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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

The Afrocentric approach to African Area Studies and African American Studies is a relatively new and budding endeavor. It differs from other academic disciplines by concerning itself with the empowerment of Africans. Units of analysis inherited from other disciplines, however, have restricted its approach. Most of the resultant theories focus on individuals and diasporic elements. Within Africa, these scholars recognize only ethnic and linguistic groups while they attack a continental-wide African identity as being pejoratively essentialist. These models, therefore, have not satisfactorily addressed the question of African agency at macro levels.

This new approach requires agential models at the level of African nation states and the ‘African world.’ The life and works of Kwame Nkrumah, including the ideology of Nkrumahism, offers a set of analytical and coherency tools with which to build an African-centered base in the study of international politics. Indeed, Nkrumah offers a revolutionary model of Pan-Africanism to the explication of African Personality studies. Nkrumahism stands as the intellectual progeny of Garveyism and the earlier works of Blyden.


Nkrumah is inevitably mentioned in scholarly discussions that assess Pan-Africanism from the Manchester 1945 Pan-African congress onward. His work
in the area of African liberation has overshadowed his early theoretic contributions to African studies. His significant contribution to African Centered thought, through the ideology of Nkrumahism, has only scant mention among Black Studies, Africa Area studies, African-American Studies, Africana Studies and Pan-African studies departments in the United States.

Nkrumah’s impact on the development of the fields of Black Studies and African Area studies requires further attention in the academy. This understatement results partly from political and epistemological debates between: Afrocentrists and Eurocentrists; Black nationalists and African nationalists; Diaspora nationalists and continentals; and, capitalists and socialists.

Besides these various polemical entities, Black Studies and African Area Studies have housed debates between the languages of various disciplines. This is clearly seen on one hand by those scholars in literature fields who often find themselves wed to periodizations categorized by deconstructionism and post-modernity. The sub-categorization and pathological vantage points employed in the field of social science have helped to ossify negative images of African descendants. There are healthy exceptions. Africology, a reflection of Afrocentricity in the academy, claims its own disciplinary language and thereby circumvents the extra stress points suffered by other scholars in the field.

On the level of language, an essential component in epistemology and gnosis in general, Africology has seized the discursive ground. This proved to be a major breakthrough in the study for African agency at the personal level. Africology, however, has not clarified the role of Africa’s modern development. Nkrumah’s experience and ideology has the potential to enrich this budding discipline with a Pan-African Centered paradigm.

Nkrumah’s life personifies the development of Pan-Africanism. Nkrumah shared an early battle against a foreign colonial system and witnessed the depersonalization of his clan and larger polities. He also experienced the early urge of Black and African nationalism through his affiliation with West African intellectuals and nationalists. He spent over a decade in the metropoles experiencing first hand the misery and promise of African descendants and immigrants. The bulk of those years were spent in the United States of America. He attended and taught at both Lincoln University and the University of Pennsylvania. In the United States and in England Nkrumah organized African students; provided and delivered meaningful social services; participated in fraternal orders; affiliated with Marxist theory and socialist organizations; published newspapers and tracts; and played a key role in the historic 1945 Manchester Pan-African Congress (Fifth PAC).

From that point, Nkrumah’s life was more than a metaphor of Pan-Africanism; it became the guiding force of the movement. Nkrumah’s strategies were global and reached all corners of Africa and beyond. The ideology of Nkrumahism explicated epistemological and ethical principals. It also included a
philosophy to undergird African agency, the central distinguishing pillar of Africology from other disciplines.

Nkrumah’s reign as the personification and leader of Pan-Africanism was a period of enhanced, multileveled, African agency. Some of the factors leading to this enhanced agency predated Nkrumah’s ascendency. Significant ones, however, were directly related to his theories and policies. Specifically utilizing the resources of a modern state in the quest for organized continental unity, the assertion of a non-racial African Personality, the assertion of scientific socialism for all of Africa, a liberated zone approach to Pan-African liberation, are all attributed to the Nkrumah era of Pan-Africanism. These themes resurface in discussions around the Afrocentric postulates of Molefi Asante as explications for Africology’s basis.

The multidisciplinary focuses of many Black Studies programs assess Nkrumah’s experiences and ideology in alienating terms. This situation is often due to alienating influences resident in the ontology of guilty disciplines. Historians in African Area studies, as a case in point, traditionally come from preparatory backgrounds in colonial history. The concerns of these disciplines historically have been centered on methods to profitably integrate the colonial areas and populations into the empire. Nkrumah’s efforts were antithetical to these interests and his image suffered the consequences. While multidisciplinary research can help explicate the social milieu surrounding Nkrumah’s life and works, the biases of the disciplines should not be forgotten.

The bulk of academic social science disciplines are all too often tainted with a pro-imperialist bias limiting their abilities to deliver a balanced assessment of the nemesis of European imperialism that was Nkrumah. Studies ranging in discipline from Psychology to Political Science have cast Nkrumah as a notorious egomaniac. The discipline of History, functioning in the realm of Black Studies field, often restricts its twentieth century focus to the African experience in the Americas and Europe. This was less true in the 1970s, when the modern field of Black Studies was initiated, but it had increasingly become the rule in the 1990s.

Historians and policy advisors of colonialism dominated Africa Area studies historically. Later it received an infusion of anthropologists, archaeologists, and scholars in religious studies. In Ghana, in 1962, the First Africanist Conference reoriented African Area studies. At this conference, Kwame Nkrumah delivered an address that gave the unifying purpose to their efforts. Nkrumah’s contribution to this field dates back to his days as a student at University of Pennsylvania. As the Prime Minister and later President of Ghana, Nkrumah recommended specific curricular items for Pan-Africanists.

Nkrumahism synthesized the ideals of the Pan-African movement and the anti-imperialist movement. Marxist dialectical materialism and aspects of historical materialism were absorbed into the ideology’s epistemological tool kit. Aspects of Marxism that were deemed out of cultural synch with African culture were eliminated. Nkrumahism considered its first psychosocial referent to be the
values underlying traditional communal African society. As such, it asserted a philosophy that accepted the ordinal primacy of matter but refuted the sole existence of matter insisted upon by dogmatic Marxists. This assertion of Nkrumah’s had profound effects on subsequent and derivative theories. Nkrumahism, as a system of ideas, vitalized the impetus for social change and liberated it from the morbidity of Marxist determinism. Nkrumah’s Consciencism puts it most succinctly:

Revolution has two aspects. Revolution is a revolution against an old order; and it is also a contest for a new order. The Marxist emphasis on the determining force of the material circumstances of life is correct. But I would also like to give great emphasis to the determining power of ideology. (1970d, 34)

Nkrumahism became a distinct breed. It contributed other modifications to Marxist ideology.

Nkrumahism refused atheism as being out of touch with the African’s notion of spirituality. Nkrumahism also asserted the African Personality as a cultural unifier of a continental wide African nationalism. It could be speculated that Marx would have agreed with Nkrumah’s approach but many Marxists classified Nkrumah as a revisionist. Nkrumahism was not satisfied with class-consciousness; it asserted a mass nation/class analysis as a minimum. The nationalist aspect of European Marxism was seldom declared and often chided as reactionary. History would come to show that declaring socialism, especially National Socialism, in Europe did not necessarily mean the elimination or exploitation of workers. In areas of national construction, Nkrumah’s Pan-African leanings made him appear more radical than most Marxists.

Nkrumahism also sought the elimination of borders resulting from Europe’s imperial intrusion into Africa. It opposed the conceptual division of Africa by the Sahara rather seeing the Sahara as a bridge. This position has profound potential for African Centered thought, which is often at odds with Islamic-dominated North Africa. The anti-Arab sentiment of many scholars in the Black Studies professions often blocks research in the so-called Maghreb. Vital information that could complement research in ancient Pre-Kemetic history, Kemetic history, Carthage, traditional African resistance to Islam and Arabization, and North African resistance to European imperialism, is thus, sadly unavailable.

Nkrumah advocated other profound linkages. Nkrumahism linked the Black revolution with Pan-Africanism, which Nkrumah redefined as the total liberation and unification of Africa under a socialist union government. In his text, Class Struggle in Africa, Nkrumah stated:

The African revolutionary struggle is not an isolated one. It not only forms part of the world socialist revolution, but must be seen in the context of the Black revolution as a whole. In the U.S.A., the Caribbean, and wherever
Africans are oppressed, liberation struggles are being fought. In these areas the Black man is in a condition of domestic colonialism, and suffers both on the grounds of class and of colour.

The core of the Black Revolution is in Africa, and until Africa is united under a socialist government, the Black man throughout the world lacks a national home…. Africa is one continent, one people, and one nation. The notion that in order to have a nation it is necessary for there to be a common language, a common territory and a common culture, has failed to stand the test of time or the scrutiny of scientific definition of objective reality. (1970c, 87–88)

To Nkrumah, all “peoples of African descent” were African and “belonged to the African nation” (Nkrumah 1970c, 87). Nkrumah advanced the Pan-African ideal and restructured its definition as a national goal more so than a character of racial unity. This was the vision of the problem from the African homeland and Ghanaian liberated zone. This perspective caused a paradigmatic shift in the Pan-African movement.

This was a shift from DuBois, another key Pan-African agent, who had declared the twentieth century as the century of the color line. DuBois addressed what he called, ‘double-consciousness,’ painfully divided against itself by the ‘color line’ of racism. According to DuBois, this double consciousness threatened to tear one asunder in that each consciousness was antagonistic toward each other.

For Nkrumah the cultural contradictions took on a different form. The essential obstacles to Africa’s liberty and unity were the conflicting values of Africa’s traditional communal past and the impacts of external intrusion. Nkrumah recognized the crisis of an unresolved ‘triple consciousness.’ Rooted in cultural synthesis, Nkrumahism sought a positive resolution of ‘traditional African’ values with the Islamic and Euro-Christian impact. This synthesis was sought to resolve the crisis in African conscience. Ali Mazrui has also used this latter approach, though the weight assigned to the Islamic impact appears heavier is Mazrui’s model.

No discipline is free of ideological influence. “In fact, we observe only what our predilections, problems, physical condition, interests, expectations, orientations, and theory make relevant” (Henderson 1995, 9). Academic disciplines are often laced with notions of racism, bias of sex (gender), and socio-economic class bias (Henderson 1995, 13). Other hegemonic postures taint disciplines that have their origin and/or administrative budget controlled by imperial interest groups. Such is the case with a number of traditional social science disciplines within the academy.

The rise of the modern discipline of Economics coincides with ascendancy of the French and British empires. These economists were concerned with how to maximize the accrual of wealth for Europe. “Consolidated during the colonial era, early work in Africa shaped the conception of anthropology as an inductive
search for cross-cultural generalizations…. Indeed, the image of these societies as constructed by anthropologists had been shaped by the anthropologists’ own participation in the colonial enterprise” (Bates, Mudimbe, and O’barr 1993, xiv). “For social scientists, Africa appears to pose a problem of incorporation” (Bates et al., xviii). “The vast majority of political scientists still classify research on African questions as peripheral “area study” which is not essential to the discipline’s scientific progress” (Sklar 1993, 84). The perspectives of these disciplines gave rise to a set of denigrating postures rampant in research around Pan-African agency.

Two of the most devastating postures generated by these disciplines have been 1) the insistence on dividing African agency into non-viable entities, and 2) the requirement for assimilation of African cultural options into the European Empire. These postures weaken Pan-African agency and thereby cheapen the value of life in Africa. The reduction of effectiveness and vitality results from a double malignancy. Africans experience a devaluation of their labor and an unfair exchange for their resources in relation to metropolitan centers.

With their historicity stripped from them, they experience a denigration of self-image in educational institutions. This condition, more so than social and individual derogatory acts, leads to a condition of reflective powerlessness for the subject.

Tainted with these perspectives, two disturbing trends have emerged in the academy:

1. The rise of diasporization as a primary theme in Black and African-American studies versus African-centering and
2. The continued balkanization of social research in Africa Area studies.

These trends go beyond neglecting the needs of the African people, they actively counter them and decrease the agential effectiveness of the African populace. The former does so by detaching the cultural importance of the African land base and ancestral connection, an African value dating as far back as ancient Egypt. This in effect blurs the vision of forward motion and accomplishments/setbacks of a culture. Pan-African Agency has a spatial character that requires willful balance in order to be effective. One way to render it ineffective is by distorting the space/time anchors serving as cultural gyroscopes to Pan-African agency. Disjointed, and often self-negating, micro agency results at best.

The effect of academic balkanization limits Pan-African agency by encouraging or endorsing ineffective units and levels of analysis. Thus, studies become restricted to African-Americans, continentals, Ghanaians, Egyptians, Kikuyu, etceteras. Neither of these categories, in disjointed fashion, can resolve problems that face them as a collective. Some studies have accepted the collective problems of Africa and its descendants but cannot envision a collective solution.
A PRESENTATION OF KEY TERMS

Afrocentric scholars, in their effort to improve the life chances of African persons and people in particular and humanity in general, construct paradigmatic approaches in which African values, thought, agency, and experience are considered the means and end of all inquiry. Nkrumah’s contribution to Pan-African agency is magnanimous and well documented. Examining that contribution Afrocentrically should give rise to theories that will clarify political, economic, psychological and cultural aspects of Pan-African agency.

Pan-African empowerment requires a unifying worldview and disciplinary approaches that foster and enhance the agency of the African people. The move for political, economic, social and psychological well being of Africans residing within Africa proper is in dire need of a qualified African centered perspective to address problems of African agency.

The field of African studies, in order to support improved African agency, requires Afrocentric resuscitation. The term resuscitation is used because at one point Africanists had been urged to use approaches and methods that would empower the general African populace. Nkrumah did this urging during his reign as President of Ghana. The field, however, has not followed his lead. Africalogy is the exception.

Afrocentric scholars operating in the field of African Area Studies are in need of viable theories that help evaluate Africa in World Affairs. Nkrumah’s ideological statements from 1945 through 1966 offer conceptual pillars for constructing such theories. Overall, Nkrumah’s strategic theme for developing Pan-African agency may offer purposeful approaches to the various fields and disciplines in the academy.

Africology and ‘Africalogy’

My discussion of African agency spans both the fields of Area Studies and Black/African-American Studies. When that discussion centers inquiry on Africa and Africans; and seeks to improve the life chances of all Africans, Afrocentric theories arise. While Afrocentric scholars are guided by the same paradigm, the fields within which they associate influence their inquiry and theory construction. Scholars agreeing with the Afrocentric paradigm have given rise to the discipline of Africology within the field of Black and African-American Studies. While this field addresses a global African cultural experience, it has geographically focused on Africans in the Americas. In contrast, the field of Area Studies focuses on the exclusive examination of life in contemporary Africa. In each field Afrocentric scholars seek to conceptually reunite the African trans-Atlantic experience.

‘Africalogy’ is a term used in this book to name the disciplinary focus within the field of Area Studies, which examines the African continent and/or the populations residing within. Its scholars are Afrocentric and/or Pan-Africanist in
outlook and this distinguishes them from their field colleagues, many of whom are scholars based in colonial disciplines and therefore employ tools of analysis insufficient to improve Pan-African agency.

‘Africalogy’ differs from Africology in that the former focuses little on African descendants residing outside of Africa because of European imperial dispersion. On the other hand, Africology is a disciplinary pinnacle within the field of Black, African-American, Afro-American, and Africana studies. Within this field, it is distinguished by its Afrocentric core location. Many others in the field however, are wed to colonial disciplines in a similar fashion as Area Studies.

Both, Africalogy and Africology, engage African-centered data and both employ a variety of positive synthetic approaches to gathering data. Certain concepts we will encounter, however, are rooted in one or the other of these approaches. The concept, ‘African world’, for example, grows from the Black nationalism of Africology while the concept, ‘African Union’, arises from the Pan-Africanism of Africalogy. These concepts are not exclusively placed in one field or the other, but are different points of vision within the same worldview. This work highlights the distinct points of views only when it adds to the descriptive analysis of Nkrumah’s ideological and academic approaches.

