

Self-reparation for Afrikan Power: Pan Africanism and Black Consciousness

By Chinweizu

Copyright © by Chinweizu 2006

Please see the Feel Free notice at the end

[Paper presented at the Global Pan Afrikan Reparations and Repatriation Conference (GPARRC) on 26 July, 2006, at the University of Ghana, Legon, Accra]

This paper is dedicated to the memory of Steve Biko.

One type of struggle we regard as fundamental is . . . *the struggle against our own weaknesses.*

--Amilcar Cabral, [1980: 121]

You must not abandon discussion out of tact . . . There should be no concession where there is a question of establishing a scientific truth . . . Remember we are focused on a quest for truth and not on a sacrosanct idol we must avoid debasing. . . .

--Cheikh Anta Diop [quoted in Van Sertima, Ivan 1986: 13]

Professor Diop does have one important desideratum that has yet to be fulfilled. He desires a forum or colloquium somewhere in which an extensive and exhaustive discussion, analysis, and clarification of his ideas can be carried out. He feels that his work and ideas have not had the proper feedback, examination, and testing necessary to properly validate them despite their ever-widening reception. . . . His is a search for truth, not the establishment of a new orthodoxy.

--Charles Finch [1986: 230]

Introduction

First of all, I have quoted Cabral and Diop to make a point that applies to Pan Africanism as a whole. All its ideas are in need of exhaustive discussion, rigorous analysis and clarification to test their validity and utility. We also need to examine the practices of the Afrikan anti-colonial struggles, from before the 18th century Haitian war of independence to the 20th century South African anti-Apartheid struggle, and we need to sort out the half-baked from the sound, the helpful from the harmful, the up-to-date from the out-of-date. And in this vital exercise, we must insist, as Diop urges, on not abandoning any discussion out of tact, or out of reverence for any hero or idol. We must courageously persevere in the struggle against our own weaknesses, for they, no less than the actions of our enemies, have helped to bring about our failures and disasters.

Secondly, we must understand that we want to solve the problems of the Afrikan people not of the African landmass or continent. The focus of Afrikan self-reparation must be to produce the conditions that would rescue Afrikans from their dismal plight of the last two millennia.

Thirdly, we must understand that getting our Arab and European enemies to pay us trillions of dollars for the disasters they inflicted on us-- by invading, abducting, enslaving, conquering, exploiting, robbing and exterminating hundreds of

millions of us-- will be just like collecting rain with a basket unless we first seal up the holes in the basket. And sealing up the holes is the job of self-reparation.

Fourthly, what has been the basic problem, the mother of all problems, of Afrikans for the past 2000years? Here are some clues:

If we had Afrikan power to stop them, would Arabs have conquered and occupied 1/3 of our African homeland in the last 1500years?

If we had Afrikan power to stop them, would Arabs and Europeans have raided Africa and carried off hundreds of millions of Afrikans to enslave in the Americas and Eurasia in the last 1500 years?

If we had Afrikan power to stop them, would Africa's resources have been exported to build up Europe and America while Afrikans starve?

If we had Afrikan power to stop them, would Arabs have taken over Sudan for the last 50 years and waged war on the South Sudanese to Arabise them and prevent their independence?

If we had Afrikan power to stop them, would the World Health Organization (WHO) and its US masters have had unhindered access to our population to AIDSbomb us? Would they have vaccinated 97 million Afrikans with AIDS-infected smallpox vaccines? No enemy can go into China or the USA or Europe to do mass vaccinations: Chinese, American or European power respectively would prevent it.

Now, that gives us a glimpse into the basic problem of the Afrikans for the past 20 centuries i.e. **POWERLESSNESS! –the lack of the power to protect our lands, populations and cultures from alien attacks.**

On the other hand, everything on the Afrikan wish list (prosperity, security, dignity, respect, basic needs, an end to racist contempt, etc) requires Afrikan power. Without Afrikan power, Afrikans cannot ensure that Africa's resources are used primarily to meet Afrikan needs. The great world powers will continue to extract Africa's resources for the primary use of Europe and America, thereby denying Afrikans the resources for Afrikan prosperity. Without Afrikan power, Afrikans cannot hold onto their land and lives and resources and cultures. We need Afrikan power to end the kinds of mayhem and ethnic cleansing and Arabisation that are being inflicted on Blacks in Darfur and Mauritania, which are a humiliation for all Afrikans.

And the organizing of Afrikan power requires a Pan Afrikanist perspective that can see ECOWAS or SADC as potential sub-continental megastates to be industrialized for the protection of all Afrikans.

But could Afrikan powerlessness possibly be cured by Scientific Socialism, Liberalism, Marxism, Communism, Christianity, Islam, Humanism, Continental Union Government, or by any combination of these and the other decoy solutions offered in the last 50 years by all sorts of saviors of Africa? Were these "-isms" designed, in the first place, to solve the specific problems of Afrikans? After 50 years of chasing these decoy shadows, our plight is worse than before.

Perhaps it is time to make a fresh start, to take a new and comprehensive look at our problems and what we need to do to solve them for ourselves.

Fifthly, such a fresh start requires our acceptance of full responsibility for ending our plight. It means that we accept that, whatever Arabs or Europeans have done to cause our condition, and whatever our ancestors may have contributed to our plight, the responsibility is now entirely ours to cure it. Acceptance of this responsibility is our fundamental act of self-reparation; without it, we are fooling ourselves in demanding reparations from others.

Perhaps, the first key area in need of self-reparation is Pan Africanism itself.

The need for self-reparation in Pan Africanism:

Outside the estacode/dollars-per-diem ranks of AU bureaucrats and intellectuals, Pan Africanism has lost its relevance and appeal to most Afrikans. All the evidence available today indicates that Pan Africanism has failed the Afrikans woefully. Strictly speaking, Pan-Africanism in the 20th century scored more failures than successes.

