the Imperialist period, in contradistinction to the earlier colonialist one, the imperialist metropolises gave hospitality to the Panafrocanist Conference. This is because the governments of the day, also, in spite of themselves, were unable to reject a revindicative language which was suited to their philosophy, although this fact, historically, was an antithetical position to their own imperialist structure.

In terms of historical development, in spite of all its shortcomings, Panafrocanism is surely an advanced step towards the liberation of the black people. To be blindly critical of its forerunners would not be doing them justice. A retrospective
In spite and even because of this challenge there arose in Britain a power psychosis, a crisis of national pride, which resulted in a crescendo of chauvinism in the English mentality. Works which had been written some years before such as Dilke’s *Greater Britain*, Sheeley’s *Expansion of England* and culminating in the numerous writings of Kipling, now, in this period, at the zenith of Imperialism when British supremacy was challenged, achieved an enormous popularity. The injection of Panafricanism into this specific context underlines the dialectical matrix of Panafricanism itself. The final resolution of the First Pan-african Congress in London with its stress on humanitarian demands which ignored the economic implications of the colonialist phenomenon, which had now become the Imperialist phenomenon, is the weak link in Panafricanism and would, in the long run, give it an evasionist complexion. Marxian theories of historical materialism were not unknown to Panafricanists such as Du Bois, who after all, was an economist. But the tragedy was that they did not pay to this theory the attention it merited, i.e. they evaded it. We hold that this is due to two main facts, which underlie their lack of confidence in the role of economic factors in the historical process of the development of societies. Firstly, up to this time there was not any concrete historical precedent of a successful application of Marxian theories,
other hand, there is a negative stress on the role of skin colour, which in spite of exposing an aspect of the colonial system which is by no means negligible, in terms of a myth and a post facto rationalisation of economic contradictions, has dislocated the solution of the problem. This at the expense of obscuring the ideological axes in the economic dimension and in many cases turning ideology into an object of purely sentimental discussion.

Du Bois and Panafrikanism

W.E.B. Du Bois was a negro aristocrat not only in his great learning but also because he always acted as such. He said as much of himself when he wrote: "I have never been and will never be popular." He had a doctorate from Harvard and was professor of economics and history and later of sociology at the Southern University of Atlanta. The ideas of Du Bois on Panafrikanism form an exclusive movement of ideas and emotions which sometimes reveals links with socialism and sometimes with such empty concepts as World Federation, Atlantic Union and Federal Europe. The word dignity, is the cornerstone of the Panafrikanist thought of Du Bois. It is the obscuring fascina-
sense. Then, the case of the Negro and the Jew are hardly parallel but antithetical. The Negro having a home but seeking his identity in Panafrianism, while the Jew has, at best, a religiously defined and, at worst, a "racially", i.e. a discriminationally defined identity. But the Jew was without a home. Du Bois' parallel is, however, not quite so far-fetched in the case of the Negroes of the Americas. But to apply this americano-centric thinking to Africa or for that matter to Panafrianism smacks of American cultural conditioning or even worse of American cultural imperialism.

Panafrianism is from its origin up until the end of World War II, we are convinced, more of a cultural doctrine than a political ideology. Moreover, the period, during which this is the case, coincides exactly with that of the leadership of Du Bois.

In his famous speech delivered at the opening session of the First Panafrian Congress of 1900 Du Bois stated: "The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the colour-line, the relation of the darker to the lighter races of men in Asia and Africa, in America and the islands of the sea." These words not only underline what we have frequently characterised above as a misconception of the real reasons behind the Negro Drama, vis-à-vis the economic ones, but stresses it not only in
the Africans' rights to independence. It proclaimed the need for international laws to protect the natives; for land to be held in trust; for the prevention of exploitation by foreign capital; for the abolition of slavery and capital punishment; for the right of education, and, finally, it insisted that 'the natives of Africa must have the right to participate in the Government as fast as their development permits ...'"15

These results, although they represent a relative advance compared with those achieved at the First Congress, are still very insufficient when we consider the date of the conference and the events of the time. For, in the meantime the theories of Marx had, in Europe, achieved a concrete success in the October Revolution of 1917, which established the first socialist state in the world and gave the oppressed peoples the world over a new hope. But, as far as the Second Panafrian Congress of 1919 was concerned, this earth-shattering event had but a negligible effect.