**African Centered**

This term is used as an intellectual and/or ideological locative. More often than not, this term is used incorrectly. Many disciplines are African Supported but not African Centered. This means that data on Africa and Africans are collected with the supportive purpose of answering disciplinary questions. Centering, however, speaks to a purposeful emanation. A work that is African centered is culturally rooted in the broad spectrum that is African culture. Scholarship that is African-centered has general, specific, macro, and micro aspects.

Generally, African-centered scholarship is that scholarship which orbits the experience of African peoples. This type of orbit is similar to economic scholarship, which orbits around the question of resources and resource accumulation, and history, which orbits around chronologically significant events, persons, and processes. Culture and interests refine the term “significant”.

Another example of this general approach is found in the way that anthropological scholarship treats customs and rituals, or the concern that political scientists have with government. For African-centered scholarship, the agential factors are African peoples and their organizations (in the broadest sense of the term).

A more specific character of African-centered scholarship is its tendency to accept as fact, an unbreakable bond of culture between Africa and Africans. Scholars of other disciplines find this tenet to be “essentialist” and therefore inaccurately stagnant.
The essential relationship between Africa and African populations is not deemed as problematic to those who find the discovery and presentation of knowledge to be culturally specific. Even those African-centered scholars who are wedded to colonial disciplines appear to accept this essential relationship between Africa and the populations that evolved there since pre-historic times.

Historical inquiries often link the historical evolutions and revolutions of African descended populations inside and outside of the African continent. The discipline of Economy is centered on resource discovery and allocation, human and otherwise. Psychologists center on normative values and mental health while Anthropologists center on ethnic subgroups and are resistant to accepting the idea of a continent-wide African culture. Africalogy and Africology place African agency at the center of inquiry.

**African Liberation Movement (ALM)**

This movement includes the collection of African organizations and key personnel that cooperated to bring a cessation to the European classical colonialism. They sought to dismantle the colonial apparatus that dominated Africa from the latter part of the nineteenth century through the latter part of the twentieth century. Tactical unity within the movement existed on the ideas of socialism and unity.

**Pan-African Nationalist Movement (PANM) and the African Unity Movement (AUM)**

These are the monikers for that association of African agents committed to the rapid evolution and revolution of a continent-wide autochthonous government and cultural institutions. These nationalists are to be distinguished from regionalists and micro-nationalists.

The African Liberation Movement (ALM) was subsumed for a while under the rubric of the PANM but with the assertion of an African Union the PANM was brought into clearer focus and distinguished from the ALM which sought nationalisms wedded to colonial borders. In this work, the PANM speaks to those who promoted the establishment of Africa as one nation.

The African Unity Movement (AUM) was a broader movement that included the PANM and federalist ranging from those that would accept a Union to those that would accept a Federal form of continental unity. Some of the participants of the Casablanca Group were a part of this movement.

**African Personality**

In its broadest sense, African Personality speaks to the cultural idiosyncrasy of African peoples as distinct from non-African peoples. Edward Wilmot Blyden (1832–1912) used the term as far back as 1883 in a speech titled, *The Origin and
**Purpose of African Colonization** to the Young Men’s Literary Association of Sierra Leon (Esedebe 1982, 36). Marcus Garvey (1887–1935) popularized the concept to the African masses in the Americas, Europe, and Africa through his organization, the Universal Negro Improvement Association and African Community Leagues and their organs, *Negro World* (1918–1933), *Daily Negro Times* (1922–1924), *Blackman* (1929–1931), *The Black man magazine* (1933–1939) (Esedebe 1982, 67; Lewis 1988, 80–83). Both of these Caribbean born Africans were somewhat condescending in referential language when referring to Africans on the African continent. Through the passage of time, however, both discovered and projected the splendors of African achievement. Both ideologues were also drenched in a racial analysis, which is understandable given their geographical origin and upbringing.

These two points distinguish this older usage from the way it was employed by Nkrumah. The change was more one of degree rather than kind. For Nkrumah this personality is still a distinct reflection of a distinct people but that distinction is based on synthesis of heterogeneous traditions and external impacts on a composite culture as opposed to a biological race. Nkrumah also held traditional values and methods in higher esteem than the external impacts imposed on the African continent.

**Collectivist African Personality**

This concept speaks to the Pan-African national culture. While close to the African world in meaning this concept is not essentially a race-based one but a race conscious one. More importantly, it is an ideological and culture based identity. It speaks to an ‘African People’, which Nkrumah referred to as the African masses and which Sékou Touré often called the People’s Class. It speaks to the behavior and character of organized entities in their attempt to establish an optimal zone for continued cultural development.

**Composite African**

Under a discussion of cosmological issues, Asante speaks to the concept of ‘composite African’. “The fundamental assumptions of Africalogical in quiry are based on the African orientation to the cosmos. By ‘African’ I mean clearly a ‘composite African’ not a specific discrete African orientation which would rather mean ethnic identification, i.e., Yoruba, Zulu, Nuba, etc.” (Asante 1992, 9). To these specific groups we will add, Nzema, Asante, Fante, African American, and Ghanaian. The composite African is the foundation of Pan-African identity and the individual reflection of the African Personality.
Pan-Africanism
This concept is a dynamic one that is fully discussed in chapter 4. Suffice to say here that this term addresses a set of ideas and actions that seek to establish an optimal zone for macro-African agency. Nkrumah has stated it as an objective while others have described it in its adjectival form as an indicator of cross-group participation of African peoples. Some authors have also described it as an ideology. In this book, it is made synonymous with the African Personality, African Genius, and African Community as described by Nkrumah.

Philosophical Consciencism
Nkrumahism projected the philosophical basis for decolonization. It suggests an applied philosophy that takes the social milieu of the philosopher(s) into consideration. It upholds certain traditional values while synthesizing incoming experiences. Finally, it maps out the creation of liberated territories through the formulaic application of “positive action.”

Centrism
“Centrism, the groundedness of observation and behavior in one’s own historical experiences, it shapes the concepts, paradigms, [sic] theories, and methods of Africalogy [sic]” (Asante 1992, 12). The center becomes the filter of all experiences and the emanation of all decisions. Locating the center of an agent helps to provide awareness of the motive factors surrounding her, his, or its willful actions. Behavior, language patterns, and symbol preferences are processes that assist in identifying locations.

Object-Subject
Both Nkrumah and Asante address the false claims of universality that Eurocentric scholars attach to European hermeneutics and culture. Asante’s refutation of these claims is rooted in a basic premise that rejects the object/subject dichotomy. Asante illuminates this in the following quote:

The Afrocentrist sees knowledge of this “[inside] place” perspective as a fundamental rule of intellectual inquiry because its content is a self-conscious obliteration of the subject/object duality and the enthronement of an African wholism. (1992, 5)

What seems to be a contradiction around Asante’s desire for Africans to occupy the position of “subject” and Nkrumah’s desire for Africans to occupy the position of “objectivity” is actually a dilemma of disciplinary language. Asante’s previous training in communication theory explains why he sees “subject” status
as an elimination of marginalization. Nkrumah’s experience with colonial economics would explain why he sees the “subject” status as the embodiment of marginality, which is characteristic of the colonial subjects. Both positions are calling for the assumption of agency but in different lingoes.

Multidisciplinary studies often face this unavoidable problem. Sékou Touré used a hybrid term that seems to resolve this language and concept faux par. For Touré, the human being is, and should be, the subject-object. For Touré, this means that persons are the ends and means of culture. Thus, agency is for and by the agent. This proves to be a healthy remedy for the Afrocentric method, in which “interdisciplinary study is one of the primary principles” (Asante 1993, 56).

**Traditional Rulers**

Traditional rulers in this text refer to those queens, kings, and local leaders, which, before European colonial intervention, managed the affairs of polities throughout Africa. It is a broad and sweeping term including a host of traditional interrelated leadership groups and public officials. All seekers of political control sought the collaboration or annihilation of these rulers.
CHAPTER 2
Method to Examine Nkrumah’s Contribution to Pan-African Agency

This chapter explains the methodology employed to Afrocentrically evaluate the ideology of Nkrumahism. It will also address the key concepts, sources of data used and the rationale for the selection of data sources. A description of Afrocentricity and its impact on disciplines used to examine African phenomena is given.

This examination of Nkrumahism uses Africology as its core discipline. The organization and presentation of materials will employ a periodization that is idiosyncratic to Pan-African historiography. Descriptive theoretical tools were employed when needed from the disciplines of psychology, economics, politics, linguistics, philosophy and international relations. They are useful tools for the evaluation of broad praxis and ideology. Their use values are elevated when grounded in the life affirming moral and ethical base of Afrocentricity.

The definition of concepts and terms that add important information and structure to the examinations of Nkrumahism are: Pan-Africanism, philosophical conscientism, philosophical materialism, nationalism, socialism, African liberation movement, African unity movement, political location and organizational agency.

The structure of this book follows the description of the analytical approach and the assumptions held by the author. I will then illuminate my relationship to this area of inquiry through a process of introspection, which is required of Afrocentric intellectual production.

AFROCENTRICITY

Afrocentricity is an African-centered perspective and as such, its ultimate challenge is “how to bring about social justice or Maāt” (Keto 1994, 82). Keto has summarized Afrocentricity as “an encapsulating term that is used to describe the complex theoretical process of knowledge formation which places Africans at the center of information about themselves” (1994, vii). Afrocentrism, according to Keto, is “the social practices that emerge from the relocation of knowledge about Africans and peoples of African descent outside Africa” (1994, vii).
Obenga agrees with Keto on the concept of Afrocentricity and clarifies further that it can be correlated “with the anthropological dimension of Maât, which deals with the Society and Man” (1995, 79). He quotes Asante as defining Afrocentricity as, “literally placing African ideals at the center of any analysis that involves African culture and behavior” (1995, 79; Asante 1987, 6). Obenga goes on to say that a “similar effort to undertake the critical study of the philosophies of the past led Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, first President of Ghana, to consciencism (a philosophy and ideology of decolonization)” (1995, 79).

Asante states in a chapter titled On Afrocentric Metatheory, that “Afrocentricity is a simple idea. At its base it is concerned with African people being subjects of historical and social experiences rather than objects in the margins of European experiences” (Asante 1993, 99).

The Afrocentric idea, according to Asante, has the following five distinguishing characteristics:

1. An intense interest in psychological location as determined by symbols, motifs, rituals, and signs;
2. A commitment to finding the subject-place of Africans in any social, political, economic, architectural, literary, or religious phenomenon with implications for questions of sex, gender, and class;
3. A defense of African cultural elements as historically valid in the context of art, music, education, science, and literature;
4. A celebration of “centeredness”, agency, and a commitment to lexical refinement that eliminates pejoratives about Africans or other people;
5. A powerful imperative from historical sources to revise the collective text of African people. (Asante n.d., 4)

On this last point, Obenga adds, “Afrocentricity, then, implies two things: (a) the critique of Western historicism, psychologism, and reductivism; and (b) the orientation of the African mind from its “natural” center in order to produce acts of consciousness, or more correctly, of self-consciousness” (1995, 10). To Obenga it is clear; Afrocentricity “is a principle that rests on the human capability of self-understanding” (1995, 10).

A SYNTHETIC AFROCENTRIC PARADIGM

A synthesis of Afrocentric paradigm constructed by Asante, and commented on by Keto, supply the thematic structure used to evaluate Nkrumahism. Briefly stated, this paradigm involves the utilization of the following concepts:

1. Individual and organizational agency in the intellectual and social landscape;
2. Psychological, political, and philosophical location;
3. Historicity and hermeneutics;
4. Critique and delinking;
5. Denunciation of Eurocentric and Sinocentric hegemony; and
6. Assertion of an African culture, personality, and genius.

**Individual and Organizational Agency in the Intellectual and Social Landscape**

The concept of agency is best understood by reviewing a precise etymology of the term “agent.” Today, the term, “agent,” means, something that produces or is capable of producing an effect. As a word, it has been traced through Middle English to the Middle Latin word, agens. This word derived from the Latin present participle, agere, which means drive, lead, act, or do (Webster 1972).

The identification, evaluation, and qualification of agency to “regain freedom,” are concerns of Afrocentric inquiry (Asante 1987, 159). These perennial concerns are directly related to the history of social and cultural struggles experienced by African populations in their effort to establish and maintain “well being”. Who should be well and what is meant by ‘wellness’ are questions that are addressed in Afrocentric examinations, thus relevant identification of subjects, objects and intervening categories are required. In line with this concern, this work offers a categorization of the social forces and agents with which Nkrumah had to interact.

Afrocentric evaluation assumes and asserts that descriptions of wellness involve culturally based values. This inquiry also assumes and asserts that self-conscious behavior, thus agency, is most effective and successful when consistent with the understanding of those values. The agent’s understanding and practice of cultural values are seen as the internal motive factors of volition. This is formulaic in Asante’s assertion that “consciousness precedes unity” (Asante 1993, 42). Life threatening forces are seen as the objects of disharmony, discord, disease and disorder. This is not necessarily hedonistic for hedonism is anchored in an individualistic ethic. Rather it is life-centric, animating vitality, reflecting and regenerating cultural values.

Scholars, starting from the ideological perspectives of their inquiry, approach the relationship between subjects, objects and opposition from differing vantage points. For Afrocentrists, the relationship between these categories and agency is one of ‘conditioned urgency,’ more so than ‘causality.’ In other words, rather than restricting inquiry to the cause of a phenomenon, questions asked will focus on the most rapid formula for African empowerment in all aspects of life.

This is epistemologically distinct from psycho-sociological concerns with the concept of agency. Those concerns seek to ontologize and serialize action and results from the point of individual volition (McCann 1998). The psycho-sociological identification of the “self” falls short in codification. It constructs a competitive relationship between the individual and collective sense of self (Segal 1991). This unworkable dichotomy contradicts the continuous relationship
from the collective entity to the individual entity, which is assumed in the Afrocentric paradigm.²

More specifically, to assess the collective influence on Nkrumah and the impact of his ideology on Pan-African activity, it is necessary to recognize the organized character of collective agency. Only in this way can Nkrumah, as agent, be understood in his ideological extension.

Göran Ahrne, though not an Afrocentrist, developed an outlook on agency that proves to be especially useful in examining Nkrumah. In his text, *Agency and Organization: Towards an organizational theory of society* (1990), Göran Ahrne, allies himself with but claims to go beyond the so-called ‘New Theoretical Movement within the social sciences.’ He uses the metaphor of a ‘social landscape,’ and positions social systems into a daily ‘lifeworld’ as opposed to vice versa. “Social landscape is a mingling of diverse social processes and phenomena that happen to coincide in a certain place at a certain time” (1990, 24) Ahrne, in line with the movement he claims to be transcending, rejects the micro/macro theories of agency as unsatisfactory and demands post haste that action and structure be interwoven (1990, 4). The movement also seeks to connect the agent with the organization and remove Occam’s razor from the relationship.

This concept looks different from various vantages and reflects diversity of depth and texture. Changes in the environment of the landscape “depend on the strength of various objects in their relations to the nearest environment. Their strength, however, emanates from their origins and their inner logic” (Ahrne 1990, 25). For the author, components of the social landscape include:

1. Nation-state (materialized as schools, railways, prisons)
2. Capitalist enterprise (materialized as processes of industries or real estate)
3. Interest organizations (no examples of materialization given)
4. Families (no examples of materialization given)
5. Cultures (materialized as books signs, symbols, paintings)
6. Languages (materialized as books signs, symbols, paintings) and

The social landscape is comprised of various terrains and is inhabited by people.