While its basic objective of removing the blanket of white European rulers from Africa was achieved, little else has succeeded. Black governments may now rule the countries of Pan Africa, but visible black rule has not removed the white imperialist control and exploitation of our countries; nor has it done much to improve the conditions of the overwhelming majority of Afrikans in the world. The expected fruits of black rule have not materialized. Poverty, powerlessness, social disintegration, cultural decay and disillusion remain the hallmarks of Afrikan countries and communities everywhere.

More seriously, in the 50 years of Continentalist Pan Africanism, our race war enemies have inflicted three potentially terminal disasters on Afrikans, namely, the AIDSbombing of Africa, a resurgent Arab expansionism that is expropriating more and more of our continent, and the AU's NEPAD that guarantees that Africa can never industrialize or escape poverty. The collective failure of the OAU and its member governments to deter/prevent the AIDSbombing of Africa is a cardinal failure of Pan Africanism.

Clearly, therefore, we need to investigate what went wrong and why, and we need to repair the Pan Africanism that helped make things go so badly wrong.

Perhaps most importantly, in the 20th century Pan Africanism failed to mature into a full-fledged political ideology with a sound concept of its constituency, a sound idea of its paramount strategic goals and a sound political program of transformative action. It also failed to adjust itself to the changes in its environment. For instance, it has persisted in focusing only on the European domination that was the most prominent blight on the African landscape before 1950; it has failed to recognize the resurgent Arab expansionism that followed the withdrawal of European rule, and has refused to organize an appropriate Pan Africanist response to it. Correcting these failings is a task of self-reparation, perhaps our most urgent task of self-reparation today.

And for our self-repair of Pan Africanism to commence properly, we need to put together a Pan Afrikan intellectual collective whose task is to assemble "A Pan Africanism Reader", an anthology of the principal ideas, documents, as well as the achievements and failures of the Pan African Movement, so we can all know what we are to repair. Then, with that body of work in our hands, we can all join in the great discussion and analysis to find out why thing went wrong and what to do to repair them.

The first key aspect of Pan Africanism that needs attention is the doctrine of Continentalism.

1. Continentalism

The brand of Pan Africanism which Nkrumah launched in 1958 with his First Conference of Independent African States (CIAS) was dedicated to the political unification of all the countries on the African continent, regardless of race or creed or –surprisingly-- anti-black behavior. Hence, for instance, Nkrumah, quite amazingly,

saw fit to invite to that ostensibly Pan-Africanist, and implicitly anti-colonial, conference the Apartheid South African government of Premier Verwoerd! In his subsequent campaign for what became the OAU and now the AU, Nkrumah relentlessly argued for what may be called Continentalism. He claimed that only by bringing all the countries in Africa under one continental government, could Africans defeat neo-colonialism economically, militarily, diplomatically etc. But, in fact, a close look at his arguments shows that they do not validly imply a continental African government. What he actually argues validly is that the countries created by the European conquest and partition of Africa are each too small to defeat neo-colonialism; and that they, therefore, should coalesce into something bigger. But what would be big enough? He does not give any criteria for determining that. He simply asserts, with increasing desperation as time went on and his invalid argument fell on the deaf ears of his OAU peers, that it must be a continent-sized state! He doesn't consider the possibility that a continent-sized state could be too big or not big enough.

In fact, one of his funny arguments actually suggests that what would be required to defeat neo-colonialism is a political union, not just of the African continent, but of the entire Third World – a Tri-continental state that would bring all of Africa, Asia and Latin America under one government. He said:

Thus far, all the methods of neo-colonialism have pointed in one direction, the ancient, accepted one of all minority ruling classes throughout history – *divide and rule*. Quite obviously, therefore, *unity* is the first requisite for destroying neo-colonialism. **Primary and basic is the need for an all-union government on the much-divided continent of Africa.** [Emphasis added] Along with that, a strengthening of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organisation and the spirit of Bandung is already underway. To it, we must seek the adherence on an increasingly formal basis of our Latin American brothers.
--[Nkrumah, 1973:335]

On this argument for defeating a global neo-colonialism, why should it be all countries on the African continent that should unite, and not all countries in the Third World? The argument is really for a Union Government of the entire Third World victims of neo-colonialist divide and rule, a Tri-continental Union Government for all the ex-colonial countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America! On the other hand it would apply equally to a Union Government of West Africa, or East Africa or Southern Africa, or of Africa and the Arab World. Take your pick. Like the other arguments Nkrumah put forward, it contains no specific reasons why the union should be continental in scope and nothing less. Please note that Nkrumah asserts, but doesn't say why "an all-union government" of the African continent is a "primary and basic need".

Cheikh Anta Diop, another passionate advocate for African continental unification, was no better than Nkrumah at specifying why exactly the admittedly larger state required for Africa's development must encompass the entire continent.

When an advocate consistently begs the question, suspicion is aroused that his overt arguments are mere mystifications for something held on other, undisclosed, grounds. The real reasons might be some secret fear or desire. In the case of Nkrumah and Diop, we get a peek at their hidden motive for Continentalism when Diop said, in a 1976 interview:

If we black Africans take steps to include North African Arabs into a continental federation and the latter prefer instead to elaborate organic political ties with Arabs of Asia, this would be tantamount to a rebuff. If north African states, rather than looking to black Africa in a natural partnership, preferred a federation with Asian Arabs extending to the Persian Gulf, *then we would be entirely justified to organize ourselves in an exclusively sub-Saharan federation. In such an eventuality, no one could accuse sub-Saharan Africans of being guilty of exclusivism*, [emphasis, in bold, added] since their appeals to the North would have been refused. [Moore, 1986: 261]

This is a clue that the unargued and illogical conclusion, that we need an African *continental* state, was driven by fear of being accused of “(racial) exclusivism”. In other words, in the integrationist atmosphere of the 1950s and 1960s, Pan Africanists feared that if they advocated a union of sub-Sahara countries, or any smaller grouping that would include only blacks, they would be accused of racial exclusivism, i.e. segregation/“black racism”. Continentalism was, therefore, something believed without good reason, but out of fear-- in other words, a superstition!