During the Third Panafican Congress held in London and Brussels in 1921, Du Bois established another of the themes of Pan-
africanism: "The beginning of wisdom in inter-racial contact is the establishment of political institutions among suppressed peoples. The habit of democracy must be made to encircle the world."16
seek their destruction, by infiltration. This clash between Panafri-
canism and Communism struck a very important keynote. Here again
we are confronted by the lack of clarity in Pan-
africanism as to any political position, the enunciation of
which is the **sine qua non** for the liberation of the oppressed
from their oppressors. Yves Bénor in analysing the Third Pan-
african Congress offered the following clearcut insights:

"Because, finally the four Congresses were held between 1919
and 1927, that is to say after the October Revolution, after
the Third International had adopted a position of support and
active help for movements of national liberation. But in spite
of this the Congresses rejected all that which had happened and
did not even mention it. Is this not a case of a deaf intention
of affirming Black Nationalism in opposition to Communism (and
not only in opposition to Imperialism)? At the time, the Pan-
africanists cut the figure of moderates in comparison with the
Third International, while the later, even if it had hardly
penetrated Black Africa, was already inspiring significant anti-
colonialist uprisings in China and in Indonesia. Perhaps the
Panafrican Congresses were tolerated in Paris and in London for
the sole reason that the authorities considered that anything
was better than communism."\(^1\) Of all in this series of Congresses
the most important one was to prove to be that of 1945 held in
Manchester.
War II, both the victorious Allies and the defeated Axis, emerged from it economically ruined, with the sole exception of the USA whose industrial and economic power actually increased both absolutely, and especially comparatively. The War also solved the unemployment problem of Western Europe. The anti-fascist propaganda machine, and the shelving of capitalist-communist ideological differences during the War caused a great swing to the Left in the working class and armies of the West, which was registered in the post-war elections. The economic feebleness, the advent of full employment, and the popular prevalence of leftism, together had the consequence that the Western powers (except USA) were unable to afford to maintain standing armies overseas and that the proletariat would be unwilling to join the army when there were jobs at home, in addition to being untrustworthy as soldiers, because they would at that time have been unwilling to fight their class-brothers in the colonies. The result of this was that the colonial powers had no choice but to dismantle their Empires and to grant Afro-Asian freedom movements their demands.

With the Manchester Congress Panafricanism entered a new era, that of political revindication and the seizure of power by force if necessary. The congress issued the following two declarations: 18
We are not ashamed to have been an age-long patient people. We continue willingly to sacrifice and strive. But we are unwilling to starve any longer while doing the world's drudgery, in order to support by our poverty and ignorance a false aristocracy and a discarded imperialism.

We condemn the monopoly of capital and the rule of private wealth and industry for private profit alone. We welcome economic democracy as the only real democracy.

Therefore, we shall complain, appeal and arraign. We will make the world listen to the facts of our condition. We will fight in every way we can for freedom, democracy and social betterment."

V. DECLARATION TO THE COLONIAL PEOPLES

"We affirm the right of all colonial peoples to control their own destiny. All colonies must be free from foreign imperialist control, whether political or economic.

The peoples of the colonies must have the right to elect their own Governments, without restrictions from foreign powers. We say to the peoples of the colonies that they must fight for these ends by all means at their disposal.

The object of imperialist powers is to exploit. By granting the right to colonial peoples to govern themselves that object is defeated. Therefore, the struggle for political power by colonial and subject
In spite of the results achieved the delegates to the Congress did not manifest a political unity among themselves. We will offer two examples. That of Kwame Nkrumah, joint secretary of the Congress, was vital. It was he who wrote the Appeal to the Colonised peoples, in which the principle of revolution is unambiguously formulated. The other example is that of George Padmore, an intellectual from Trinidad, who until 1936 had been a communist. He was the editor of the *Negro Worker* which was published in Germany. Because of his criticism of the racial politics of Hitler against the Jews and the Negroes he was gaoled. Padmore exerted a great influence on English-speaking Negro intellectuals and later became the foreign-affairs adviser of Nkrumah. George Padmore's *volte-face* from being a militant communist until 1936 to becoming an opponent of Communism is clearly the consequence of the impact of institutionalised Stalinism on his humanitarian commitment. This is a classical case of emptying the baby out with the bathwater.