It is made up of the artefacts of individual and collective actions…. The interaction between individuals and organizations, as well as the interaction between organizations, must be comprehended in relation to their positions in the terrain, which keep them together. (Ahrne 1990, 27)

In response to the auto-query, “what is organized?” the author identifies a basic feature of organizations: permanency. To Ahrne, this quest for permanency drives the organization to seek favorable control over its immediate environment within the social landscape. Organization also calls for an order that molds the
agency of its constituents. “The relationship between organizations and individuals is paradoxical” (Ahrne 1990, 37). On one hand, organizations become free from individual dependence, thus possibly outliving them and acting beyond individual restraints. In fact, Ahrne says they are “extraindividual” entities. At the same time, “activities of organizations are tied to unique individual actors” (Ahrne 1990, 37).

Ahrne’s main point is that the conglomeration of human activity is best understood when discussed in terms of the social landscape metaphor. Rejecting the traditional units of analysis used by sociologists, he asserts the employment of the central category of organization as a pivotal actor. He does not deny the role of the individual, generic and unique, but he contextualizes his and her agency through the qualification of organized, semi-organized, and unorganized life within the social landscape. He also offers a typology of organizations, which, though limited, is informative in describing the relationships existing between organizations and between organizations and their constituents on the various terrains in the social landscape.

Another landscape, however, must be included in order to explain Pan-African agency. While Ahrne advocates the use of the social landscape as a space of living entities, he does not really address the life reason of this topographical metaphor. Without the consideration of an “intellectual landscape,” the landscape remains a field of minerals. Some similar relationships that appear in the social landscape are replicated in the intellectual landscape model but the method of observation varies, as do the agents. Party, educational, governmental, and enterprising institutions mold the intellectual landscape in an effort to guide the social landscape. It is in the intellectual landscape where disciplines and languages engage each other. It is also here where ideologies are engaged.

Schiele (1990) and Warfield-Coppock (1995) wrote articles concerning Afrocentric theories on organizations and particularly Afrocentric organizations. These articles are admittedly limited in that they focus their case studies on African controlled organizations in the USA. However, they offer an animating set of values for which organizations can be internally assessed. More importantly, they discuss organizations as personalities and cultures with characters dependent on axiological and epistemological values. Warfield-Coppock’s article offers a general topology of organizations based on cultural assumptions while Schiele’s earlier article focused on delinking from the values of Eurocentric models. The outstanding agreement between both of their works is on the issue of collectivity.

Both articles stress as Afrocentric the value of the individual’s dependence on the collective for any sense of human meaning. The organization is not seen merely as a sum of individuals, it is seen as a living entity itself (Schiele 1990; Warfield-Coppock 1995).

Adding organizations as a key element in the inventory of actors is helpful to the examination of Nkrumah and Nkrumahism for it illuminates the extension of agency beyond the individual. It also points to the existence of organized
influence in the equation of collective agency. Finally, it texturizes the concept of culture by including it as an organization within the social landscape. In this work, the development of the landscape is mapped through a Pan-African historiography.

The obstacles that bedeviled Nkrumah were organized and functioned within the social landscape. The drama that unfolded between his organizations and opposing organizations help illuminate Nkrumah’s edicts on Pan-African agency. At times, the drama took the form of defensive resistance. Other times it took the form of offense. After all, the social landscape that surrounded Nkrumah’s agency was war torn.

Here it is important to mention that themes of resistance and protest are tactical and occasionally strategic but they always assume an opposition in the environment to overcome. From this premise, I will search the data to identify opposition in the form of organizations within the intellectual and social landscapes as indicated by Nkrumah. I will also identify Nkrumah’s organized counter-responses to these obstacles and attempt to show their connection to the general strategy put forth by Nkrumah.

In the strategic arena, only goals and general approaches are announced while in the tactical arena, particular details of action are discussed. Strategy, the more theoretical of the two, addresses urgent conditions for the wellness of the subject-object.3 Tactics, the grounded defense-offense, addresses the conditions for the wellness strategy. Both strategy and tactics assume some rational agency against opposition to wellness.

The distinction between strategy and ontology requires brief discussion for clarity on the concept of ‘agency.’ Firstly, the ontological question of being is not debatable to Afrocentric inquiry. ‘Character of being’ upstages the concern to explain ‘being.’ Afrocentric inquiry assumes that agency is an essential characteristic of the human spirit. Accepting it as such, the qualification of agency becomes a strategic challenge to Afrocentric scholars. These scholars have to define a workable relationship with African tradition to secure an African present and future. What is to be retained and what is to be abolished? These questions were addressed by Nkrumah and may help surface the issues that affect an effective balance between tradition and innovation.

For Afrocentric inquiry, the values guiding an agent’s quest for Maātic balance are of supreme importance. The identification of this ideal balance is for Afrocentric inquiry what ontology is for philosophy. There are other names used by Afrocentric scholars for this balance.5 Nevertheless, there is a significant overlap in principles and assumptions regardless of nomenclature.

The generative and sustaining force of Afrocentric scholarship is the desire to most effectively and rapidly improve African agency to ensure arrival at a state of Maātic balance. Qualified agency is made possible by accurate Afrocentric examination as it: (1) increases the strategic and tactical options available for praxis; and (2) evaluates the relative effectiveness of past African agency.
Agency effectiveness is assessed in this work to ascertain the traces of Nkrumahism that reached beyond Nkrumah. How did the influence of ideological pronouncements effect the marshaling of resources? Levels and degrees of qualified agency are measured by achievements. The scope of agency is identified at the levels of individual, ideology, and the organization.

Individual agency is asserted as a conditional factor of personal power while organizational agency is asserted as a conditional factor of collective power. Most Afrocentric scholars seem to agree on the guiding role of traditional African values though there is some disagreement on what exactly those values are. The values advanced by Asante, Keto, and Obenga will be used to examine the declarations of Nkrumahism.

In giving form to Pan-African agency, concepts addressing the self are discussed. Here the terms “composite African” and “African personality” illuminate the challenge. For the Afrocentric approach, the composite African exists as a type but not as an individual. The composite African is a term used by Asante to display the collectivity of culture within the individual. Nkrumah reasserted the African personality as a description of this same collectivity. Both authors stress the theoretical existence of an ideal cultural type that is actually the embodiment of the redemptive aspects of the collective culture.

The radiance of the African personality is measured in agency: the projection of will on the environment. Nkrumah’s influences on various organizations illuminate his specific agential contribution while it is also true that Nkrumah reflected the agential flow of certain organizations and movements. Those organizations and key individuals that helped influence his ideology will be identified. I will also identify some of the key agents that were impacted by Nkrumahism.

**Psychological, Political, and Philosophical Location**

“Dislocation, location, and relocation are the principal calling cards of the Afrocentric theoretical positions” (Asante 1993, 100). Afrocentric scholars identify thought and ideological positions through language by using location theory.

The primary view held by Afrocentrists is that the most rewarding results of any analysis of culture derive from a centered position, usually defined as the *place* from which all concepts, ideas, purposes, and visions radiate. Determining place, therefore, becomes one of the central tasks of the Africological scholar. (Asante 1994, 53)

In this approach, location points are indicators of psychological, political, or philosophical positions. Asante sets up a method of location architecture when he explains psychological location to be identifiable through symbols, motifs, rituals, and signs (1990).
Political location can be ascertained through affiliation, self-identification, nationalism, and stance on policy issues. Philosophical location can be ascertained through ontological, epistemological and axiological markers. Afrocentric approaches often attempt to indicate thought maps based on language cues. The purpose of this application is to identify harmful, self-deprecating terms. Sublime terms expressing concepts of surrender and irresponsibility are more challenging to identify.

Terms of identity provide a worthwhile example. For the Afrocentric scholar, the word negro (with a capital ‘N’ or not) will only be found as a citation or quote. The term is seen as historically outdated and demeaning. However, the identity tag of “African American” versus “African” is still debated among these scholars. There can be a peaceful détente in collegial operation but not in ideology. It seems that present debates of identity are resolved through historic resolutions. The racial term “negro” died effectively with the Black Power movement of the 1960s and 1970s. Deeper visions of history uncover a time in which the word “Negro” was deemed a radical improvement over the previous terms used to denigrate persons of African descent.

The terms ‘African’ and ‘African-American’ have a different dissonance at their base. That dissonance is rooted in the historical relationship between the United States of America and Africa. Where one is “located,” in this spectrum, is related to one’s political ideology. This is where political location becomes a meaningful term. The distinction between these terms mirrors the struggles that the Pan-African movement had with regional and irredentist identities that surfaced in the African Liberation movement. National identity serves as a locative of patriotism and camaraderie.

Nkrumahism speaks to the primacy of an African identity over local variants as a necessary condition of well being. Nkrumahism, as an ideology, eventually forbade a local identity to be granted more weight than the Pan-African identity. This location of Nkrumah’s self-identity provides an avenue to understand the agency that Nkrumahism supported as well as his shifts in thought on Africa’s optimal zone for development.

This book will attempt to locate Nkrumahism culturally, politically and in a self-conscious manner. Shifts in location will be highlighted and events that surrounded the shifts will be explored.

**Historicity and Hermeneutics**

Obenga’s comment is informative on the instrumentality of history,

Facts belong to the field of empirical research, claiming methodology, analysis, proof and verification. For instance: anthropological and linguistic data are the raw footage of interpretation, mere facts. The historian’s task is to take these uninterpreted pile [sic] of recorded
experiences and order, interpret and explain them according to certain 
basic ideas (such as the notion of causation in history). (1995, 61)

Historic facts are employed in Afrocentric inquiry but their presentations are 
always seen as connected to interpretation. Interests and cultural filters condition 
the focus and emphases of historical presentations. Keto (1994) exposes the 
Eurocentric misuse of history as a debilitating force. At the other end of the 
spectrum, history is seen as a potential fortifier of African self-conceptualization. 
What qualifies the use of a historic presentation is, first, its centrality. The 
identification of a center allows the examiner to locate the presenter and the 
presentation within an ideological region. A second qualifier is accuracy and 
preponderance of data.

Afrocentric research has been critical of the claims and assumptions of 
universalism made by Eurocentric curricula (Asante 1987, 1993; Obenga 1995; 
Henderson 1995). History, with its objective facts and subjective interpretation, 
if used in an examination, requires the introspection called for by the Afrocentric 
method (Asante 1993, 103). In the introspection section, the author(s) identifies 
his or her (their) relationship to the project, perspective and data. Introspection 
allows the recipient of historical information to weigh the relationship between 
the presenter and the presentation.

It is important to note that the Afrocentric method of inquiry does not 
encourage bland and seemingly aloof presentation forms. In fact, presentation 
should take advantage of aesthetic values in order to re-animate the content. Life 
is a perennial theme in African-centered literature and orature.

The range of aesthetic license is connected to the purpose of the presentation. 
A.Hampâté Bâ explained this most succinctly in the following passage,

The doma traditionalists, whose function is to teach in a way that 
stimulates their listeners when the need arises, should not be confused with 
griots, minstrels and house captives, whose main function is to entertain 
and who accordingly have the right to misrepresent the truth and invent 
lies. Griots, it is said, ‘are allowed to have two tongues’. The public does 
not confuse the two. (1989, 64)

This approach to historic presentation is deeply rooted in the methodology of the 
societies that practiced African orature.

‘Universality,’ wrongly asserted, tends to distort reality and give birth to blind 
alyses. The contention with unwarranted universalism, besides inaccuracy, is 
its hegemonic assertion of normalcy. Though cultures are obviously diverse in 
historical experience and worldviews, Eurocentric hegemony sought to 
hierarchically categorize the world’s peoples according to Western European 
cultural idiosyncrasies. Guided by the arrogance of conquistadors, this hegemony 
categorized other cultures as “sub-cultures,” “primitive peoples,” “third world 
nations,” and “underdeveloped nations.” In each of these designations, the
assumption of Eurocentric history was that modern Europe was the normal and ideal society for the globe.

Afrocentric inquiry departs from this mythology and asserts not only the overlooked facts and details of African experiences but also the complimentary and multilateral nature of human history. Afrocentric scholarship recognizes the hermeneutic factor of historical presentation and harmonizes it with introspection and multidisciplinary triangulation.

Considering these prerequisites, a Pan-African historiography provides a valuable tool with which to order significant events and processes. As such, it is used in this book to: (1) establish a proper Pan-African periodization and (2) to texturize the terrain of Nkrumah’s formative background. In this sense, history provides us with a paleo-pollenolgy of the social and intellectual landscape.

Critique and Delinking

Afrocentric inquiry, by its very nature, comes to comment on hegemonic paradigms that reduce African agency and responsibility. Contemporary scholars have been trained in the tradition of Eurocentric hegemony. To harness the empowering aspects of information, Afrocentric scholars have to locate, and often relocate, current bodies of knowledge as a result.

This approach becomes necessary because each discipline has its own tools and assumptions. Afrocentric scholarship consciously searches for hangover assumptions, from ill-fitted disciplines, that may blur knowledge. This blurring often takes the form of attributing African accomplishments to non-African or non-human causal factors. The blurring happens because these disciplines are centered on questions not connected with the interest of African well-being nor African agency. The effort to delink, therefore, is often included in the researcher’s introspection.

Denunciation of Hegemony

Following the precepts of Afrocentricity, this book denounces postures and interpretations that extend hegemony over African agency. In this manner, denunciation is a declarative act of destruction. Where this denunciation is found in Nkrumah’s selected works, it is explicated.

Assertion of an African Culture, Personality, and Genius

The existence of an African culture, personality and genius is accepted and asserted in this work. The discussions around these concepts vary in positions but the existence of each is put forth in the works of Asante, Keto, and Obenga, though with different foci. They are also working concepts in Nkrumah’s works. Reference to these concepts in Nkrumah’s first voice will be examined and put in
a meaningful order. The task was to assess Nkrumah’s description of these items in his watershed presentations selected for review.
The works, thoughts, and reflections of Kwame Nkrumah have inspired much literature, ranging in revelation value from profound to confusing and contradictory. There are many images and opinions of both Nkrumah’s legacy and Nkrumahism. Even when narrowing the field to those who were associated with Nkrumah directly the body of literature remains immense and often contradictory. The twentieth century literary world unavoidably weighted the selection of works with a hegemonic bias. Much written during this time was oblivious to the exigencies of Pan-African agency. If there are works that are not covered in this description, this is partly the reason.

Most works selected were seen as directly related to the topic of African Nationalist ideology or Pan-Africanist agency. Some literature on Nkrumah formed part of the arsenal of psychological warfare launched against him by imperialist forces. These works had as their goal the edification of negative propaganda for the purpose of arresting Pan-African agency. These materials, however, were used when and where they assisted in the clarification of Nkrumahism in thought and practice.

**CUSTOM LOCATIVES**

Secondary and tertiary works were located in this review according to the following designations and sub-locations:

1. European-centered (hegemonic, transitional or revolutionary)
2. Diaspora-centered (hegemonic, transitional or revolutionary)
3. Ghana-centered (opposition, nationalist or Pan-African nationalist)
4. Regionalist (opposition, nationalist or Pan-African nationalist)
5. Africa-centered (Federalist or Unionist)

Following the guide of Keto, this work does not oppose all European schools of thought. Keto says that some of them are as valid as the Afrocentric paradigm, Sino-centric paradigm or other paradigm rooted in experiences, thoughts and values of particular peoples in the ‘global village’. 
I do however draw this critical distinction. I emphatically disagree with those aspects of the Eurocentric paradigm that claim universalism without a global foundation. I certainly oppose the hegemonic aspects of the Eurocentric paradigm where it has operated under the auspices of European imperialism and as an intellectual corollary of European world domination in the last 500 years. In its hegemonic aspect, it has been a concealed pillar of the doctrine of “White Supremacy”. (Keto 1995, ix)

As Nkrumah was involved in revolutionary anti-imperialist activities, some European-centered persons that joined him were developing anti-hegemonic notions. If the authors or testifiers were in midst of this transformation they were located as European (or other) centered but ‘transitional’. If the people serving as the source of information had committed themselves to supporting the African Revolution but were secure in their European culture they were considered ‘revolutionary’ even if they remained European centered. The qualifying factors were their commitment to negating hegemony in the first instance and their resolution to develop this commitment without negating their cultural base. This latter condition required a commitment to transform their home base also (not just Ghana or Africa) if in fact that base was hegemonic.