With this clue from Diop, we can now attempt to diagnose the roots of Nkrumah’s passion for an illogical Continentalism.

Nkrumah: the roots of his continentalist superstition

As I pointed out above, Nkrumah’s argument contains no specific reasons why his proposed Union Government must be *continental* in scope. This lack of Africa-specificity was typical of his anti-colonial advocacy. For example, his pamphlet “Towards Colonial Freedom”, which was written in 1942 and published in 1947, closed with the exhortation “PEOPLES OF THE COLONIES, UNITE; The working men of all countries are behind you.” [Nkrumah, 1973:41] In the same vein, the “Declaration to the Colonial Peoples of the World”, a resolution which he wrote, and which was adopted at the 5th PAC in Manchester, also ended, not with the exhortation “Africans/Blacks of the World—Unite!” which would have been appropriate, but with “COLONIAL AND SUBJECT PEOPLES OF THE WORLD – UNITE”. [Nkrumah, 1973:44] Nkrumah himself seems to have been vaguely aware that his anti-colonial theses were usually not for Africa specifically; for, in commenting, after Ghana’s independence, on “Towards Colonial Freedom” Nkrumah himself said, “Although I have concentrated on colonial Africa, the thesis of the pamphlet applies to colonial areas everywhere.” [Nkrumah, 1973:16 fn] Why, we may wonder, was he shy of focusing on the specific Ghanaian/Black African situation for its own sake rather than merely using the African situation as a convenience in arguing for the global anti-colonial cause? In this eccentric procedure, Nkrumah was unlike Biko whose focus was consistently on black South Africa, his immediate and natural constituency; and also quite unlike Cabral for whom the reality in Guinea was always the focus and who, though no less a Third World internationalist than Nkrumah, insisted that “our own reality is at the centre of a complex reality, but it is the former that most concerns us.” [Cabral, 1980:47] Was Nkrumah perhaps a racial integrationist who was emotionally uncomfortable about being too much identified with his natural, Black African constituency? And, if so, why?

In the document known as THE CIRCLE, which he drew up soon after the Manchester 5th PAC, Nkrumah advocated creating and maintaining a “Union of African Socialist Republics.” [Nkrumah, 1973:48] These exhortations from the 1940s

suggest that Nkrumah was, at heart, a global anti-colonialist rather than a Pan Africanist specifically; in fact, that he was a socialist internationalist, probably a Trotskyite, who found himself at some point obliged to focus on promoting socialism, first in one country, Ghana, and thereafter for one continent, Africa, pending any opportunity that would release him from the “parochialism” of one country or continent, and let him finally become an unconstrained global socialist internationalist. Was Nkrumah, then, basically a universalistic socialist missionary who, as the saying goes, “happened to be black” and who went home to Ghana/Africa to convert his people to socialism? Or was he primarily an African liberationist for whom socialism was a useful ideological tool? This should be investigated as the finding could throw unexpected light on his primary identity, constituency and preoccupations, as well as on aspects of his behavior that have had adverse consequences for Afrikans.

His socialist internationalism aside, there is still to be considered the added factor of Nkrumah’s commitment to “non-racialism”. That was evident in his CPP constitution (1949) which lists among its aims “abolishing imperialism, colonialism, racialism, tribalism and all forms of national and racial oppression and economic inequality among nations, races and peoples . . .” [Nkrumah, 1973:59] Could Nkrumah’s “non-racialism”—probably imbibed from the 1930s American socialist milieu with its slogan “Black and white unite and fight!”—have reinforced his devotion to a global, multi-racial anti-colonialism, and helped blind him to any union in Africa that, by excluding Arabs, would be open to the accusation of racial exclusivism? Any black anti-colonialist intimidated by the scarecrow of “racial exclusivism/black racism” into evading the political reality of black skin in a white supremacist world, would not consider, let alone be enthusiastic about, a blacks-only sub-Saharan union, even if that would be enough to defeat neo-colonialism in Africa!

If this diagnosis is correct, we owe Nkrumah’s advocacy of the continentalist superstition to a combination of the socialist internationalism and the non-racialism he had imbibed from his liberal and socialist mentors in the imperialist world.

But the antidote for this particular non-racialist superstition was indicated, even during the integrationist 1960s, by John Oliver Killens when, in his 1965 essay “The black writer vis-à-vis his country” he observed that:

Negroes are the only people in this world who are set apart because of who they are, and at the same time told to forget who they are by the very people who set them apart in the first place.
—[Killens, 1965:358-359]

A few years later, in the early 1970s, the young Steve Biko, in building his Black Consciousness Movement, developed the much-needed therapy for this superstitious fear. Among other things he correctly argued that integration was a false antithesis to segregation/apartheid, and that the correct antithesis was Black solidarity/unity. For the specific context of apartheid South Africa, he argued:

It is time we killed this false political coalition between blacks and whites as long as it is set up on a wrong analysis of our situation . . . [and because] it forms at present the greatest stumbling block to our unity. . . . The basic problem in South Africa has been analysed by liberal whites as being apartheid. . . . For the *liberals*, the thesis is apartheid, the *antithesis* is non-racialism, but the *synthesis* is very feebly defined. They want to tell the blacks

that they see integration as the ideal solution. Black Consciousness defines the situation differently. The *thesis* is in fact a strong white racism and therefore, the *antithesis* to this must, *ipso facto*, be a strong solidarity amongst the blacks on whom this white racism seeks to prey. [Biko, 1987:90]

And Biko further observes, quite correctly:

The concept of integration . . . is full of unquestioned assumptions. . . . It is a concept long defined by whites and never examined by blacks. . . . [It is one of the] concepts which the Black Consciousness approach wishes to eradicate from the black man's mind. . . . Black Consciousness is an attitude of mind and a way of life, . . . the realisation by the black man of the need to rally together with his brothers around the cause of their oppression—the blackness of their skin – and to operate as a group to rid themselves of the shackles that bind them to perpetual servitude. [Biko, 1987:91-92]

Biko, the Black Consciousness prophet, further argued that, in South Africa,

As long as blacks are suffering from inferiority complex – a result of 300 years of deliberate oppression, denigration and derision – they will be useless as co-architects of a normal society. . . . Hence what is necessary as a prelude to anything else that may come is a very strong grass-roots build-up of black consciousness such that blacks can learn to assert themselves and stake their rightful claim. [Biko, 1987:21]

And Biko drives his point home thus:

Those who know, define racism as discrimination by a group against another for the purposes of subjugation or maintaining subjugation. In other words one cannot be a racist unless he has the power to subjugate. What blacks are doing is merely to respond to a situation in which they find themselves the objects of white racism. We are in the position in which we are because of our skin. We are collectively segregated against -- what can be more logical than for us to respond as a group? When workers come together under the auspices of a trade union to strive for the betterment of their conditions, nobody expresses surprise in the Western world. It is the done thing. Nobody accuses them of separatist tendencies. Teachers fight their battles, garbage men do the same, nobody acts as a trustee for another. Somehow, however, when blacks want to do their thing the liberal establishment seems to detect an anomaly. This is in fact a counter-anomaly. The anomaly was there in the first instance when the liberals were presumptuous enough to think that it behoved them to fight the battle for the blacks. [Biko, 1987:25]

Biko's full critique of integration should be required reading by all Afrikans today.

This Black Consciousness therapy helped to produce a new breed of black freedom fighter in South Africa, the self-confident type, unconfused and uncrippled by fears implanted by false liberal doctrines like integration and non-racialism. It produced self-confident blacks who insisted on doing things for themselves and all by themselves, and who did not feel they had to prove themselves to whites.

To see the validity of Biko's doctrines for Pan Africa today, one needs first to note Biko's remark that "the black-white power struggle in South Africa is but a microcosm of the global confrontation between the Third World and the rich white

nations of the world.” [Biko, 1987:72] More specifically, we should note that the black-white situation in Apartheid South Africa was a special local case of the global situation between whites and blacks. We can therefore validly transpose Biko’s doctrines to the global situation that Pan Africa ostensibly is struggling to eradicate.

Accordingly, in a world where blacks are oppressed and exploited by white Arabs and Europeans, any Afro-Arab alliance is just as false a political coalition as that in South Africa was between whites and the blacks they oppressed. To realize that is to find the intellectual ground for the courage to repudiate the Afro-Arab alliance and continental political union that Nkrumah promoted and Diop advocated.

We need to be ever mindful of Biko’s remark that “the biggest mistake the Black World ever made was to assume that whoever is against Apartheid is automatically our ally.” [Biko, 1987:63] And we need to apply it to the global imperialist situation.

Still in that vein, let us see what Black Consciousness doctrines would say of the AU, NEPAD, and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) prescribed for Africa by Blair’s Commission for Africa. Biko rejected the Bantustan idea on the fundamental ground that “it is a solution given to us by the same people who have created the problem.” [Biko, 1987:82] ***His rejection would equally apply to the AU Trojan horse with its wrecking crew of NEPAD, MDG etc. which-- like what Leon Damas called “the theories that they season to the taste of their needs”-- are designed to worsen our problems, not solve them.***

In South Africa, Biko asked: “whether the Bantustan leaders do not see the barrenness and fraudulence implicit in this scheme?” He answered thus: “We have some men in these Bantustans who would make extremely fine leaders if they had not decided to throw in their lot with the oppressors. A few of them argue that they are not selling out but are carrying on the fight from within . . .” He ended by dismissing them and their delusions with the comment “After all, as one writer once said, there is no way of stopping fools from dedicating themselves to useless causes.” [Biko 1987:84]

When we realize that these so-called independent African states that have been herded into the AU by Gadhafi are nothing but the glorified Bantustans of the G8 system of UN Imperialism, i.e. the global system’s version of those Bantustans of Apartheid South Africa, we can see the aptness of applying Biko’s remark to all these black heads of state and government in the fraudulent and useless AU.

My point in this exercise has been to illustrate that we have enough sound ideas within the body of Pan Africanist thought to challenge and correct the false ideas and misguided projects that have crippled us, if only we would collect and study the tradition and use it to correct itself. And I’d like to suggest that we form and equip a collective of our academics to do this job. In the last 50 years, all manner of half-baked ideas have been hurriedly implemented, and even with desperate urgency, while the Pan Africanist intelligentsia failed to cry foul and to subject them to rigorous debate and correction. We must mend our ways. As a contrite act of self-reparation, we must create the necessary organs of unfettered debate and use them effectively henceforth.

We cannot blame Nkrumah, Diop and others for their errors. They gave what they thought were the right ideas. But it was for us to have collectively corrected their errors, and we didn’t. We have yet to do for Diop’s ideas what he himself pleaded for. And it is our duty to Pan Africa to do the same for all ideas on offer, even those by prima donnas who are touchy about criticism, or by Presidents who are full of

themselves. We must do our duty and politely ask those who resent public criticism to keep their ideas to themselves and not pollute the public space with them.

By the way, to throw a cold and sobering splash of comparative reality on this delirious hankering after a continent-sized political union, we should note that the megastates and great powers of the 20th and 21st centuries –USA, USSR, EU, China, Russia, India – are actually of **sub-continental**, not continental, size. The only actually continent-sized state is Australia, which is not a great power at all! Unless we wish to persist in playing the fool who insisted on walking on a cloud, we should trim our ambition to what is, at least geographically and culturally, possible. Therefore, *the project of an African megastate should be guided by the feasibility conditions for putting it in the power league of China, EU, USA, Russia and India, and not by some superstitious craving for continental size.*

Other issues in Pan Africanism crying out for self-reparation

Continentalism is not the only aspect or doctrine of Pan Africanism that is crying out for correction. Having looked at that error in some detail, all I have time to do here is list a few others, with brief comments, so they can be attended to afterwards.