The political ideas of George Padmore were crystallised in his *Panafrikanism or Communism: the coming struggle in Africa*. 19 This book is the exposition of a subjective approach to politics and it is in this light that it poses a new definition of African nationalism which omits the economic phenomena which are the backbone of this nationalism.
elaborate a coherent system of political thought, one which was adequate to the task of transforming the colonial structure of the Negro Continent. Also, for the first time Panaficanism was not viewed as merely the concern of the English-speaking African. Nkrumah is not a very original thinker, but what makes him completely original within the orbit of African intellectuals, is his decisive approach and his commitment to the economic and political theories of Marxism-Leninism.

One of his main sources of inspiration was Lenin's *Imperialism the highest stage of capitalism* whose methods would, in the long run, and at the very moment of their application to African realities, determine his own failure as a statesman. Inspired by the above-mentioned work by Lenin, Nkrumah was very much aware of all the dimensions of the political situation of our era and wrote his materialist analyses of the contemporary African situation which he published in his *Neocolonialism the supreme stage of Imperialism*. Nkrumah analysed the Imperialist contradictions as immediately dependent upon, and as a clear consequence of the political situation imposed upon colonial people for economic reasons. This position, which reflects his concern with Marxist economic philosophy, was in clear contrast to the position of the French-speaking Panaficanists. For them, the national liberation struggle was not merely economic, but
Consciencism which is sometimes a very confused and consequently confusing defence of dialectical materialism, aims to prove: (1) That atheism is not a sine qua non condition for the application of Marxism or even materialism in Africa. (2) The main elements of socialism, such as the affirmation of egalitarianism, are very far from being in opposition to African social tradition which includes culture. According to Nkrumah, these are, on the contrary, the main requisites of a modern political philosophy. He stated, paraphrasing the Communist Manifesto: "The philosophy of consciencism aims at securing individual development, but in such a way, that, the conditions for the development of all, shall become, the conditions for the development of each." In April 1958, which is to say one year after the independence of Ghana, the First Congress of Independent African States took place in Accra. With the exception of South Africa all the independent states took part. The Accra Congress resulted in a commitment to the emancipation of the whole continent and constituted a declaration of war against colonialism and the Apartheid system in South Africa and gave total support to the Algerian people who, at that time, were on their victorious way towards defeating the French colonists. The Accra Congress marked the culminating point of Panafrikanism. The acceleration of the process of independence which followed both in the remaining British colonies and in the French colonies.
Panafricanism. Putting Africa into Marx instead of putting Marx into Africa. The main virus we are discussing is centrifugal alienation which pervades the Panafrican intellectuals. Also their disregard or misinterpretation of the role of economic forces in the process of social change.

Cultural Panafricanism: Azikiwe & Kenyatta

The political ideology implicit in Panafricanism is, as I have attempted to show, not entirely precise in its essential coordinates. In order to offer a more complete idea of it, we must deal with cultural Panafricanism, i.e. that Panafricanism which makes of the cultural resurgence of the Negro the pre-condition of the role he is to play on the world stage of peoples. Nnamdi Azikiwe, the Nigerian leader, offers us a prefect example of this cultural Panafricanism. His book Renascent Africa advocates his viewpoint and makes an appeal which un-ambiguously shows his idea of the prime importance of culture in achieving the liberty of the Negro. After saying, "Teach the African, who is being reborn, to be a new man. Tell him that he offered a great contribution to the history of Man."22 Like Padmore, he goes on to react against communism when he declared
calculated rejection of the economic dimension of the colonial
problem, is an opportunist position calculated to please the
British Imperialists. It is not without reason that he was to
become the head of state of the future Federation of Nigeria.

Jomo Kenyatta must be considered as a Panafrikanist more because
of his previous membership of the intellectual club of the Pan-
african Movement than by any application of Panafrikanism in
its generally accepted sense in his subsequent actions as a
practical politician in Kenya. Kenyatta, for reasons which re-
main to be elucidated, is at the same time a centrifugal and a
centripetally alienated individual. So, that when we say his
Panafrikanism is a cultural one, it is not, as in the case of
Azikiwe, that he made of the cultural renascence of the Negro,
a sine qua non precondition for the seizure of liberty. His
Panafrikanism is cultural, because it constitutes an almost
total return to the tribal fact, with all that this implies in
the field of African culture. Culture here being defined not in
the literary sense of the term but more in its anthropological
sense. Kenyatta is not a statesman in the modern sense of the
term, he is a super-tribal chief. Azikiwe and Kenyatta differed
in the sense in which they used the term culture: Azikiwe was
applying it in its European sense as a sort of luxury or status
symbol, while Kenyatta saw it as just a part, but a part which
African a free democracy which means universal suffrage.\textsuperscript{23}