The location approach of the above paragraph also applied to those authors who may have sought a hegemonic position for the so-called African Diaspora. Hegemony in this realm is actually a caricatured response to an enslaved mentality. If this enslaved perspective was being eradicated, as it was for many who chose to support the African Revolution as Africans, then the ‘transitional’ sub-location became a valid identifier. Within this locative, the ‘revolutionary’ was a Pan-African nationalist.

In terms of the Ghana-centered authors there were three sub-locators: (1) opposition, (2) Ghanaian nationalist, and (3) Pan-African nationalist. The first sub-locator included those authors who opposed Nkrumah’s rule in Ghana while the second sub-locator referred to those authors who felt that Ghana’s resources were being squandered in Nkrumah’s efforts to use Ghana as a base for the African Revolution. As in the next locative, the Pan-African nationalist was actually proud of Ghana’s role in the African Revolution and hoped that other African states would devote themselves to become Pan-African liberated zones.

Some regionalists were sincere in their Pan-African nationalist aspirations and thus might be included in that sub-location though most were opposed to a central Pan-African government. The opposed were often ‘micro-nationalists’ who were unwilling to surrender any new gained sovereignty for a greater nation. This latter group was in opposition to Nkrumah and saw his efforts to unite Africa into one nation as detrimental to their interests.

The last locative field is of the African-centered agents. It was divided into two major sub-locators: (1) those for a federated African unity and (2) those for a union government for the African nation. While this distinction on the surface appears tactical in practice it proved to be two fundamentally different positions.
Events such as the Congo debacle illuminated the distinctiveness of these positions. Nkrumah’s text, *Challenge of the Congo* (1967a), clearly illustrated this point in his correspondence with the members of the Casablanca Group.

Authors sometimes overlapped in these locative fields. Identifying their location could not always be done through linguistic symbols solely. Sometimes their policies or the ‘spin’ that they employed identified their location.

Other works used to locate, triangulate and/or to contrast Nkrumah’s presentations include the works of Asante, Keto, and Obenga. Asante, in particular, provided the framework for the Afrocentric analysis while Keto sought to define African-centeredness within the Afrocentric paradigm.2 Obenga, in a similar fashion to Nkrumah, employed a science-based approach rooted in Maâtian ethics3.

The models used by both Asante and Obenga draw their strength from language usage and linguistics. Obenga and Keto overlap in relation to their heavy reliance on history. Asante employs the historical approach also, however his overwhelming strength is in emancipatory hermeneutics. The various texts from Asante that reflect these approaches are *Afrocentricity* (1987); *The Afrocentric Method* (1987); *Kemet, Afrocentricity, and Knowledge* (1992); and selected essays from the work titled, *Malcolm X as Cultural Hero & Other Afrocentric Essays* (1993). The works from Keto employed in this book were *African centered perspective of history* (1994) and *Vision, time and identity* (1995). The works of Obenga used were, *Lost tradition: African philosophy in world history* (1995), *Icons of Maât* (1996), and “Sources and specific techniques used in African history: a general outline,” (Ki-Zerbo 1989).

**PRIMARY SOURCE DATA—NKRUMAH**

For purposes of analysis, Nkrumah’s published speeches are organized into three categories: (a) theoretical, (b) operational, and (c) incidental. The first category primarily addresses admonishments on theory, ideology, and epistemic perspectives. Questions of ethics and strategy also fall in this category but more often overlap into the operational field. Operational presentations often give specific directions on action to be taken by an agency (e.g., movements, party, government, self-conscious organized social sectors, police, youth). Incidental speeches address events and important activities that Nkrumah chose to interpret to selective audiences.

Speeches deemed necessary for explaining Nkrumahist ideological positions were considered “key speeches” and were selected because of their relative comprehensiveness plus their frequency of appearance in Nkrumah’s and other’s written works. Some speeches were used to highlight Nkrumah’s speech style in an effort to culturally locate his aesthetic and mobilization techniques.
Nkrumah’s Speeches

Many of Nkrumah’s speeches can be found in the books, *Autobiography* (1957); *I Speak of Freedom* (1958); *Voice from Conakry* (1967b) and *Revolutionary Path* (1973). G.K. Osei (1970), Samuel Obeng (1997), and H.E. Joe-Fio N.Meyer (1990) also produced compilations of Nkrumah’s speeches. Osei’s compilation, titled, *12 Key Speeches of Kwame Nkrumah* was cited in a number of tertiary works that I examined. Obeng’s compilation is by far more extensive than Osei’s. With the exception of one key speech, the speeches in Osei’s compilation are included in Nkrumah or Obeng’s compilations. The importance of that exceptional speech lay in its directives and statements of qualified agency. It was one of Nkrumah’s last speeches of its type to the Convention People’s Party (CPP).

The African Publication Society in West London published Osei’s compilation (1970). The key speech provided in Osei’s compilation is significant in that it was made on June 12, 1965 in Accra to mark the sixteenth anniversary of the CPP and is conspicuously absent in Obeng’s and Nkrumah’s compilations. Nkrumah made a number of corrective declarations in his presentation to this important agency. It may have been one of the speeches that led to the coup d’etat of his government some eight months later. In that speech, Nkrumah announced the abolition of salaries for Parliament Members in an effort to decrease the gap between government representatives and the masses.

Meyer’s text is also a significant one in that it provided the full presentation of Nkrumah’s address to the First Conference of Independent African States where as Nkrumah’s *I Speak of Freedom* had only an excerpted version of the presentation. His text is focused mainly on Ghana’s work in establishing a cross-continent presence.

Obeng’s compilation is a five-volume set totaling 915 pages covering 118 speeches made from 1960 through February 1966. Volumes 1 and 2 were originally published in 1979. They covered Nkrumah’s speeches made during the years 1960 and 1961. These volumes were republished in 1997 with three additional volumes. The full 1997 edition was published by Afram Publications (Ghana) Ltd., Accra, Ghana, and is titled *Selected Speeches of Kwame Nkrumah* (hereafter referred to as *Selected Speeches*.)

*Selected Speeches* suffers slightly from typos but the damage never amounts to incomprehension. When, however, there was an opportunity to utilize Nkrumah’s compilation for the same speech then his work was chosen. When Nkrumah published extracts of a speech *Selected Speeches* was used to observe the full content.

Neither *Selected Speeches* nor Osei’s compilation described the contextual scenery of the presentations. For this element, Nkrumah’s commentaries as well as secondary sources proved useful. Six audio recordings of Nkrumah’s speeches have also proved to be particularly helpful in observing style and oratory rhythm.\(^4\) One of these recordings was of Nkrumah addressing the Organization of African Unity on May 25th, 1963, and provides an excellent expose on Nkrumah’s use of
innuendo with his peers—or agents that considered themselves so—in an effort to forge Pan-African agency (1976).

This collection of key presentations was completed with the additional speeches published in *The Spark*\(^5\) and a crucial speech published by the Encyclopaedia Africana Project (EAP). The EAP published Nkrumah’s presentation to its Editorial Board’s First Annual Meeting on September 24, 1964. The *Spark* added a contextual vitality that often accompanies journalist style and aesthetic to the ideological themes of Nkrumahism.

**Nkrumah and the Pan-African Centered Perspective**

Nkrumah’s most significant presentations for the development of the Pan-African Centered Perspective and Afrocentric methods were:

1. “Come down to Earth,” delivered at the University College in Accra, Ghana, at the launching of the Convention People’s Party Students’ Union (CPPSU), June 5, 1960 (Nkrumah 1997a);
2. “Africa’s challenge,” delivered to the Parliament House in Accra, Ghana, on August 6, 1960 (Nkrumah 1997a);
3. “Ghana Republic is born,” delivered in Accra, Ghana, on July 1, 1960 (Nkrumah 1997a);
5. “Flower of learning (1): At his installation as first Chancellor of the University of Ghana, during the inauguration of the University,” delivered on November 25, 1961 at the University of Ghana, Accra, Ghana (Nkrumah 1997b);
6. “Flower of learning (2): At his installation as first Chancellor of the Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and technology, during the inauguration of the University,” delivered on November 29, 1961 at the University of Science and Technology, Accra, Ghana. (Nkrumah 1997b);
8. “Africa’s glorious past: Opening of the First International Congress of Africanists,” delivered on December 12, 1962 in Accra Ghana (Nkrumah 1997c);
10. “EAP Editorial Board First Annual Meeting” delivered on September 24, 1964; (Editorial Board of the Encyclopedia Africana)

The presentations mentioned above were addressed to students, the Ghanaian government, freedom fighters, Africanist scholars, journalists, university officials and the mass of citizens in Ghana. The intent in all of them was to guide
agency along a certain trajectory. The themes of African centeredness and praxis were consistent throughout. The presentation to the EAP Editorial Board actually called for an “Afro-centric” interpretation of African history and of the social and cultural institutions of the African and people of African descent” (Nkrumah September 24, 1964).

Operational presentations gave a more focused view on the strategy Nkrumah proposed. To grasp the strategic and tactical approach to developing the agency of the Ghanaian population, it was necessary to review the following key documents and speeches by Nkrumah and found in Revolutionary Path and in Obeng’s compilation:

2. “Dawn Broadcast,” (1997b) a 1961 broadcast to the general populous decrying corruption and dissension especially in the CPP;
3. “Work and Happiness: Ghana’s Seven-Year Development Plan,” (1997c) a 1962 broadcast to the general Ghanaian population about upcoming development plans; and
4. “Blue Print of our goal: Launching the Seven-Year Development plan,” (1997d) a 1964 detailed presentation of the plan to the National Assembly of Ghana.

Nkrumah’s presentations to the Conference of Independent African States and to the first three Organization of African Unity summits are also inspected. Other significant presentations and documents are referred to but in the main, the above-mentioned works are the most significant in highlighting Nkrumah’s developmental strategy for African agency in Ghana.

The Spark was a significant publication in this area as well as in the area of Nkrumahist philosophy and strategy. Serving as a direct vehicle for Nkrumah’s ideological cadre, this bi-weekly publication began in 1963 and continued until the 1966 coup de tat. The Spark offered debates on the proper approach to deliver empowering knowledge within Ghana’s institutions of higher education. It also challenged various perspectives that surfaced in the published works of scholars and activists of the time and attempted to locate them.

Another important presentation that was made available to me was delivered over the Internet. The speech is the one that Nkrumah gave to the Editorial Board of the Encyclopedia Africana on September 24, 1964. It explained the importance of using Afro-centric research on one hand and avoiding certain terminology that was perceived as debilitating on the other.

Nkrumah’s Written Works

The literate mind of Nkrumah is expressed through his books and selected theoretical articles. His commitment to Pan-African agency went beyond
The future of our country, like the future of most countries throughout the world, lies at stake today. Only action will remove the threat to oppressor and oppressed alike. The cause of Africans everywhere is one with the cause of all peoples of African descent throughout the world.

Barely twenty-five years ago the statesmen of the world thought that the catastrophe of 1914–18 would never happen again. But today the Muse of History is singing another song. War has drowned the world again in another blood-bath, in misery, ruin and devastation, on a scale undreamed of in the course of human history. And the paradox of it all is that those who are supposed to be the torchbearers of modern civilization are responsible for this tragedy.

In the circumstances which have plunged the world in another holocaust, [sic] it behooves Africans and people of African heritage to recognize and assume the responsibility which is theirs in these monstrous times. Unity, Freedom, Independence, Democracy—these should be our watchwords, our ideals, and not the barbaric totalitarianism of the Fascists or the perverted colonial “democracy” of the imperialists.

The time has passed for speculation and conjecture. These are times which speak only in terms of deeds and action. We must rise and join hands together, for in unity alone can we find our strength and future. This is the time to remember Mother Africa and build for her a glorious and independent future.

Let us therefore arm ourselves with the sword of knowledge—concrete knowledge—and return to our specific places in Africa, to organize and build great works, great projects, and a great nation. (The African Interpreter: Organ of the African Students Association of the United States and Canada vol. 1 no. 4. Summer 1943. p. 5)

The themes of unity and responsibility remained constant in Nkrumah’s approach to organized agency. We can see even at this early stage his astute awareness of the need for a Pan-African scope to the solution of the problems facing African people. Where themes mentioned appear consistently in the other organizations Nkrumah worked with then he can at least be seen as a courier if not the initiator of such ideas.

Organizational mission statements and published statements of intent often reflect ideological debate and resolutions. Nkrumah’s ideological stamp was evident in a number of organizations seeking to establish Pan-African Agency.
Important documents that Nkrumah authored, or sponsored authorship of, included the constitutions, declarations and mission statements of the:

1. Fifth Pan-African Congress (1945 Manchester PAC)
2. West African National Secretariat (WANS)
3. The Circle
4. The Convention People’s Party (CPP)
5. The Ghana-Guinea Union (G-GU)
6. The Ghana-Guinea-Mali Union (G-G-MU)
7. The Union of African States (UAS)
8. The Conference of Independent African States (CIAS)
9. The All-African People’s Conference (AAPC)
10. The Casablanca powers
11. The Accra Assembly and
12. The Spark.

While some authors that discuss Nkrumah attribute the charter of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to Nkrumah it is incorrect to do so. The OAU charter was actually a compromise, which watered down Nkrumah’s recommendations. The presentations that Nkrumah delivered before the OAU concisely presented his argument and formula for African states to cooperate in a unified manner. These presentations were particularly useful in that they offered strategic and tactical suggestions that may be viable today. The disagreements and agreements between Nkrumah and other heads of states allows for a distinguishing of perspectives on issues of African liberation, unity, and socialism, all emancipatory elements of African agency according to Nkrumah.


Two book chapters specifically address the history and challenge facing the intellectual production of African people. The first chapter is found in Nkrumah’s Africa must unite (1970a) and is titled, “The Intellectual Vanguard.” The second chapter is in Class struggle in Africa and is titled, “Intelligentsia and intellectuals” (Nkrumah 1970). Other works, such as Consciencism (Nkrumah 1970c), also address aspects of an African-centered perspective. Definitions of Pan-Africanism can be gleaned from two of Nkrumah’s written works. The first is the “Declaration to the Colonial Peoples of the World, Pan African Congress, Manchester, October 15th–21st, 1945” (Nkrumah 1973). The second significant work offering a definition of this term is Handbook of revolutionary warfare (Nkrumah 1969).
To Nkrumah, the African Personality and the African Genius served as progeny and progenitors to the Pan-African movement, which he adjoined to socialism. Pronouncements of traditional African values are found in *Consciencism* and in his *Autobiography*.

Nkrumah’s post coup correspondence allowed him to participate in the debate that scholars launched about his ideological and agential influence. Milne’s compilation, *The Conakry Years*, provides some support here. Milne played a significant role in the Panaf Books Ltd. that issued or reissued a number of Nkrumah’s works. Her proximity to his works was therefore an important one. Milne’s selection of documents, however, reflects a transitional European-centered focus. The assessment of Milne’s focus is based on her choice of documents presented. It overwhelmingly reflects the conversations between Nkrumah and European expatriates that had worked in his government and even less relevant Europeans. Marvin Wachman is one such not-so-important reference.

It is understood that all books are limited and choices have to be made concerning what is included or omitted. One would, however, like to have seen more correspondence between Nkrumah and significant African and non-African scholars and revolutionaries. I visited Howard University’s Mooreland-Spingarn Research Center where Nkrumah’s papers are housed and had the opportunity, for instance, to come across correspondence between Nkrumah and Cheikh Anta Diop. This was absent in Milne’s book as was any significant correspondence between the Egyptian and Cuban ambassadors that visited Nkrumah frequently (Ture 1997)

### Autobiographical Works

Three books serve as Nkrumah’s most important self-reflections. The first text of this type is his often quoted *Autobiography* of the same name (1973a) that covers his life from birth to the independence of Ghana in 1957. In it, he mentions a number of significant persons that impressed him early on. These include his mother, siblings, teachers, West African nationalists, philosophers, scholars, and all and sundry activists. Names surface such as the famous Aggrey, Sam Woods, Nnamdi Azikiwe, Marcus Garvey, George Padmore, W.E.B.DuBois, and others. His childhood experiences in the Gold Coast colony, university and activist years abroad in both the United States of America and Britain are recalled.