2: African identity

The question of African identity and its criteria has not yet been rigorously analyzed or Afrocentrically resolved. What is Africa? Who are the Africans? What are the cultural and biological boundaries of Africa/Africanness?

This fundamental matter of defining Africa and the Africans--those that are the constituency served by Pan Africanism-- has been bedeviled by the same fears of exclusivism that helped install the superstition of Continentalism. Those black Africans who fear the white enemy would label them exclusivists are prone to evade including the color/phenotype/racial factor when defining the African. Some insist on defining Africanness in purely cultural terms. Some fools even say that the African is anybody who is “committed to Africa”! Others, such as the AU bureaucrats who organized the 2004 Conference of AU intellectuals in Dakar, urge what they call “identity fluidity” and assert that:

Africa, whose construction is currently on the agenda, transcends geographical borders as well as cultural or racial barriers: it extends from both sides of the Sahara; it is white and black, Arab and African, continental and insular; it is a cultural meeting point where successive strata of cultures of Eurasian origin intermingle with indigenous cultures born in the Continent of Africa (Mbeki’s Speech: “I am an African” epitomizes these assertions in that it recognizes all the above assets). The concept of identity fluidity has now become imperative;

. . .

-- “Draft Concept Paper” to AU Intellectuals meeting, Dakar, Oct. 2004, p.7.

On this question of identity, we sorely need to take our cue from Biko and boldly “rally around the cause of our suffering” and, without apologies to our enemies and their integrationist dupes in our midst, define ourselves for ourselves on the basis of our black skin--the cause of our suffering. *A continent does not make a people, and so cannot legitimately be used to define or name a people. Ancestry, historical experience and culture are the valid factors for defining a people. Our latching at*

all unto a geographic name (African) is a seminal error that is spewing unending problems and confusions we could do without, and we should find our way out of it.

As a first step out of that costly error, we must Afrocentrically limit the African identity to those from Africa who have, over the centuries, been singled out as targets for enslavement by the black color of our skins. Hence, whites, European as well as Arab--the very predators who decided to target blacks for racialised chattel enslavement-- cannot be legitimately included with us, their prey, just because they've forcibly made themselves our neighbors on the African landmass. By the Africans, Pan Africanism can legitimately mean only the members of the indigenous populations of Africa who were, for the last 20 centuries, targeted for enslavement by Arabs and Europeans on account of their black skin color. That is the fundamental historical factor. Anybody who is not a biological descendant of these blacks cannot qualify as an African. Perhaps we could make our usage sufficiently distinctive by reserving the term **Afrikan** for such indigenous populations and their descendants – until we adopt a name for ourselves from an Afrikan language. In which case, we are interested in **Afrikans** and after that in **Afrika** their homeland, and not first in Africa, the continent, and then in Africans –those populations of any race whatever that are now located in the African continent, whether black or white, indigenous our exogenous, imperialist predators or their prey. Pan Africanism must therefore, with Black Consciousness rigor, limit its constituency to **Afrikans**, i.e. Black Africans and their global diaspora and, provisionally, rename itself **Pan Afrikanism**.

Black Consciousness historical considerations aside, *it would be scientifically incorrect to define Afrikans without including the biological/racial factor of black color/phenotype*, for, as political science assures us:

People define themselves in terms of ancestry, religion, language, history, values, customs, and institutions. They identify with cultural groups: tribes, ethnic groups, religious communities, nations, and, at the broadest level, civilizations. . . . In coping with identity crisis, what counts for people are blood and belief, faith and family. People rally to those with similar ancestry, religion, language, values, and institutions and distance themselves from those with different ones. [Huntington, 1997:21, 126]

Since the instantly visible mark of Afrikan ancestry and historical experience is the black skin, it would be unscientific to exclude it from the factors for defining Afrikanness.

Furthermore, just as it is the indigenous Chinese who define who are Chinese, and the indigenous Arabs who define who are Arabs, and the indigenous Europeans who define who are Europeans, so too do we indigenous Africans, a.k.a. Afrikans, have the right and duty to define who are Africans. And if it is in our interest to include a phenotype factor, black skin, in our definition, we must do so, regardless what anybody else thinks. In this regard, we need to note the Chinese example:

To the Chinese government, people of Chinese descent, even if citizens of another country, are members of the Chinese community and hence in some measure subject to the authority of the Chinese government. Chinese identity comes to be defined in racial terms. Chinese are those of the same “race, blood, and culture,” as one PRC scholar put it. In the mid-1990s, this theme was increasingly heard from governmental and private Chinese sources. For Chinese and those of Chinese descent living in non-Chinese societies, the

“mirror test” thus becomes the test of who they are: “Go look in the mirror,” is the admonition of Beijing-oriented Chinese to those of Chinese descent trying to assimilate into foreign societies. [Huntington, 1997:169]

We might, likewise, tell those of black African ancestry who claim to be Arabs or Europeans, as well as those Arabs and Europeans who claim to be Africans, to “Go look in the mirror!”

We could all learn from what our Afrikan-American brother, Runoko Rashidi, said on a Johannesburg radio program recently:

The hosts asked me my positions on global African unity.
I responded, and the phone lines lit up!

The first caller was a white man who said what a "racist" I was and how offended he was. I let him have it!!! He said that he was an African and that I was not. I said that I was an African and that he was not. I told him that you can teach a parrot to speak but that in the end it was still a bird. I told him that you can dress a monkey in a suit but in the end it was still an ape. I told him that his ancestors came to Africa uninvited, without passport or visa, stole the land, near exterminated whole groups of people, and enslaved and colonized the rest. And now, he wants to be an African!