The position of Oginga Odinga,\textsuperscript{24} in his brief analysis of the Mau-Mau Uprising, makes it clear that the independence of Kenya was the result of the sacrifice of the lives of the freedom fighters and that it was not acquired at the conference table. This thesis is advanced in order to give an alleged class character to the Mau-Mau. The position of Oginga Odinga is doctrinally untenable and there is nothing which can better demonstrate this than the state of tribal stagnation in which Kenya still remains.

\textit{Negritude}

Each of the Western colonial powers has their own colonial philosophy: that of Great Britain is based on the theory of the respect for the beliefs and customs of the natives. The French philosophy is that of assimilation which means the integration of the African population into French culture. The Portuguese philosophy, in the terms of their little father, is one of unilateral integration by the Portuguese as well as an interracial penetration whose aim is nothing but the creation of a "new man", the mulatto.
The comparative "mildness" of English colonialism and the barbarity of the French are nothing but the expressions of the different power of the colonialist powers and not philosophical differences between them.

The difference between Panafri canism and Negritude taken by itself as a literary expression of Panaf ricanism is reflected by the acceptance by both movements of the idea of different colonialist philosophies referred to above. Aímé Césaire, an intellectual from the French West Indies, is the father of the word Negritude. From the very beginning Césaire found in Leopold Sédar Senghor an ardent defender, not only of the word but of its cultural connotations. For this reason, both men are regarded as the founders of Negritude. The political implications of the ideology of Negritude are vague and imprecise but, as a cultural stand, it is synonymous with cultural assimilation. Logically, this position is in dialectical opposition to the French colonialists' philosophy of cultural assimilation, but the analysis of the political implications of Negritude reveals that the contradiction exists only between the Negro intellectuals in face of the European values they were confron ted with.

At the meeting held in June 1958 in Cotonou, Senghor explained
portrait of an idealist, according to whom Negritude, although literary, is a desperate effort to bring Africa into the realities of the present century without any regard for the role played by such realities in the drama of the African people, of which Negritude claims to be a positive reflection. Such a position was to dictate the ideas of Senghor as a statesman.

There is one main difference between Negritude as applied by Senghor and that of Céaire. According to the latter, Negritude is a cry of the Negro race, an incitement to return to the native country. The future was to prove that on a literary plane Negritude was for Céaire a need for the affirmation, a way to cure the inhibitive effect of an inferiority complex of an isolated Negro intellectual. Céaire showed himself to be more concerned with the structuring of an ideology that would give the Negro Africans the authentic political basis of which cultural conditions are but consequences. As happened with Panafriicanism, Negritude was for the same reason widely accepted in the European Imperialist capitals. Sekou Touré summed this up in his *L'Afrique et la Révolution*: "In international meetings the position of Negritude is more often held by 'non-negroes' than by negroes."²⁶ The influence of Negritude is still great among African intellectuals of the post-war genera-
above, the genesis of the idea of African unity was introduced by the fathers of Panafrokanism. In spite of having been introduced by them in a very vague way, the idea cannot be separated from their pan-ideologies. In one sense African unity is the consummation of Panafrokanism and Negritude. Both were conceived and developed within the colonial context itself, which reached its decline with the end of World War II, when African Unity was to face a new world political context, of the independence of several African States, and the development of the Imperialist policy of the United States. Too weak in their political structure, the newly independent African countries, independently of the political options open to them, agreed on the idea of uniting Africa. This unity, in spite of being, logically, the immediate answer to the interests of the continent, on the other hand, posed problems that the African states would prove unable to face. Many of the Independences were mere transfers of sovereignty, leaving the real power, the economic power, still in the hands of the original colonialists. This meant that the economic problems underlying the political problems of post-war Africa could not be solved by the efforts of the governments of the new African states.

The formation of the European Economic Community represented a new stage, that of neo-colonialism, in that more countries...
ment of African peoples, of their originality, and of their civilization." In effect, the words of the Guinean leader would later find themselves institutionalised in the Guinean Constitution which, in its article 34 predicts the partial or total abandonment of sovereignty "in order to achieve African unity".