Nkrumah’s second text, titled *I speak of freedom* (1973b), overlaps the 1947 through 1957 period in his autobiography. It adds details to that work and extends itself to the period in which Ghana declares itself as a republic—1960. This was a period of heavy political activity in Nkrumah’s life. This work includes a number of speeches made during this time period, which help the reader see Nkrumah’s style of oratory, and offers a social texture and depth with which to envision the landscapes in which he operated.
Finally, Nkrumah’s *Revolutionary Path* (1973c) adds to both of these works and extends his self-reflection to the last days of his life. Milne reportedly worked on this book with Nkrumah and assisted with the retrieval of crucial works published by Panaf books. Other works, such as *Dark Days in Ghana* (1969a) and *Kwame Nkrumah: the Conakry years, his life and letters* (1990) add other information about Nkrumah’s agency and ideology.

**Nkrumah’s Theoretical Works**

The philosophical, epistemological and ethical issues addressed by Nkrumahism are found within the text *Philosophical Consciencism: The philosophy and ideology for decolonization and development with particular reference to the African revolution* (1970c). It is supplemented key presentations to institutions of learning and by discussions appearing in *The Spark*, the ideological newspaper of the CPP from 1963 through 1966.

Nkrumah’s theories on geo-political economy shifted during the period under review. His first published analysis on the political and economic situation facing Africa is found in *Towards Colonial Freedom* (1973c), published originally in 1962 but written between 1942 and 1945. Its main concern was the analysis of colonialism’s effect on the people of Africa. Years of experience ‘on the ground’ as the head of government business, Prime Minister, and then President of the First Republic made Nkrumah well versed in the maturation of colonialism’s modified approach. This approach gave rise to his articulation of the concept ‘Neo-colonialism.’ Nkrumah expounds upon this theoretically in his text titled, *Neo-colonialism: The last stage of imperialism* (1965) and practically in his work titled, *Challenge of the Congo* (1967a). In fact, the theme of neo-colonialism remains consistent in his works from 1963 onward.

So pervasive was the phenomenon that it changed Nkrumah’s tactical recommendation, which was originally non-violent ‘Positive Action,’ best described in his 1949 speech titled, “What I Mean by Positive Action” (1973c). The mechanisms of neo-colonialism and Nkrumah’s work with the African Liberation Movement (ALM) made him move closer to the position that armed struggle was inevitable for the successful prosecution of the African revolution. This position became cemented after the military coup in Ghana deposed him. Nkrumah’s hardened position is reflected in his later works, *Handbook of Revolutionary Warfare: a guide to the armed phase of the African revolution* (1969b) and *Class struggle in Africa* (1970b).

In regards to African unity, Nkrumah’s outlook shifted from the earlier strategy of forming an initial nation from West African colonies⁹ progressing to a union of socialist African states. This position was reflected in the works of the West African National Secretariat (WANS) but more particularly in the credo of *The Circle* (1973c). This early position was most clearly expressed in the previous mentioned tract titled, *Towards Colonial Freedom*, written between...
1942 and 1945 (1971c). The following quote best describes his eventual shift in thought:

When *Towards Colonial Freedom* was written, my ideas on African unity, important even as I considered them at that time, were limited to West African unity as a first step. Since I have had the opportunity of putting my ideas to work, and in intensification of neocolonialism, I lay even greater stress on the vital importance to Africa’s survival of a political unification of the entire African continent. Regional groupings, specially *sic* when based purely on economic co-operation, in areas which are already dominated by neocolonialist interests, retard rather than promote the unification process. (1973c, 14)

Nkrumah’s *Africa must unite* (1970a) is undoubtedly his *tour de force* on the need for a continental union government for Africa. It was originally published to coincide with the formation of the OAU. As such, it is a significant work in this book and shows Nkrumah’s approach both to independent African states and the ALM. This work is supplemented with Nkrumah’s presentations to the first three OAU summit meetings and to the Ghanaian National Assembly concerning the OAU’s charter (1973c, 1997d, e).

Nkrumah’s approach to developing the optimal zone for African development included roles for Africans throughout the world but the development of the African population within Ghana was to fall within a specific trajectory explained succinctly in Nkrumah’s *Revolutionary Path* (1973c). Nkrumah utilized the collective agency of Ghana as an instrument of African liberation and a general Pan-African agency. This was no surprise to all who listened to Nkrumah’s pronouncement at Ghana’s independence celebration. It was at that celebration where Nkrumah declared to the world that Ghana’s independence was meaningless as long as any part of Africa remained colonized. In fact, as this work shows, Ghana became the first Pan-African liberated zone of the type that was summoned by the 1945 Manchester PAC.

**Testimonial of Key African Revolutionists**


Nkrumah’s wife, Fathima Rizk, was an Egyptian of the Coptic ‘ethnic’ group. Her marriage to Nkrumah is often seen as a political marriage sought to bind Egypt to Ghana (Smertin 1987). Nkrumah does not speak of it in such a manner but it is clear that the Egyptian connection assisted in saving her and her
family’s lives during the coup d’etat. In fact, Egypt sent a plane to rescue her and the family from the Egyptian Embassy. The tale of their escape was harrowing one.11

SECONDARY SOURCES

Secondary sources informing this book have been categorized as published works of colleagues, comrades, and ideological partners. These are not hard and fast categories they merely serve as tools to display the proximity that various authors and chroniclers had to Nkrumah and Nkrumahism. Of the secondary sources, information is ranked in importance from the ideological partner to the comrade to the colleague. In this way the information source moves from inner to outer circles. The testimonials and writings of ideological partners helped to ascertain the impact of Nkrumahism on other key agents.

A note of caution must be made concerning the secondary sources. The world that Nkrumah participated in was full of intrigue and violent opposition. Many close colleagues, comrades, and ideological partners became enemies to Nkrumah. They made contributions during the time of their collusion with him. Two persons that were once closely related to Nkrumah as ideological partners and then later classified as opposition were Tawia Adamafio and Alexander Quaison-Sackey. Even Nkrumah’s extra-Ghanaian partners, Sékou Touré, Modibo Keita, and Abd Al-Nasser did not always agree with his positions. This latter group, however, never opposed Nkrumah violently and in the case of Touré the camaraderie was genuinely familial.

One requirement for inclusion into the secondary source level was active participation in similar or the same endeavors as Kwame Nkrumah. Authors that were colleagues were not necessarily as close to Nkrumah as authors that were comrades. The former category included persons such as Erica Powell, Geoffrey Bing, and Major-General Alexander, all of whom worked first with the British Colonial government and then in Nkrumah’s government.

Joe Appiah wrote his book after the others mentioned above, however, his relationship as a colleague to Nkrumah covered an earlier period (1945–1947) in England and a brief stint in the CPP before Ghana’s independence. Joe Appiah’s relationship with Nkrumah went back to his days of working with George Padmore in England and inside the leadership of WASU. He later joined the CPP only to leave as a result of the rift between the Asante leadership and Nkrumah. From that point on, Appiah remained opposed to Nkrumah. Though Appiah (1990) recalls his relationship with Nkrumah, he is only mentioned once in Nkrumah’s published works and that was in reference to Appiah’s resignation from the CPP (Nkrumah 1973b). Those who refer to Appiah’s account of Nkrumah must take into account their seesaw relationship.

Erica Powell was Nkrumah’s secretary and penned a book on him yet his mention of her was inconsequential with the exception of Milne’s compilation of correspondence. In that compilation Nkrumah advises Powell not to write about...
his thoughts because she did not really know him. Powell waited until Nkrumah passed and did as she pleased. Generally, Powell’s work was a self-glorifying text of her experience. It did offer, however, a contextual vision of the European expatriates in the employ of the Ghanaian government during the First Republic.

Major-General Alexander (1966) also wrote a version of his experience as the head of the Ghanaian military, until Nkrumah relieved him. Alexander’s text is a general criticism of the armed forces in Ghana and the government’s handling of them. It is not a key work for this book. Nkrumah only speaks negatively of him in reference to his failure to protect Ghanaian soldiers in the Congo crisis. He does not figure, however, as largely in Nkrumah’s picture as Geoffrey Bing does.

Nkrumah’s relationship with Bing was strongest amongst the colleagues mentioned here. Bing was formerly a lawyer and one of a dozen socialist Members of British Parliament that sent a congratulatory letter to Nkrumah on the victory of the CPP in the 1951 general elections (Padmore 1953). He became Ghana’s Attorney General from 1957 through 1961. He also became a legal advisor to Nkrumah from 1961 through 1966 (Thompson, W.S. 1968) and conducted significant investigations at Nkrumah’s behest. Bing’s work (1968) offers insight into the internal and external intrigue that went on in Ghana with which Nkrumah had to deal with while attempting to build a base for the African Revolution. At Nkrumah’s request, Bing forwarded his initial manuscript. After reading the manuscript, Nkrumah recommended the following in a letter dated May 27, 1967:

COMMENTS ON MS OF REAP THE WHIRLWIND

1. I am sure it will have an impact on those who have the patience to read it. Patience, because the writing is rambling. The rambling confuses and obscures the main purpose of the book.
2. Either the whole of Chapter 12 is deleted or you should re-write it. As it stands it does not do any justice. It destroys the scholarship you have put into the whole book. You should have done with Bretton’s book what you have done with Afrifa’s book in this chapter.
3. Conclusion disappointing. Why don’t you be bold enough to say that the forces that led to Dr Nkrumah’s overthrow were the forces of world imperialism and neo-colonialism? They were responsible, and nowhere in the book have you even cast a disguised aspersion as to those who were responsible for the Ghana coup—America, Britain, Western Germany, Israel.
4. Is this your book or Afrifa’s?
5. Too many quotations mar a book of this nature. The quotations from Afrifa do not help in any way and might as well be deleted.
6. Anyone reading the book will think that you use quotations merely to fill pages. You are quoting others, but write so that others can quote you too.
In a subsequent letter to Milne date June 17, 1968, Nkrumah reported that he had received a final copy of the book from Bing’s publisher and that Bing had followed much of his criticism. Nkrumah had a problem, however, with the prohibitive high price of the book and its sheer verbosity. He was, however, happy that Bing included the Ghana constitution in the book (1990). That inclusion proved to be a boon for this work.

Nkrumah also reported in a letter to Pat Sloan, dated July 1, 1968, that Bing did well, but here and there I do not like the apologetic tone. We make no apologies. After all, what we went through was a socialist effort to arrive at socialism without a revolution. Apologies are an attitude characteristic of British liberalism. And Bing, in certain pages, spits out and then tries to lick up his own spit again. On the whole, however, the book is good and worth the effort.” (1990, 245)

What surfaces from Bing’s book and Nkrumah’s response to the book is the question of how to approach the agency of the opposition. Nkrumah enforced the policy of ‘Preventative Detention’, which proved uncomfortable to Bing’s British training of liberalism. This aside, the value of Bing’s book is in its expose of Ghana at that time and the machinations of its organized opposition.

Comrade-Authors

Comrade-authors such as Tawia Adamafio, John Tettegah, Kojo Botsio, Kofi Batsa, June Milne, S.G.Ikoku, and W.E.B. DuBois were in some ways closer to Nkrumah than the colleague-authors were. There were others in this category such as Genoveva Kanu, but their works, given the nature of this book, offered only contextual support at a maximum. Ikoku and Batsa overlap in their relationship to Nkrumah and were considered ideological-author partners.

Of this group, Botsio had the longest standing relationship with Nkrumah. He was a confidant as far back as 1946 in London where he served as treasurer to the West African National Secretariat (Sherwood 1996). He traveled from England to African with Nkrumah in 1947 and became the Secretary of the Convention Youth Organization (Apter 1972), a wing of the United Gold Coast Convention; the first editor of Nkrumah’s Accra Evening News (Ghana Yearbook 1959); and later the first General-Secretary of the CPP (Sherwood 1996). Botsio remained close to Nkrumah until the end of his life with a brief reprise during the ascent of Adamafio within the CPP.

Botsio served as a Minister of Education and Social Welfare from 1952 through 1953; Minister of State from 1954 through 1958; External Affairs from 1958 through 1959; Minister of State from 1959 through 1961; Foreign Minister from 1963 through 1965; and Chairman of the State Planning Commission from...
1965 until the coup (Apter, 1972; Thompson, W.S. 1968). The Ghanaian Times once reported on Botsio as the Minister of Agriculture.

Adamafio was initially a member of the United Gold Coast Convention (UGCC) youth group, the Convention Youth Organization (CYO). He was one of the CYO members that opposed the formation of the CPP until a compromising speech, made by a UGCC leading member, seemed to capitulate to colonialism. Adamafio was a member of the opposition Ghana Congress Party until 1954. According to Adamafio’s own account (1982), he led the charge to criticize and censure CPP members like Botsio because of their ostentatious behavior.

Adamafio became the General Secretary of the CPP in 1960 and the Minister of Information from 1960 through 1962 during which time he recruited youth like Batsa (Batsa 1985) to the ranks of the Party. Adamafio’s zeal, and according to some, opportunism (Bing 1968; Thompson, S.W. 1969), put him on the outs with some of the CPP old guard.

Adamafio, Ako Adjei and Kofi Crabbe were later implicated in the attempted assassination of Nkrumah at Kulungugu and bombing outrages that took place in 1962. Adamafio claimed that he was framed by bitter elements of the old guard as revenge for his ideological positions within the Party’s administration. Nkrumah was convinced of Adamafio’s treachery and was sorely disappointed as well as shocked (1969a).

Regardless of the intrigue, Adamafio’s book, By Nkrumah’s Side (1982), provides some excellent detail to the political milieu surrounding the development of Nkrumahism. The following quote from Adamafio’s book is an efficient contextualizer:

Dr. Kwame Nkrumah regarded himself as an African first before he was anything else. Early after the inauguration of the Republic he called me to his office one morning and suggested that we should create a Ministry of African Affairs. We discussed the problem seriously and I refused to give the proposal my support. I argued that this would duplicate the work of the Foreign Ministry and cost the country money that could be wisely saved for other purposes. Nkrumah stressed that he did not like the idea of treating affairs of other African countries as ‘Foreign Affairs’. He said Africa was one and indivisible and no part of it should be foreign to any other part. (94–95)

Batsa, the official editor of The Spark and author of The Spark: From Kwame Nkrumah to Limann (1985), attributes Adamafio to bringing him into the service of the Party. The same publisher-Rex Collings, published Batsa’s and Adamafio’s books.

Batsa described Nkrumah’s weekly discussion groups with the young ideologues that staffed The Spark and sought to radicalize the CPP into socialist development. Batsa had the official title as editor of the ideological bi-weekly
however; the consistent headlining articles by “Julius Sago” most loquaciously presented the ideological tenets of Nkrumahism.

Julius Sago was the alias for Sam Goomsu Ikoku, an activist-scholar condemned at one time for treason in Nigeria. Ikoku was a long time activist with the Nigerian Action Group under the leadership of King Awolowo (Ayoade 1985). Like Adamafio, he was originally opposed to Nkrumah but for different reasons (Thompson, S.W. 1969). He later split with his organizing colleagues over the question of achieving socialism and developed a strong working relationship with Nkrumahists at the Spark and the Winneba Institute. After the coup d’ etat, Ikoku was deported to Nigeria and began to work with Awolowo again. (Nkrumah 1990)

Ikoku’s articles in The Spark under his covert name and pen name (Julius Sago) had to be considered to inspect the ideology of Nkrumahism. His sheer proliferation as well as the positioning of his articles to either page one or two reflect the important role that he played in leading the discussions on Nkrumahism during the period of The Spark. Another reason to consider him is that he remained highly esteemed in Nkrumah’s correspondence (1990).