I told him that his pedigree was European, his history was European, his lineage was European, his culture was European, and that he was a European! I guess that you could say that I effectively silenced him, and every other call that I received on both programs, from African and European alike, was extremely favorable! You would have been proud.

Yes indeed! Arabs and Europeans may be settled in Africa, but that doesn't make them Afrikans! ***Just because a snake has crawled into your bedroom and settled down to rear its young doesn't mean you should now count and embrace it as a member of your family.*** It would be extremely irrational and Afrocidal for Afrikans to accept a non-racial, continentalist concept of their identity.

Incidentally, we must note that in contrast to the European settlers in South Africa, the Arab settlers in North Africa do not normally claim to be Africans. They insist on their Arab identity and speak, at the most, of belonging to both the Arab and African regions of the world. The amazing anomaly is that Black African leaders, such as Nkrumah and Diop, have insisted on foisting African identity on them!

3. African Unity: unity of what, for what and against what?

African unity has been the major mantra of Pan Africanism for the past 50 years. Unfortunately, the purpose of the advocated unity has been so vague and unspecified as to leave the impression that it is nothing more than unity for unity's sake. Worse still, the uncritical welcoming of the Arabist-Imperialist AU suggests that even a unity in an enemy dungeon has become acceptable to Pan Africanism. Since a union in the prison of Imperialism or Arabism is contrary to the Afrikan interest, the concept of African unity has to be re-examined, and its purposes clarified and made consistent with the interest of Afrikans. We need to bear in mind that people do not unite for nothing or against nothing. Our experience in the past 2 millennia suggests that Pan

Afrika should be uniting against white domination, by Arabs no less than by Europeans.

Leaving aside the question of the vague purpose of African unification, and the question of whether the unification domain should be continental or sub-continental in scope, Pan Africanism has failed to examine the question of the character of the entities that it sought to unite. Nkrumah, for all his anti-colonial fervor, was the head of a neo-colonial Bantustan, and was seeking to unite a bunch of such neo-colonial Bantustans. If Pan Africanism has not abandoned its original anti-imperialist purpose, it is rather strange that it has not focused on the task of changing the neo-colonial character of these states it was attempting to unify. Diop touches on this when he said in his 1976 interview: “The neo-colonial character of such regimes is therefore an objective factor in the way of constituting a continental federation.” [Moore, 1986:262]

But even Diop failed to give the matter the type of examination it required. He saw it merely as an obstacle to federating, rather than a basic obstacle to such states ever saving Afrikans from imperialism, even when federated, —and, therefore, an obstacle that should be removed while, or even before, uniting them. After all, will individual armed robbers, if they form a gang, stop their armed robbery or get more effective at it? But continentalist Pan Africanism has been so obsessed with unification that it doesn't seem to have given this crucial aspect the attention it deserves.

As the example of Cuba makes clear, continental union government, in Africa or anywhere else, is neither necessary nor sufficient, and so is irrelevant for defeating a global neo-colonialism. Castro's little Cuba, right there at the doorstep of the USA, has proved that you don't need a union government of a continent to defeat imperialism locally; all you need is a resolute and clever anti-imperialist leadership, plus protection by a nuclear megastate/superpower. After he defeated Batista, Castro dismantled the neo-colonial state in Cuba and built an anti-imperialist state to lead the anti-imperialist reorganisation of Cuban society and economy. So, even little Ghana, had the CPP leadership been so minded, might have become an African Cuba. Instead, it remained a neo-colonial state and society while Nkrumah pursued the false and delusional project of continental union government in Africa.

Given the character of these Bantustans, is it any wonder that their OAU/AU has been a union of Bantustan bureaucrats and an anti-Afrikan agency of imperialism? After all, an AU of neo-colonial Bantustans can only be a much bigger neo-colonial Bantustan than its members. The neo-liberal IMF framework of the economic programs of its NEPAD can only make one wonder: By what devious route, by what subtle betrayals and mutations, has the anti-imperialist Pan Africanism of Du Bois and Nkrumah achieved the precise ends sought by the white-supremacist Pan Africanism of Jan Smuts that Du Bois and Nkrumah had pointedly opposed, namely an “African continent (ruled) in the interest of its white investors and exploiters”. [Du Bois, 1970:178; Nkrumah, 1973: 17]

carry over from the era of expatriate European colonialism when these states were local agencies of subjugation for their imperialist founders. That needs now to be changed. And having redefined security Afrocentrically, we need to invent organs for implementing it. Since neither the AU nor the UN can ever function as an organ of Afrikan collective security from both Imperialism and Arabism, it is imperative that we organize a **Black World League/Afrikan League** to do that job for us.

5. Afrikan solidarity

Why is Afrikan solidarity so weak nowadays? And what is needed to make it a strong, and automatic reflex yet again? In 1935, when Nkrumah, who was passing through London to the USA to study, saw a poster that read “MUSSOLINI INVADES ETHIOPIA,” he was overwhelmed by emotion. In his own remarkable words: “At that time, it was almost as if the whole of London had suddenly declared war on me personally.” The West African press reacted in a similar manner. One newspaper, for example, declared that “that war with Abyssinia is our war”. Ethiopian Defense Committees sprang up in various parts of West Africa and the Americas. Garvey and many other diaspora leaders organized help for Ethiopia. Some Afrikan-Americans, defying the US government’s “neutrality”, even went to fight in defense of Ethiopia. [Esedebe, 1980:117-121; Harris, 1993:708-713]

Why do we not react to Darfur, Mauritania, South Sudan etc with the exemplary indignation that Nkrumah experienced when he heard that Italy had attacked Ethiopia? For 50 years we have had the strange spectacle of Pan Africanists who show passionate solidarity with Palestinian Arabs but not with the black South Sudanese or Darfurian victims of Arabs! What does it take to imbue hundreds of millions of people with an active solidarity and the militant enthusiasm to defend their group at whatever cost to the individual? We must discover and apply such remedies to ourselves.