The Charter of The African Unity Organisation promulgated in Addis Ababa on the 25th May 1963 did take into account the factors of economics and sovereignty. In article N. 3 on Principles we read:

1. Equal sovereignty of all member states;
2. Non-interference in the internal affairs of states;
3. Respect for the sovereignty and of the territorial integrity of each state and of the inalienable right to independent existence;"

This fact, in spite of its appearance of soundness, dictated the very failure of African unity. The future would prove the almost picturesque idealism implicit in the ideology of African unity. Today African unity is nothing but a patient in a deep sleep.
III - PARTY STRUCTURE

The developments in African ideology and the tendencies which they developed before the period of independence tended to adopt as their immediate aim the seizure of power. After independence a different problem faced African leaders, that of maintaining power. It is in this domain that the political party was to play its role. In order to better understand the particularity of the very conception of party in the African context, in the period after that of direct colonialism, we must not only simply recapitulate the political heritage of colonialism, but we must also analyse the pressures acting upon African states, after they have achieved sovereignty. With the exception of the Congo (ex-Belgian), and the Portuguese colonies which are still "overseas provinces" of Portugal, decolonialisation of the territories under British and French domination presents the same economic basis which were to dictate the genesis of the one-party government. In the cases where independence was prepared beforehand and also where power was seized by force of arms, the similarity of anti-colonialist forces was a vital condition. For the Africans the struggles against colonial oppression was and still is, a struggle on a national scale against a foreign enemy, and not a class struggle destined to break the feudal structure of the colony. It is under this common
leads a party; (2) In the Communist democracies there is a single political party because its role is that of the resolution of class contradictions.

The European communist parties, above all the French communist party, played a role which, though it was not the role they should have played, nevertheless cannot be usefully criticised. Almost all the leaders of the states of Africa had links in varying degrees with the French Communist Party and other European left-wing parties. At the end of World War II, these parties, due to the role they had played in the defeat of Fascism, enjoyed a considerable prestige, and even had a place in the power structure. This certainly constituted an encouragement for left-wing African leaders.

Nevertheless, the points of agreement were infinitely weaker than the points of disagreement. It was not the alliance of the African and European intellectuals on an ideological plane, but one of the European and African proletariats which might have been expected to form a revolutionary alliance. However, the situation was very far from this. In order to better understand this gap between the two proletariats let us turn to the analysis of Ho Chi Minh: 28 Indifference of the metropolitan proletariat regarding the struggles of the communist movement...
Imperialism and Capitalism do not fail to take advantage of this reciprocal dislike and this artificial hierarchy of races to inhibit propaganda and to divide forces which should unite."

Another fact is that European parties had clearly defined frameworks within which they could exert their authority. This, however, was not, in general, the case in Africa. In Africa the national idea still remained to be created, which faces us with two concepts of party: (1) The European one, aimed at maintaining the status quo; (2) The African one, facing the obligation of even having to forge the very political structure of the nation. The one-party system plays an imperative role upon this fact.

The case of one-party system in Africa, in general, is not the corollary of a political philosophy which is based on a class analysis in order to finally resolve the contradictions between classes. Such a case is, as we stated above, the consequence of an artificial alliance whose strength has, until now, been dedicated to the development of a national conscience.

In confrontation with events in Africa we hold that: class division had not yet developed and that the communist option
dominant party in a developing state is an outgrowth of the mobilization of persons and groups in the pre-independence period. In the former British territories, the existence of a cohesive political party under a dominant leader was a sine qua non for the transfer of political power to local hands. Since the British were empirical, reacting to and through a "process of interrelated pressure", to quote Sir Andrew Cohen, the conditions for extension of local power remained relatively common while the timing differed. In the former French areas, it was the timing of the transfer of powers that was common while local conditions often varied widely. ... Thus both colonial regimes stimulated, though by different means, the mass dominant parties, which form the decisive link between the pre-independence and post-independence periods."

Margaret L. Bates in her essay concerning the one-party states in Tanzania stated: "The first and most pressing problem is attainment of national unity. The size of Tanganyika, its lack of communications, and its varied tribal and racial background make it vital to achieve some form of national allegiance and national consensus and to give the country a sense of its common past and its common future. Until a few years ago, there was no way even of saying "Tanganyikan" in Swahili; the word
for example the case of Nigeria. In 1965 the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons was the only political power of the country. Its leader Azikiwe was progressively reduced to only representing the Ibo people, the majority in the Eastern region of the Confederation. This weakness goes back to 1951 and to the Action Group, the party of the Yorubas in the West, under the leadership of A.T. Balewa finished up by representing and being dominated by the Hausa sultans of the Muslim North further weakened the Confederation.