John Tettegah played a significant role in the trade union movement. The union movement’s importance is addressed in the text. Kofi Hadjor was one of the last of the young CPP members to become part of Nkrumah’s inner circle. He was a journalist during Nkrumah’s last few years in office as the president of Ghana. Hadjor’s skill and experience helped him to produce a succinct biography of Kwame Nkrumah. Another youth during the time of Nkrumah was N.N.Tetteh who was a member of the Young Pioneers. His paper on that movement was helpful in this book as it provided a perspective from a participant.

**TERTIARY SOURCES**

From secondary sources, we move to tertiary sources. Mostly, these sources are used for frame working and cross-referencing. At this source level are the non-participant scholars and journalists. They are categorized as historians, social scientists, biographers, and professional journalists.

**Pan-African Historiography**

One of the tertiary works addressing Nkrumah’s contribution to Pan-African agency and thought is the edited compilation titled, *The life and work of Kwame Nkrumah: Papers of a symposium organized by the Institute of African Studies, University of Ghana, Legon* (Arhin, 1993). Various scholars, politicians and per functionaries participated in the symposium and this book is a collection of culled presentations. The text is structured in the three broad areas of social, political, and economic thought. The authors represent various ideologies and perspectives.
Considering that Ghana became a significant base for Nkrumahist-guided agency and the organization of Ghana played a key role in Nkrumah’s emancipatory strategy, this book was of a special value. The book largely focused on Nkrumah’s works as a Ghanaian national by Ghanaian contributors. One of the most valuable articles within the text was the one written by Takyiwah Manuh on women and their organizations during the time of the CPP. The Ghanaian root of the scholars adds an authentic profile to Nkrumah the Ghanaian. The downside of this local presentation is that Nkrumah the Pan-African nationalist is not strongly presented. Thus, while professing to address the life and times of Nkrumah, the presentations do so only in part. Nevertheless, the book offers a treasure chest of local assessments.

An Afrocentric analysis requires, however, no less than an African-centered global analysis. For this analysis, a number of tertiary works were helpful. First among these works were UNESCO’s *General Histories of Africa* Volumes I, II, VII, and VIII. They address the methodologies used to study African history; ancient African civilizations; Africa during the period of classic colonialism, and Africa since 1935 respectively. These themes are essential components of Nkrumahist discourse. They are also necessary items for the theoretical construction of the ideological and intellectual landscape within which Nkrumahism found itself.

As the *General Histories of Africa* helped in the construction of an African-centered historiography other works were used to narrow in on the Pan-African agency reflected through the Pan-African Movement (PAM). Awareness of this movement is crucial to a coherent understanding of the culture articulated in Nkrumahism. For Nkrumah, the African Personality called for Pan-Africanism, the latter concept being a goal and reflection of the development of the former. This understanding begins to resolve the vagueness surrounding the term ‘Pan-African’ but requires a historical context to clarify its role in African cultural development.

The general works consulted included *Pan-Africanism: The idea and movement 1776–1963*, by P.O. Esedebe and *Pan-Africanism and Nationalism in West Africa, 1900–1945*, by Langley; *The Pan-African Connection* by Tony Martin; *Pan-Africanism*, edited by T.A. Rahmeen; and articles by Robert Chrisman and Natambo that addressed the definition of Pan-Africanism and Pan-African Nationalism.

Michael Williams, in his article titled, “Pan-Africanism and Zionism: The Delusion of Comparability,” expressed a view that contrasted with those that refer to Africans residing outside of Africa as belonging to a Diaspora. Williams also provides a specific study of Nkrumahism as a reflection of ‘leftist thought’. In his article titled, “Nkrumahism as an ideological embodiment of leftist thought within the African World,” (1994) he connects Nkrumah’s thought with W.E.B. DuBois, Marcus Garvey, C.L.R. James, George Padmore, Sékou Touré, Patrice Lumumba, Julius Nyerere, Malcolm X, and Kwame Ture.
Williams’ text, *Pan-Africanism: An annotated bibliography* comes with a broad definition and historical summary of Pan-Africanism. For their specificity and particular relation to this book, however, Esedebe and Langley provided the bulk of information concerning the modern Pan-African movement.

Esedebe’s text covered a broader space/time than Langley’s work, however Langley’s focus on Pan-Africanism within the West African milieu was useful. Langley was rightfully criticized in Esedebe’s work as relying too heavily on European source materials when African materials were available. Esedebe gives a precise definition of the Pan-African Movement that is visited in the next chapter. Martin’s work was particularly useful in showing the Caribbean connection in the Pan-African movement. Chrisman, through his article in *The Black Scholar: The Pan-African Debate* titled, “Aspects of Pan-Africanism,” offered a definition of Pan-Africanism commonly employed in these other works. It was Natambo, however, that offered the closest Afrocentric understanding of Pan-African Nationalism by linking it to developments within KMT.17 Natambo’s work is contrasted with the definitions offered by these other works including that of Horace Campbell’s included in the recent work on Pan-Africanism offered by Rahmeen.

Ron Walter’s text, *Pan-Africanism in the African Diaspora: An analysis of modern Afrocentric political movements*, provides a clear presentation of the African world and the diversity of concepts that exist within the Pan-African movement globally. Highlighting the race based perspective of St. Clair Drake, Walter’s text helps to clarify the racial leanings and analysis of such works as Sithole’s *African Nationalism* and Elisa Nascimento’s *Pan-Africanism and South America: Emergence of a Black Rebellion*. Sithole, focusing from the settler-colonial reality of what was then known as Rhodesia, and Nascimento’s viewing of the Pan-African phenomenon from the experience of Brazil, shed light on the racial aspects of the modern Pan-African movement. Nascimento leans heavily on a “Diaspora” basis to Pan-Africanism.

Natambo allows us to locate these other works though his work can also be sharpened in terms of clarity.18 Like Asante, Natambo supports a model that connects the African Personality with Pan-Africanism, or more specifically—Pan-African Nationalism. He also includes ancient Egypt (KMT) as a classical referent and rejects a race dependent analysis.

While other landmark works exist on the Pan-African movement, most notably, V.B.Thompson’s *Africa and Unity*, the above-mentioned texts are the most recent or succinctly supportive of this work. Choices had to be made to narrow the selection as was also required when surveying Nkrumah’s biographers.

**Biographers**

Since neither his wife, children, nor other family members wrote biographies on Nkrumah, his biographers were usually tertiary sources. These biographers
reflected a wide range of ability. They seldom, however, added to Nkrumah’s autobiographical writings choosing usually to repeat only what he himself had stated. When treading beyond this point the interests and locations of the biographers became apparent. Some of the tertiary biographers such as B.Davidson (1973), Y.Smertin (1987), and C.Nelson (1985) supported Nkrumah’s quest to establish Pan-African agency while it appeared that others such as T.P.Omari (1970) and M.Sherwood (1996) saw his efforts as opportunistic or egomaniacal. The most recent biography on Nkrumah by D.Birmingham (1998) offers very little in terms of new information and is merely a rehash of other tertiary works.

In summing the impressions that surfaced in the biographies done on Nkrumah one is left with the unmistakable impression of a hard working ideologue of the Marcus Garvey type. Like Garvey, a person of Nkrumah’s magnitude was bound to foster detractors and doubters. Nkrumah was not short on either of these. Many of the secondary and tertiary sources debated Nkrumah’s intentions and sincerity but almost all agreed that he had an overwhelming impact on the African Liberation Movement and the Pan-African Movement. Chapters 4 and 5 address the impact that these movements had on his agential development.

Tertiary and secondary sources were helpful illuminating the environment that engendered Nkrumah and Nkrumahism. His works, however, remain the key prime source of information as regards to his ideological positions. Before investigating these positions directly we will explore the environment that impacted his Pan-African agency.
CHAPTER 4
The Pan-African Nationalistic Trend in African Culture:
An Afrocentric Presentation

The Afrocentric historiography of Pan-Africanism serves as a guide to the empowerment of an African nation through the collective agency of African People. This work identifies confusing and debilitating ideas about the Pan-African movement and attempts to neutralize them where possible. This chapter gives a description of the Pan-African movement and ideation to help establish definitional parameters for Nkrumah’s Pan-African agency. Many of the incapacitating notions around the Pan-African movement emanate from the crippling canons of Eurocentric hegemony in the Academy.1

At the outset of presenting this Afrocentric historiography, which illuminates Nkrumah’s agency, a preliminary discussion is needed. This is required because of the variety of meanings which surface when one discusses Pan-Africanism. The difficulty in understanding the concept arises primarily from the disciplinary approaches of the Academy. Replete with its own ideological leanings, the Academy elicits a dichotomization of phenomenon into material and spiritual (or non-material) realities. Additional dichotomies, which are inimical to discussions of Pan-Africanism’s essence, surface in settler-colonial2 branches of the Academy. When Pan-Africanism is viewed as an aspect of culture the dichotomous relations between traditional customs and innovative creations surface. These dichotomies are useful when they clarify reality. More often, however, they cloud the concept of Pan-Africanism in confusion.

One of the dichotomous sets involves the classification of Pan-African reality as ‘adjectival’ versus ‘nominal.’ Walters adds order to this relationship in the introduction of his text titled, Pan-Africanism in the African Diaspora: An analysis of modern Afrocentric political movements. In a ‘stylistic note’, he informs the reader, “The term “Pan African” is used throughout when referring to aspects of the formal movement being analyzed. On the other hand, the term “pan African” or “pan Africanism” refers to the phenomenon itself in the generic sense of its usage” (1993, 12). Walters approaches the adjectival notion of the term as a “generic sense” and the nominal notion as the “formal movement.” In the generic sense, the term is attached to a subject as a modifier while in the nominal state the term is the subject. This book uses the latter form.

Pan-Africanism, primarily, is a dynamic and creative-strategic response of African culture to a challenging environment. In relation to African agency, Pan-
Africanism is a strategy. The search for an ontological order to the phenomenon of Pan-Africanism often gives one the feeling of the proverbial putting of a square peg into a round hole. Understanding Pan-Africanism requires both a dynamic awareness and an awareness of dynamism in Human culture generally and African culture in particular.

Pan-Africanism is best understood as a trait of African Culture or African Personality. It speaks to that aspect of the culture that transforms the boundaries of patriotism and optimal development on the collective level.

Culture is defined here to mean: all of the works, products, and systems of ideas developed, instinctively, consciously or self-consciously, by a People to advance their peaceful and secure position in the face of perilous natural and social environments. The sheer vastness of the African continent along with the episodic dispersion of its population throughout the world ensured diversity within the African culture. Some societies remained decentralized polities uniting only in the face of encroachment and then only temporarily. Other societies tended to unite proactively with the intention of fortification and greater rationalized production (Mokhtar 1990).

This chapter initiates advocacy for the development and use of a Pan-African Centered Perspective (PACP) to assist scholars interested in assessing African revolutionaries and their ideologies. It does this by reviewing the accepted definitions and typology of Pan-Africanism; giving a brief review of the Afrocentric presentation of Pan-Africanism’s character and genesis; and clarifying the movement’s primary opposition in the Twentieth Century.

THE PAN-AFRICAN CENTERED PERSPECTIVE

Some elements of cultural activity are transparent and traceable only through history. This type of transparency does not refer to some actual translucence but speaks to the capabilities of the observers. British colonialism/enslavement’s attempt to annihilate African culture serves as a case in point. The enslavers would forbid: (1) speech in African languages, (2) worshipping of previously adopted or created religions, and (3) maintenance of prior family structures when attempting to “break” enslaved Africans. These enslavers, while adept in economic exploitation, were ignorant of the essential cultural currents behind the banned customs. As a result, the cultural practices of the enslaved populations mutated to new forms allowing the continuation of many cultural values.

The enslaved African communities amended foreign and hostile languages to serve the purpose of communication and to evoke resistance and rebellion. This same transformation took place in religion.

Africans took virtually useless and debilitating interpretations of religions and synthesized them into practical utilitarian forms. As far back as the 1816, Africans tired of the racist alienation within the USA Methodist congregations created their own practical institution known as the African Methodist Episcopal Church. It not only served souls but it also took political stands such as opposing
attempts of early schemes to colonize Africa. This tradition is also reflected in
the advent of Islam in the USA. While a significant portion of the enslaved
Africans arrived to the North American continent as Muslims, the religion of
Islam did not gain widespread adherence with Africans in America until it
proved to be a practical doctrine. Modified and propagated widely, Islam was
rejuvenated in the form of the Nation of Islam, which became for a time, the
dominant political force among Africans in America. Its appeal was related to its
programs of rehabilitation, educational and economic self-reliance (William
1994).3 Even ancient African religious systems have resurfaced in an attempt to
find practical relief from day to day strife experienced by Africans in the USA.
The text *Metu Neter: Vol. 1: The Great Oracle of Tehuti and the Egyptian System
of Spiritual Cultivation*, by Ra Un Nefer Amen, serves as a type of prime
reference for this movement.

The augmented family maintained extended family relations without a
strict dependence on biological connections but on sociological needs.
These types of relations are often referred to as ‘fictional kin,’ though the
use of the adjective ‘fictional’ denotes a bias for the static and Eurocentric
definition of kinship (Chatters, Taylor, and Jayakody 1994, 297).

The point being made is that African culture has values that remain consistent
and practices that are constantly modified to negotiate the requirements of
environment. The values of African culture serve as the centrifugal epicenter
around which practice revolves.

Culture, by its very definition, is in constant transition. As the container of
ideological frameworks it must modify itself to ensure behavior consistent with
its central values. This change is one of rejuvenation similar to the Human body.
Biologists claim that over the course of a person’s physical life she changes (by
replacing) all bodily cells except those of the brain, many times. This change is
not observable to the naked eye but assisted with analytical tools it can be
observed over time. This basic human function is a micro-metaphor of culture,
which also moves and is not static. Assertion of this truism is necessary to
counter the confusion resulting from a nostalgic historiography.

Mudimbe criticized the static perspective of persons who consider new
developments in the culture of African People as “non-authentic,” and therefore,
non-African, as erroneous (1988). In the static perspective, culture is a stagnant
event or disjointed episodes and not a dynamic or continuous force. Pan-
Africanism as articulated by Nkrumahism did not opt for nostalgia but for a new
African society, enriched with the latest technological options yet based in what
he considered traditional African principles. These principles, as explained by
Nkrumah, were similar to elements of Maāt and Nefer (Nfr)4.

Culture is not only dynamic but it is also a multifaceted whole. For reasons of
analysis, we will say that culture has material, conscious, and self-conscious
aspects to it. These aspects are abstracted only for analytical purposes.5 In the
Academy, archaeology, a rational offspring of colonial economics, gives primacy to the material aspects of culture in understanding a People. The conscious aspects of culture are usually the reserve of the social sciences. Finally, the self-consciousness of a culture is usually studied within the confines of philosophy. Anthropology attempts to access all three areas of culture but is restricted to an ‘ethnic based analysis.’ By themselves, these abstract perspectives cannot enable one to understand any culture, much less the Pan-Africanist aspects of African culture.

DEFINITIONS AND TYPOLOGY

The Problem of Eurocentric Hegemony and African Phenomenon

The Academy is constrained by the context of its creator: the Western European empire. This limitation is reflected in the stubborn refusal of the Academy to recognize meaningful societies that predated Greece and Rome. This hesitation to explore the pre-Greek is as determined as the resistance to imagine a post European imperium. The resulting ontology is insufficient for the Afrocentric examination of the Pan-African movement.

Appearing in the journal Africa Today, an article by Kwesi Yankah titled, Displaced academies and the quest for a new world academic order (1995) makes the point that “a fairer international academic world order would acknowledge the odds facing Africanists, particularly African academics, contending with prejudices in the Western academy; and attempt to forge a future based on the equality of academics of all world cultures” (17). In this article, Yankah shows beyond a reasonable doubt, the formidable task of expressing cultural based knowledge in the Academy if that culture is not European.