Having Afrocentrically and scientifically defined Afrikans—as well as non-Afrikans-- for ourselves and in our interest, with passing the “mirror test” as a necessary criterion; and having highlighted Pan Africanism’s weaknesses in the matters of Afrikan Unity, Collective Afrikan Security and Afrikan Solidarity, we can get on to working out a correct Pan Afrikanist position on Sudan and the Afro-Arab borderlands.

6. Sudan

By 1945, the agenda of Pan Africanism had crystallized as follows: to end colonialism and color discrimination in Pan Afrika. But quite surprisingly, the questions of Arab domination and anti-Black discrimination were not placed on the Pan Africanist agenda. The issue of Arab domination, surprisingly, did not attract continentalist Pan Africanist thinkers and leaders even during the Anya Anya war in Sudan (1955-1972). Whatever the reasons for that neglect, the project of ending Arab domination and expansionism in Africa needs to be now placed at the top of the Pan Afrikan agenda, in light of Afrikan experience in the Afro-Arab borderlands in the last 50 years. In the 50 years of continentalist Pan Africanism, with the sole exception of Zanzibar, Pan Afrika did not release any Afrikan territory or people from Arab domination or enslavement. Rather, more Afrikan lands and peoples have fallen under Arab rule and enslavement.

Before 1970, for lack of Biko's insight, Nkrumah and Co. threw Afrikans into an Arab embrace that inhibited Afrikans from defending themselves against Arab hegemonists. Since then, by failing to use Biko's insight to clear their confusions and complexes away, *the black governments in the OAU/AU have become, as shown in Dar Fur, like the black father who holds his own daughter down to be raped and battered by his Arab business partner and 'friend'*. That is the role played by the spineless AU presidents who met in Khartoum and Banjul this year without expelling the Arabist government of Sudan from the AU for its crimes of ethnic cleansing and genocide, and without doing enough to precipitate UN intervention to end the scandalous raping and killing and enslavement of black Africans in Dar Fur.

In atonement for all that, *Pan Afrika needs to acknowledge that Sudan is not an Arab family affair; that it is a theatre of the Afro-Arab Race War, and that the hegemonic Arab aggressors are the great enemy of Pan Afrika*. Pan Afrika must, therefore, in contrite solidarity and for collective security, vigorously mobilize support—financial, military, diplomatic, ideological, propaganda etc-- for the victims of Arabist attacks in Dar Fur and elsewhere in Sudan. We must also mobilize support for South Sudan to attain its independence in 2011. That is our task of self-reparation. In fact, Sudan is a serious test of our willingness to undertake self-reparation.

7. Pan Africanism's ideological deficiency

The ideological deficiency, not to say the total lack of ideology, on the part of the national liberation movements . . . constitutes one of the greatest weaknesses, if not the greatest weakness, of our struggle against imperialism.

--[Amilcar Cabral, 1980:122]

In the light of the weaknesses I have pointed to above, we need to take serious note of Cabral's observation and, therefore, assemble and test all the ideas of Pan Africanism to see if they amount to a coherent ideology for Afrikan liberation. And if they do not, it is our self-reparation obligation to elaborate them into an ideology with a transformative program for breeding the kind of Black Consciousness activists who can champion the interests and aspirations of the overwhelming majority of Afrikans on this earth. Only by so doing can Pan Africanism be revitalized; re-emerge, as **Pan Afrikanism**, from its doldrums; and gain popular following.

With these examples, let me leave the weaknesses of Pan Africanism and draw attention to the larger area of our

8. Afrocidal traits:

These include our Europhilia, Arabophilia and Afrophobia; also the idiotic individualism, oblivious of collective interests, of our black comprador elites who are obsessed with personal power and conspicuous consumania rather than the security and prosperity of their countries. Another Afrocidal trait is a fatalistic patience, especially under misrule, which General Jan Smuts, that white supremacist promoter of imperialist Pan Africanism, described in 1930 as "one of the world's marvels, second only to the ass's". Yet another is our callous indifference to the plight of other blacks.

Any shortlist of our Afrocidal weaknesses must include what Nkrumah described as "a lack of malice, an absence of the desire for vengeance for our

wrongs”. [Nkrumah, 1973:114]. Though Nkrumah lists this among the admirable traits of the African Personality, we need to take a critical look at it, for it is, in fact, Afrocidal.

Other observers have described it more candidly and in more revealing detail. For example, an American reporter, David Lamb, after 5 years travelling and observing Africans in 48 countries during the late 1970s, said:

Given all he has had to endure from the beginning of slavery to the end of colonialism, the African displays a racial tolerance that is nothing short of amazing. He holds no apparent grudge against the European as an individual, and it is rare indeed for any white person to experience even the slightest indignity because of his color. . . . The African has forgiven, if not forgotten.

As a white settler in Kenya, a former hunter of Mau Mau freedom fighters, explained to Lamb:

“Why has it been forgotten? Well, partly I think, because the African isn’t capable of the depth of emotion that the European has. He doesn’t love his women or hate his enemies with the same intensity. You look at a good solid white hatred and it can last for generations. Africans don’t hate that way.”

But, on the other hand, Lamb notes:

For a people who have had to tolerate so many injustices over the centuries, yet have remained basically gentle, polite and racially equitable, I was constantly shocked to see the cruelty, even sadism, that Africans inflict on one another so willingly.

And he wondered what makes the African “a fatalist, intent on his own survival but caring little for those who are less fortunate.”

--[Lamb, 1985:161-162,164, 235,236]

Likewise, from Canada in the 1980s, another investigator, O. McKague, reported:

As one female member of the Nationalist party told me, one can treat blacks like dirt for years, cease such treatment, and almost immediately they are willing to be your best friends. This, she explained, is because blacks do not have the capacity either to feel injustices or to remember them. Jews, she stated, are quite [a different matter].