In Tanzania, Julius Nyerere correctly avoided this degradation of power which consisted in the superposition of tribal power over and above that of the state. Relying on the support of the small-scale farmer, knowing that international opinion was interested in the difficulties of his compatriots, he succeeded in acquiring an immense popularity among the whole population. His patient action of mobilisation and indoctrination ended up with the political unity of all the tribes and sidestepped the efforts of British Imperialism to reawake Tribalism. This is why the case of single-party rule in Tanzania, different as it is, from other cases, has to be analysed not only in terms of its cause but also of its consequences.
All these parties have a pyramidal structure which envelop a totality of organs usually corresponding to administrative sub-divisions.

Most parties adopt the rule of democratic centralism, according to which, each board of party apparatus elects the level immediately above it. These rules are inscribed in the Statutes of the majority of single-parties in Africa.

Passing from the analysis of the structure of the single party to the analysis of its role, we find that the single party has not only the monopoly of politicising the masses, but, also by definition, of parliamentary representation.

Contrary to what takes place in Western democracies, the prominence of the party in constitutional organs is a fact. In this case we are confronted with a fundamental difference between the role of the party in Africa, which in this case is nearer in its qualitative aspects to that which we find in communist countries.

For a better understanding of the essential role of a single party in Africa, nothing is clearer than the words of Sekou Touré.
Another problem, no less important, linked to the existence of single-party structure is that of succession. In his study of the one party state in Tunisia, Lars Rudebeck offers us the following insight: "It has often been pointed out that the real test of a one-party or dominant party regime's viability comes at the moment of succession to its original founder or leader. In fact, very few such regimes have been able to handle that problem peacefully and according to pre-established rules. Mexico and India are two very rare examples, perhaps the only ones among the underdeveloped countries entering modern politics during this century, which have been able to institutionalise a legitimate procedure. The conscious re-adaptation and strengthening of the structures of the Tunisian party described here can be viewed also from this angle. The problem was dramatically brought up by Bourguiba himself, when he described the role envisaged for the new Central Committee."

We accept his thought but must take exception to his language. As an a posteri ori or post facto observation of fact, all this is perfectly true. The phraseology is one of evolution in the use of terms such as "underdeveloped", "entering modern politics" etc. In terms of evolution, the examples of Mexico and India, are very telling because these are two of the most ancient and
Socialism. Some comments.

Socialism, being conceived as a philosophy of egality, had found a favourable echo among Africans, whose aspirations for economic and political justice saw a possibility of solution in it. As we have already shown, one of the African intellectuals whose Marxism cannot be doubted is Kwame Nkrumah. It is through him, in his defense of dialectics, in his book Consciencism, which represents the contradiction of Marxist atheism and African spiritualism, that the first scientific study was done in order to penetrate African realities. Other leaders have tried merely to superimpose the teachings of scientific socialism over the African colonial reality, of which they did not know the fundamental rudiments. From this, results the abundance of socialisms in Africa, whose failures are so obvious and which we have no need to enumerate here.

Apart from this reason of philosophical doctrine and social justice, it remains that most of these socialisms consist of the reconciliation of an interior effort with external aid, whether from Imperialist or from Socialist countries. Confronted with the real needs of Africa for revolution, we can see that this is neither economic nor aid. The construction of socialism...
Sudan coup of the 25th of May 1969, as a masterly summary of what kind of socialism he intended to use in building up his country: "None and all (forms of socialism) at the same time. We want to benefit from experiences and doctrines from abroad, those set out in the holy books, or put into practice in England or in the Soviet Union. Socialism is not a dogma and cannot be imported or exported. Therefore, here, it will have, at the same time, a Sudanese essence and also be open to the currents of world thought."33

This statement offers the guidelines for an African socialism. It seeks to avoid repeating the errors of the past, of excessive foreign influence or nationalism, of excessive religious or of anti-religious attitudes, of excessive supra-nationalism or of excessive isolationism.

This, if coupled with a clear revolutionary attack on the economic disease rather than on its symptoms, is our plan for a revolutionary attack on the political tse-tse fly which has stung Africa, our remedy for the political sleeping sickness which has put Africa into its present state of political coma.
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