Keto has elaborated on the need for constructing a human science knowledge base in which Africans are the main players in the center. He has written that knowledge about Africans in Africa and abroad has been distorted for the past two centuries. Even African scholars, for the most part, have been ‘Eurocentrized’ and in some cases, ‘Asiancentrized’ (Keto 1995). Keto’s complaint is not that there is a European center for he sees that as a proper cultural response to phenomenon. The offense comes in when the European center attempts to universalize aspects of European culture that are specific to its cultural history.

Keto stated that the political Pan-African movement, as articulated in Kwame Nkrumah’s concept of a United States of Africa, was a parent of theoretical Afrocentricity. The Afrocentric movement “continues the cultural relocation process in search of what Kwame Nkrumah called the ‘African personality’”
This relocation is especially needed among those scholars that have been ‘Eurocentrized’ and/or ‘Americanized’ (a settler-colonial version).

The preoccupation with ‘diasporization,’ may be attributed to this conditioning. Magnification of the ‘Diaspora motif’ could logically be connected to a psychosis that saturates institutions in settler-colonies. The disjointing of populations that once shared a long history of cohabitation is naturally accompanied by psychological trauma. This trauma is negotiated through the development of mythoforms that embellish some aspects of the parent-land and the journey to the ‘new-land’ while conveniently forgetting harmful historical facts. The extreme racism and cultural arrogance that is often found among the dominating cultures of the USA, Australia, New Zealand, Israel, and South Africa under the rule of Boer governments serve as cases in point. The dominating cultures also controlled and influenced the general attitudes of the Academy within their borders.

Culturally speaking, therefore, categories that the Academy uses to access knowledge are often inappropriate to empower the African People. Within that limited context, Pan-Africanism, as a theoretical and practical movement, has been categorized as either a racial, political or more recently, an economic movement.

The ‘economic’ model often implies, though not always, capitalist type relations between Africans residing in Africa on one hand and outside of Africa on the other. Attempts to relate in this manner are spread throughout the history of Africa since the economic domination of the continent and its population by European imperialism. Booker T. Washington and Tuskegee Institute attempted to participate in agricultural ventures of this type (Langley 1973). Duse Mohammed Ali sought similar ventures with Africans residing in the Americas and Africa (Ibid.). Efforts by the late Dr. Louis Sullivan might be consider similar type efforts in recent times.

**Pan-Africanism as a Racial Concept**

In terms of race, the dominant paradigm in use and one of the most apt presentations of this position was done by the social-anthropologist, St. Claire Drake. He spoke of a ‘traditional Pan-African activity’ in which, “a concept of the black world is necessary in defining Pan-African activity…. What makes the activity Pan-African is the conceptualization on the part of the participants in these local struggles of their being part of a larger worldwide activity involving black people everywhere, with the various segments having obligations and responsibilities to each other. (1993, 453) This concept reverberates in the term, ‘African World,’ used by many but seldom defined.

Authors that experienced the racism of settler colonialism personally tended to lean strongly on a racial paradigm in defining the Pan-African movement and its ideation. This proved problematic for those authors that sought a multiracial unity in Africa. Nevertheless, the racial paradigm dominated the field as did the
global racism that accompanied European Imperialism. The diversity of approach and priority given to the factor of racialism is as old as the establishment of the Pan-African relationship between Africans suffering under colonialism and settler-colonial racism in, and outside of, Africa. Simply put, those Africans residing within European settler colonies faced a social oppression that turned their oppression as a class into oppression as a caste. There is an experience of oppressive domination resulting from the settler-colonial experience by many that has articulated a definition of, and program for, Pan-Africanism. Their oftentimes tragic experience adequately explains their preoccupation with race as a problem and a solution.

Langly (1973) differentiated these diverse positions by calling one, ‘Pan-Negroism’ and the other ‘Pan-Africanism.’ He asserted that the Pan-Negro movement was broad and addressed the maltreatment of Blacks but lacked a programmatic approach. Pan-Africanism, on the other hand, was calling for the construction of institutions. While this may have been an accurate dichotomy, most Pan-Africanist opposed racial oppression in all of its forms.

Ndabaningi Sithole, a former participant in the Kwame Nkrumah Ideological Institute at Winneba as a freedom fighter with the African Nationalist Congress of Southern Rhodesia, explained Pan-Africanism as the common identification of the peoples of African descent who have discovered their common destiny and who demand to be treated as equals of men of other races. Fundamentally, Pan-Africanism is a revolt against the doctrine of racial inferiority which centuries of oppression and humiliation have rammed down the throats of the dark-skinned peoples and is a reaffirmation of the equality of the dark-skinned peoples with the peoples of any race. (Sithole 1968, 71)

Elisa Larken Nascimento’s description of Pan-Africanism’s origin illuminates this perspective in the following statement:

Pan-Africanism, while it is also a continental concept dealing with the unity of Africa, derives its essence, I believe, from the existence of a Diaspora. International dispersion brings Pan-Africanism its true global dimensions. By this I do not mean, necessarily, the dispersion of slavery. European trade in Black gold was the most spectacular but one of the most recent of African dispersions. In Australia, for example, the Aborigines claim their African ancestry on the basis of prehistoric migrations from the Continent (Australian Delegation 1977); in India, the evidence points to an African origin of the Dravidian culture and people (Upadyyaya 1977). And in the New World itself, Columbus upon his arrival found that the he was not the first “discoverer” of America. Africans had carried on an active trade and interaction with indigenous peoples for centuries, and had left the indelible mark of their cultural,
spiritual and physical presence in ancient and medieval America (Sertima 1976). African diaspora in the Americas is not a function merely of the slave trade (Nascimento 1980, 32).

While Drake was quoted above, Ron Walters has probably given one of the most thorough ‘diasporic’ presentations of Pan-Africanism to date. Building on Drake and DuBois during his early years, Walters leans heavily on an ‘African world’ concept, which has yet to be distinguished from a ‘Black world’ concept (Walters 1993). This point becomes clear in Walters’ assertion that Pan-Africanism was a direct descendent from DuBois’ declaration of “Pan-Negroism” of 1893. Walters accepted the bifurcation of Pan-Africanism offered by Drake into ‘continental’ and ‘racial.’ In general, Walters agreed with the premise that Pan-Africanism was comprised of two fundamental elements: (1) oneness of all African people and their descendants and (2) a commitment to improve their lot (ibid.).

Walters also spent considerable print on the processes that created the African Diaspora, which he attributed to: enslavement, commerce, war and immigration (1993). To Walters, these dispersed populations became simply “another variety of African community that should be identified by their specific ethnography—Afro-Brazilian, Afro-American, African American and so on” (1993, 32).

Building again on Drake, Walters uses the categorization of ‘traditional’ or racial Pan-Africanism and contrast it to a “continental form of Pan-Africanism” (Walters 1993, 43). The indication from Walter’s work is that Pan-Africanism began as a racial form springing from the Diasporic African populations and gave rise to a ‘new’ form of Pan-Africanism which was based on the political development of African unity, thus the nomenclature: Continental Pan-Africanism. This newer form is centered on the African continent rather than Blackness.

Horace Campbell (1996) asserted that every generation since David Walker has called for a global redefinition of Pan-Africanism. He stated that because the definers relied on written records, certain social sectors such as women and youth have been neglected. He said that this neglect was purposeful and the action of a ‘class’ within the movement that sought to retard its development. Campbell actually distinguishes two types of Pan-Africanism: “Pan-Africanism from above and Pan Africanism from below” (216). The politicians that came to power because of the Pan-African movement, with few exceptions, represent the ‘Pan-Africanism from above’. Campbell asserted that this class is responsible for the current strife within Africa.

Campbell accepted and passed on a working definition advanced by Eusi Kwayana in his article titled, “Pan Africanism in the Caribbean,” (Southern Africa Political Economy Monthly, Harare, December 1993). That definition of Pan-Africanism is quoted here:
As a body of thought and action, shared but not uniform or dogmatic. A dynamic movement continually transforming itself and gaining new ideological perspectives in light of changing circumstance. Enriching itself through its own experience. Flowing from masses, groups and occasionally leaders of governments. Tend to the goal of the restoration of freedom and dignity for Africans at home and abroad. (Campbell 1996, 218–219)

Campbell’s article further asserted that the Pan-Africanism of the 21st century had to continue to struggle for emancipation through diverse means, fight white domination and restore African community. The goals of Pan-Africanism included: “finding techniques of governing that build self-reliance and community, identifying and rejecting the values of white domination and consumerism, and holding that those educated in every tradition or discipline should put that education to work to serve the working people” (1996, 219).

A deeper inspection of Campbell’s article reveals that it reflected a line of reasoning and ideological schisms that surfaced in the 1972 Dar-es-Salaam Pan-African Congress and continued through the 1992 Kampala Pan-African Congress. These latter congresses followed the Nkrumah era conferences (the Conference of Independent African States, All-African People’s Conferences, and the Freedom Fighter Conferences) and viewed the establishment of the Organization of African Unity as a symbolic block against the Pan-African movement.

Two themes were dominant within this new version of the movement. The first was the reassertion of a role for Africans outside of Africa in the Pan-African movement. The second was the dissatisfaction of the role that African states were playing in the development of Africa’s emancipation and unity. Even before Nkrumah’s removal from the vanguard of the Pan-African movement his contemporaries warned of the need to see Pan-Africanism as a ‘People’s movement’ first and foremost.

For Nkrumah, as will be seen, African States that were self-conscious of their Pan-African role could enroll the masses in the African revolution and speak to the participation and destiny of Africans outside of the continent.

African Centered Version of Pan-Africanism

Esedebe listed what he considered to be the major components of Pan-Africanism as, “Africa as the homeland of Africans and persons of African origin, solidarity among men of African descent, belief in a distinct African personality, rehabilitation of Africa’s past, pride in African culture, Africa for Africans in church and state, the hope for a united and glorious future Africa” (1982, 3). He went on to state definitively that

Pan-Africanism is a political and cultural phenomenon which regards Africa, Africans and African descendants abroad as a unit. It seeks to
regenerate and unify Africa and promote a feeling of oneness among the people of the African world. It glorifies the African past and inculcates pride in African values. Any adequate definition of the phenomenon must include the political and cultural aspects. (1982, 3)

Adom described the Pan-African movement as an interwoven and inseparable combination of racial, cultural, and political movements. He distinguished a “modern form” of Pan-Africanism and placed its beginning at the 1900 conference in London. In addressing what he considered various strands of the idea, Adom commented that Garvey’s message was essentially one of “black chauvinism” (1991, 38) and was the embodiment of the racial-separatist concept of Pan-Africanism. On the other hand, he saw the DuBois efforts and congresses as exemplary of the cultural movement and the political movement within the Pan-African Movement. New concepts of Pan-Africanism have come into existence based on the 1945 Pan-African Congress. The new concepts ranged “from complete and total decolonization of Africa to a union government of the independent African states vaguely expressed as African Unity” (48).

Adom stated that Garvey and Padmore both used the Pan-African idea as a weapon against communism. Garvey did not go as far as Padmore in asserting Pan-Africanism as an ideology (Padmore 1956), but he did agree with Padmore that European communists, especially in countries where they were a majority, were exploitative in their relationship with African peoples (Jacques-Garvey 1969). Padmore was quoted in Adom’s work as opposing the ideology of Pan-Africanism to both “white racialism and black chauvinism” (1991, 54).

Batsa claimed that it was Padmore who defined the anticommunist theme of Pan-Africanism and that Nkrumah was sympathetic with his view (Batsa 1985, 16). Batsa slightly but significantly twisted Padmore’s declarations. Padmore, in fact, was opposed more to the dogmatism and short loyalty of the communist parties he had worked with. For Padmore, like Batsa, Marxist ideology provided a useful paradigm with which to understand colonialism and imperialism (Batsa 1985).

A 30 August 1963 issue of *The Spark* registered W.E.B.DuBois’ sentiment not so much on Marxist ideology but on the option of socialist development. Since DuBois is often referred to as the father of modern Pan-Africanism his comment is too important to paraphrase and is quoted below.

Africa, ancient Africa, has been called by the world and has lifted up her hands! Africa has no choice between private capitalism and socialism. The whole world, including capitalist countries, is moving toward socialism, inevitably, inexorably. You can choose between blocs of military alliance, you can choose between groups of political union; you cannot choose between socialism and private capitalism because private capitalism is doomed!
But what is socialism? It is a disciplined economy and political organization in which the first duty of a citizen is to serve the state; and the state is not a selected aristocracy, or a group of self-seeking oligarchs who have seized wealth and power. No! The mass of workers with hand and brain are ones whose collective destiny is the chief object of all effort. (p. 2)

Sékou Touré, long time ideological partner of Nkrumah, also described Pan-Africanism. His descriptions and explanations of Pan-Africanism were similar to Nkrumah, who in this area, was Touré’s mentor. Touré’s explanation of the history of Pan-Africanism; its genesis; the emphasis on language as a locative; the importance of mass African agency; and the importance of class struggle can all be found in Nkrumah’s speeches or writings. While not agreeing on every detail, their agreements clearly outweighed their disagreements.

In his most in-depth account on the development of the Pan-African movement, Touré began with Africa’s ancient splendor, cultural richness and dignified relationships with other peoples of the world. This culture developed harmoniously to the highest level of human knowledge through its languages, philosophical systems, religions, science and technics. “The African Peoples have known how to elaborate themselves and how to perfect unceasingly principles and methods of action” (1976, 167).

Touré uses the ‘pre-colonial/colonial’ periodization, which appears to locate his presentation as being rooted in the agency of European imperialism. This, however, was the dominant paradigm at the time of his presentation and still lingers as the predominant model of periodization to date. Touré stated that it was during the pre-colonial period that the challenge to invasion led to Pan-Africanism. He explained how Africa was thriving before being brutally interrupted by European imperialism. This happened from the fifteenth through the nineteenth centuries and circumscribed the forced export of millions of African captives from her shores. Touré expressed the total devastation arising from this invasion in the following passage:

The cities, the wealth, the man of Africa himself and his values of civilization undergo the negation and the scorn of rapacious invaders who imposed their reactionary conception of life, all individualism, and their methods of exploitation, oppression, resurfacing man to the rank of the merchandise and the beast and erecting money in a sovereign God (1976, 168).

Touré stressed that the invading European force did not come to organize or civilize as it found everywhere large organized states that were well structured. The invaders did not come to improve they came to expropriate. The oppression was total and went from biocide to genocide in Touré’s view. He said that it was worse than slavery as the master had no care over the condition of the enslaved.
It is during that time that more than 300 million sons and daughters of Africa were deported to populate Europe, Oceania and essentially the Americas; anywhere they were used as slaves, they fertilized the soil, built cities, drew out of the earth its wealth, gathered treasures for the sole benefit of racist groups who made their fortune from the ruins and death of the Peoples of Africa (1976, 169).

To add to this reign of terror, Africa was depersonalized and divided in the nineteenth century. Touré lamented at the ultimate effect of the invasion, which he saw as the enforced pacification of the African to become a mere instrument in the hands of the colonizer. In light of this situation “Men took consciousness” (1976, 170).

Touré attributed the initial political and ideological consciousness of Pan-Africanism to those Africans residing outside of Africa. Touré’s expression of this era of Pan-Africanism is similar to the dominant historical line on the development of Pan-Africanism.

Pan-Africanism’s Typology (Revolutionary versus Retrogressive)

Touré, like others, said “Pan-Africanism was founded as a serious movement of revolt” (1974, 43). However, Touré asserted, Pan-Africanism would not be able to carry out its liberation activities unless it became a revolutionary movement. By a revolutionary movement he meant a movement that (1) was analytical, (2) articulated its aims, (3) decided on the means to achieve those aims, and (4) was active.

Pan-Africanism is henceforth the class struggle at the level of Africa and of her external branches….