— [McKague 1991:93]

This obscene rush to forgive and forget even the most grievous wrong done to us by the white enemy was most publicly exhibited in Archbishop Desmond Tutu’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission which, quite sacrilegiously, placed on the same moral level both the violence of the Apartheid oppressors and the counter violence of those who fought their oppressors! The armed aggressor violence of the Apartheid state criminals who inflicted the Sharpeville and other massacres and who murdered Steve Biko was treated as no different morally from the unarmed, defensive counter violence of the children of the Soweto uprising. *Tutu’s approach is as obscene as*

condemning equally for violence the soldier's hand that is strangling an infant and the milk teeth by which the infant tries to bite off the strangler's hand!

9. "Black racism"

One final trait on this shortlist. An Afrocidal trait that seems to have emerged in the 20th century is our defensive sensitivity to any imputation of "exclusivism/black racism". You can whitemail even the most intelligent and self-assured Afrikan to submit to any foolishness by the slightest hint that not to submit might be seen as "exclusivism"/"reverse racism"/"black racism". You can even get him to commit suicide or rape his mother by playing on that sensitivity! That was how even Nkrumah and Diop were whitemailed, or whitemailed themselves, into the Continentalist superstition. That even Diop-- our formidable authority on cultural identity and its constituent (historical, linguistic and psychological) factors-- fell into the Continentalist superstition, against the implications of his own cultural science, is an indication of just how effective a scarecrow this "exclusivism/black racism" charge can be. I would be surprised if the same whitemail is not a factor in the AU's timidity and complicity on Darfur! Luckily, Biko gave us the therapy, and we should all dutifully take the treatment, and get rid of our fear of being accused of "black racism".

Biko made it clear that "The most potent weapon in the hands of the oppressor is the mind of the oppressed" and that we must rid our minds of "imprisoning notions which are the legacy of the control of (our) minds by whites." [Biko, 1987:68] Among such "imprisoning notions" is the cluster of "black racism", "exclusivism", "inclusiveness", "non-racialism", "multi-racialism" etc. *We need to immunize ourselves against the false and crippling charge of "black racism". And to do that, we need to thoroughly study Steve Biko's works and apply them in our daily lives.*

Conclusion

As these traits are among the weaknesses our white enemies have exploited for millennia, I would invite Afrocentric psychologists, as a matter of urgency, to investigate and find therapies for them. I might add that even the traits of the southern cradle/sun cultures that Diop listed in his Two Cradles Theory, which some are inclined to celebrate, need to be investigated-- and eliminated, if found to be Afrocidal and to have contributed to our plight.

We must admit to ourselves that there are many things wrong with us, including psychological, cultural and social weaknesses. Otherwise we wouldn't be in the mess in which we find ourselves, and certainly not for two whole millennia! And we must have the honesty and courage to struggle against our profound weaknesses if we wish to survive, let alone with any dignity and self-respect. But we must note that the things wrong with us are not those harped on by enemy propaganda, namely, our black skins and our so-called IQ. We have no cause for any inferiority complex on account of those decoy issues.

Let me end by inviting all Pan Afrikanists, those who want Afrikans to survive and prosper, and especially the academics and other intellectuals among them, to follow Steve Biko's example and develop a comprehensive list of our genuine weaknesses and then focus on discovering and applying whatever remedies are appropriate for them, *regardless of white opinion.*

References and suggested Readings

- Bankie, F. and Mchombu, K. eds (2006) *Pan Africanism*, Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillan
- Biko, Steve (1987) *I Write What I Like*, Oxford: Heinemann Educational Books
- Cabral, Amilcar (1980) *Unity and Struggle*, London: Heinemann Educational Books
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1970) *W.E.B. Du Bois Speaks*, ed by Philip S. Foner, New York: Pathfinder Press
- Esedebe, P. O. (1980) *Pan Africanism*, Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers
- Finch, Charles S. (1986) "Further Conversations with the Pharaoh" in Van Sertima, Ivan ed. *Great African Thinkers, Vol. I*, New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1986, pp. 227-237
- Garvey, Amy Jacques ed. (1925) *Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*, New York: Atheneum, 1992
- Harris, Joseph E. (1993) "Africa and its diaspora since 1935" in Ali Mazrui, ed. *General History of Africa, Vol. VIII*, Paris: UNESCO, 1993, pp.705-723
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1997) *The Clash of Civilizations*, New York: Touchstone /Simon & Schuster
- Killens, John Oliver (1965) "The Black Writer Vis-à-vis His Country" in Addison Gayle, Jr. ed. *The Black Aesthetic*, New York: Anchor Books, 1972, pp.357-373
- Lamb, David (1985) *The Africans*, New York: Vintage Books
- McKague, O. ed (1991) *Racism in Canada*, Saskatoon: Fifth House
- Moore, Carlos (1976) "Interviews with Cheikh Anta Diop" in Van Sertima, Ivan ed. *Great African Thinkers, Vol. I*, New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1986, pp.249-283
- Nkrumah, Kwame (1973) *Revolutionary Path*, London: Panaf Books
- Van Sertima, Ivan (1986) "Death Shall not find us thinking that we die" in Van Sertima, Ivan ed. *Great African Thinkers, Vol. I*, New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1986, pp.7-16.

Feel free notice

Please feel free to comment on and fwd this document to any Pan-African persons, or to publish and reproduce it, unedited and in its entirety, to the Pan-African community, provided you credit the author, do not change, cut or add any word or otherwise mutilate the piece, i.e. publish as is or don't at all. If posted at a website, please email a copy of the web page to sundoor777@hyperia.com For print media use, please obtain prior written permission, and then send two (2) copies of the publication wherein used, to Chinweizu, P. O. Box 988, Festac Town, Lagos, Nigeria.

For further information please contact Chinweizu <sundoor777@hyperia.com>

All rights reserved

© Chinweizu 2006