We, Peoples claiming of belonging to revolutionary Pan-Africanism, we must descend to the roots of our culture, not to be sucked in, not to be isolated, but to draw up forces and materials, in the edification of a new type of society up to the universal dimension of progress of humanity; that is the Cultural Revolution in Pan-Africanism. (Touré 1976, 177)

In a statement to the Sixth Pan-African Congress held in Tanzania in 1974, Sékou Touré called for a “Revolutionary Pan-Africanism.” This type of Pan-Africanism would “uphold the primacy of Peoples as against states” (1974, 43). At the outset Touré characterized Pan-Africanism as “essentially based on an Africa of Peoples, peoples who cover the entire expanse of the geographical limits of our continent and beyond, towards the Americas” (1974, 42).

The following excerpt illuminates Touré’s definition of ‘modern’ Pan-Africanism:
Henceforth Pan-Africanism is the struggle of the masses among the Africans and their brothers abroad. If we are not fully conscious of this we shall be led into confusion which imperialism is certain to exploit. Pan-Africanism, as a collective movement against imperialist oppression, is an expression of the will to unite by African Peoples, and their determination to cease to be the passive objects of history and become its subjects. (1974, 44)

Touré placed overriding importance in agency. He addressed identity locatives as mental reflections formed in the battle to assert African agency:

There is an identity of fate of all the communities which belong to the African continent no matter where they are, for it is the colonial domination imposed on our continent which gave rise to the behaviors and the most disparaging statements made about us, like, incapable people, people without culture, people without civilization, people only good enough for drudges and such terms as ‘negro’ or ‘dirty nigger’ meaning ‘African, dirty African’.

African renaissance implies, we should repeat the development of our culture languages so that as written languages, they can serve as instruments for the dissemination of science and technology, exploitation of the material wealth of Africa by and for African peoples.... harmonization of planned development programs of all the African states so as to give our continent a powerful economic personality and a capacity to resist all external pressures with success. (1974, 42)

Touré expressed the need for the Pan-African movement to concern itself in the areas of:

1. Language development and restoration
2. Development of Africa’s resources on a continental level for African populations
3. Rehabilitating Africa and the reverberations of this for African descendants abroad
4. African Economic Personality to ward off external pressures

For Touré, Pan-Africanism involved the war for the minds of Africans. He further stated that the items mentioned above could be done “if we removed from our people the colonial and neo-colonial mentality and the capitalist or feudalist tendencies and replaced them with the ideology of a Revolution” (1974, 42).

Touré warned of a retrogressive tendency to equate Pan-Africanism with “Pan-Negroism founded on a common ancestry, a kind of racism based on a so-called Black Nation” (1974, 42). Touré went on to warn that a “movement or
revolutionary mission cannot adopt the methods of the enemy without in the long run, serving the interests of the same enemy” (1974, 43).

While Touré was opposed both to a racist and racialist delimitation on Pan-African nationalism, he expressed a race awareness reflected in this next passage:

When it comes to an African, education, professional ability have no longer their universal essence. The colour of the skin unfortunately leaves its mark on his ability. This is why no African can feel in total individual dignity so long as Africa will not have reconquered her integral dignity. For us Africans this is a fundamental problem. (1973, 182)

As Touré qualified Pan-Africanism as a crucial element of an ‘African Renaissance’ Nkrumah often related it to the African Personality and the African Genius. As others mentioned, above Nkrumah recognized a historical background of diversity circumscribed by forces of unity. He saw these forces outweighing those that sought disintegration. In his meeting Africans from all parts of the continent and the globe he was impressed by the commonalities that he encountered. “It is not just our colonial past, or the fact that we have aims in common, it is something which goes far deeper. I can best describe it as a sense of one-ness in that we are Africans” (1970a, 132).

For Nkrumah, Pan-Africanism was the practical development of this ‘deep-rooted unity.’ To Nkrumah, Pan-Africanism was a development that was similar to the African Personality in world affairs as a reflection of that deep-rooted unity. Agreeing with others, Nkrumah said that the expression ‘Pan-Africanism’ did not come into use until the beginning of the twentieth century. For Nkrumah, however, the core essence of Pan-Africanism was the one-ness of the African People.

Nkrumah referred to the term Pan-Africanism essentially as an objective to be reached rather than a method of operation or a cultural character trait. From Conakry Nkrumah wrote to freedom fighters throughout the world describing Pan-Africanism as the true dimensions of the African Revolution (1969b). These dimensions were:

1. National liberation for national reconstruction
2. National reconstruction to promote democracy and prosperity for the broad masses
3. All-African struggle against colonialism and all new manifestations of imperialism.

But the Pan-Africanism that found expression at the Manchester Congress (1945), and the All-African People’s Conference (1958) was based on the age-old aspiration towards unity of all peoples of African origin exploited as workers and as a race.
African unity therefore implies:

1. That imperialism and foreign oppression should be eradicated in all their forms.
2. That neo-colonialism should be recognized and eliminated.
3. That the new African nation must develop within a continental framework.

However, the specific content of the new social order within the developing African nation remains to be defined. (Nkrumah 1969b, 27)

Nkrumah considered the African Revolution and Pan-Africanism linked through the development of the African Personality. This was precisely his message to the intelligentsia and intellectuals who wanted to participate in the African Revolution. He told them that they had to “become conscious of the class struggle in Africa, and align themselves with the oppressed masses” (1969b, 40).

One of the most important class-conscious intellectuals of the period was Cheikh Anta Diop (1923–1986). For Diop, the revolutionary cohesiveness that would cement the African Revolution required a proper command of history. Diop was precise in suggested remedy:

If, after freeing themselves from colonialism and imperialism, the different countries of Africa are to form a democratic, multinational State, stretching from Libya to the Cape, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Indian Ocean, then it is important to begin right now to introduce into the consciousness of these peoples a sentiment of historical togetherness. It is not a figment of the imagination. (Diop 1996)

Diop’s stress on historiography is fundamental to this Afrocentric analysis and is employed in the following chapters of this book. As a key ideologue of Afrocentric thought, Diop has added enormous weight to the Afrocentric paradigm by mandating its anchor in the classical period of Africa. This is precisely what Nantambu attempts to do in his text on Pan-African Nationalism.

“The primary goal of Pan-African Nationalism,” according to Nantambu, “is the total liberation and unification of all African peoples under African communalism.” It also seeks nationhood. Ideologically, Pan-African Nationalism is “based on the seven cardinal principles/virtues of Ma’at” (1998, 569).

Revolutionary Pan-African nationalists are individuals whose deeds not only seek to challenge and destroy the European power structure and political control intent but also to serve as a positive, potent liberative tool for African peoples. Intellectual Pan-African nationalists are those persons whose intellectual works and problem solving research advance the analytical course to achieve liberation. Geopolitical Pan-African nationalists consist of those unique individuals who adopted a macro,
global linkage approach to the liberation struggle. Those who regard and stress that revolution is a science are scientific Pan-African nationalists. Cultural Pan-African nationalists are individuals whose works (a) focus on Negritude, the “African Personality; and culture as tools of liberation; (b) challenge and expose existing, oppressive Eurocentric social norms and status quo; and (c) seek to return/relocate African people to their original cultural heritage (Nantambu 1998, 570).

Nantambu helps by rooting the phenomenon of Pan-African Nationalism in the development of KMT. Nkrumah and other agents who were his peer would have agreed with Nantambu’s pronouncement with the exception of his call for a revitalization of ‘African communalism,’ for that would seem retrogressive. Nkrumah addressed the difference of reinstating values as opposes to reinstating outdated administrative institutions. More of this is discussed under the area of ‘African socialism’ in the chapter on Nkrumahism.

Eseedbe recognized that Pan-Africanism as a practice existed before the word “Pan-Africanism” did. The term became popular around the 1900 London congress. Adom writes that regardless of the terminology, “the whole idea of the Pan-African movement was born outside of Africa” as a “cry of protest and revolt by Black Americans immediately after the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863 in the United States” (1991, 36).

Sithole described the organizational history of the Pan-African movement in the same way as the main stream in terms of periodization and the time-place coordinates of its genesis. Sithole also agreed with the water-shed mark of the 1945 Manchester PAC (1968, 71). Sithole claimed that before the 1945 Manchester PAC Pan-Africanism was a reform movement but changed in its level of militancy from 1945 through 1965.

What Nkrumah has written implied that Pan-Africanism returned to the African continent in 1958 with the holding of the Conference of Independent African States (1969b). His assertion of Pan-Africanism coming to Africa where it belonged did not seem to indicate that this was Africa’s first attempt at unity. Rather than denying that Africa was a launch point of such efforts his was recognition of the continued thrust within African culture toward African unity that took place outside the continent.

AN AFROCENTRIC PERSPECTIVE TO UNDERSTAND PAN-AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT

Historical Origins of Pan-Africanism

Nantambu agreed that the “Pan-African movement or struggle was not born as a reaction to racialism” (1968, 564) and that such a premise would lock one into a “Eurocentric, ahistorical and disjunctive analysis of our absolute African
struggle” (1998, 564). Not quite explaining the logical leap, Nantambu asserts that this analysis will cause some to assert that the Pan-African movement began around 1900. Nantambu, in an effort to employ an Afrocentric analysis, attempts to root Pan-African Nationalism’s genesis in ancient Egypt’s (KMT’s) past. Nantambu contended that a Eurocentric analysis caused some scholars to incorrectly use the term “Pan-Africanism” when they actually meant, or should have meant, “Pan-African Nationalism.” Nantambu claimed that W.E.B. DuBois, George Padmore, Julius Nyerere, Peter Olisanwuche Esedebe, Robert Chrisman, and Kwame Touré lacked a correct definition of Pan-Africanism “or the Pan-African movement in terms of revolutionary, historical struggle. (1998, 562)” Nantambu’s first major concern was that struggles classified as Pan-African should not be limited to any geographically dispersed or dislocated African peoples or their descendants. He advocated that an analysis of the total Pan-African Nationalist struggle against European slave intruders and foreign conquerors in Africa be done. Specific areas or geographic regions where resistance occurred should then be observed. Nkrumah wrote that Pan-Africanism was rooted in the ‘age-old’ quest for unity shared among Africans though his description of this condition is only in his speeches. Nkrumah spoke of earlier periods in African history that implied some sense of union in vast parts of the African continent. Two of these symbols of African unity were Ethiopia and the ancient meganations of West Africa. These are expounded upon in the next chapter.

The delicate balance of forces within African society has historically determined the direction and rhythm of developments in African culture. In socially stratified African societies, the dominant castes attempted to steer the cultural development of society toward their desired goals. When up-heavals were apparent, as in the intermediate periods of KMT, the lower castes asserted their interests to the best of their capabilities. The ancient African societies were so balanced, however, that most uprisings were revolts but seldom gained the permanency of revolutions. The utter despair of have-nots, which arose in the era of European capitalism and ensured revolutions, did not exist in ancient Africa (DuBois 1965, Diop 1987). DuBois claimed, nevertheless, that Egypt gave the world its first model of “state socialism” (1965, 104) during the Eighteenth dynasty. Diop (1987) referred to KMT’s lower caste as ‘swine-herders.’ An ‘In Their Own Words’ account is yet to be done. Until then, we have the stories of the rulers, their scribes, the priests and warriors.

Opposition to Pan-Africanism During the Modern Era
S. Touré saw the Revolutionary Pan-African Movement existing in opposition to the oppression of African Peoples and anything blocking the African Renascence. This was an identical stance to Nkrumah. Nkrumah saw the opposition as all those forces opposed to the African Revolution and the Revolutionary African
Personality. Recognition of the second term presupposes the existence of a reactionary or non-revolutionary African Personality, which both Nkrumah and Touré acknowledged. Those against the African Revolution were considered to be longing for the imperial order of European imperialism or some other nostalgic order of privilege.

Nkrumah saw the principle agential forms opposed to Pan-Africanism as collective imperialism, sham independence, and neo-colonialism (1969b). Subsumed within these categories were racism, ethnic chauvinism, sexism, capitalism, and elitism that were explained as values or characteristics of imperialism (1969b, 1970b). Those opposed to the scientific application of socialist principles for the African nation were also opposed to Pan-Africanism and this was seen as the core of a class struggle.

Nkrumah saw the class struggle as inevitable because the imperialist class blocked the attainment of Pan-Africanism. This class was broadly described as comprised of imperialism and its class allies among Africans. This class is opposed to the vast mass of African peoples in Nkrumah’s paradigm. Touré comes to later describe this as the general class battle between ‘People’s class’ and the ‘Anti-People’s class’ (1977). The nature of class relationships within this class struggle caused Nkrumah to shift his position on the form of agency required to eradicate the menace of imperialism. The armed struggle became a necessity due to the mode of struggle introduced by imperialism against the efforts to achieve Pan-Africanism.

Imperialist aggression has expressed itself not only in coups d’état, but in the assassination of revolutionary leaders and the setting up of new intelligence organizations. In addition there has been an intensification of already-existing western capitalist intelligence networks which work in close co-operation with neocolonialist governments to block socialist advance. (1970b, 48)

The specific names of the most prominent and active imperialist aggressors Nkrumah referred to were the “U.S.A., Britain, West Germany, France, Israel, Portugal, Rhodesia and South Africa” (1970b, 49).

Nkrumah warned the intelligentsia and intellectuals who wanted to participate in the African Revolution that this would involve “the difficult but not impossible task of cutting themselves free from bourgeois attitudes and ideologies imbibed as a result of colonialist education and propaganda” (1970b, 40).

CONCLUSION

The move to unite Africans over greater territorial expanses into larger functioning political and economic units did not begin in the post-European colonial period as many scholars in the Academy have asserted. This motion
existed as far back as the establishment of KMT, which itself, was the result of a unifying thrust. A cursory glance at the history of African development will show this movement to be omnipresent even if its vanguard is elusive.

The movement for unity at one time comes from the southern part of the African continent (to Lower, to Upper KMT); at another time from the horn of Africa (Kush or Nubia); at another time from the Nile (KMTic empire); at another time from the northern part of Africa (ancient Libya); at another time from the western part of Africa (Ghana, Mali, Songhay, etc.); and still, at another time, from Africans dispersed outside of Africa (Pan-African Congresses and Universal Negro Improvement Association to name a few). When Pan-Africanism is said to have originated in the twentieth century, it is this last thrust that is being referred to. However, when African culture is looked at as a whole, Pan-Africanism is not so ephemeral.

In the final analysis, Pan-Africanism is a reflection of that aspect of African culture that seeks to unite African People for the improvement of their lot in the face of anti-human natural and social agents. This is done through the organized assertion of traditionally rooted cardinal values.8

The use of the Pan-African Centered Perspective enables the scholar to invoke African culture into their approach at solving dilemmas facing African subgroups around the globe. It is this perspective that dominates the presentation of information in this book, which is why I have gone to this length to discuss it.

From the Afrocentric perspective, Pan-African agency is the root and the flower of Pan-African historiography. This historiography defines Pan-Africanism as a dynamic concept. It provides watershed examples in an effort to construct a living terrain of culture and its flowering artifacts. The terrain is multidimensional in that there are a plenum of forces, personalities, and organizations in tension. The Pan-African record of significant activity is vibrant and colorful. To focus on Nkrumahism’s contribution to Pan-African agency the next chapter will examine two major tributaries in the Pan-African experience to Nkrumah’s consciousness.

These tributaries include Africa’s political culture of seeking optimal boundaries for well-being and liberation from oppression and alienation. Anchored in ancient examples, these tributaries are punctuated with symbolic struggles and then narrowed to Nkrumah’s lifetime and focused more clearly on the years 1945–1966. Because this is an Afrocentric analysis it reaches as far back as records show to spot signs of Pan-African activity. Therefore, KMT9 will serve as the classical example of this activity as pre-KMT information from the Sahara and Congo region is still not as rich as the literature and artifacts of KMT.
CHAPTER 5
Major Tributary Events That Influenced Nkrumah’s Pan-African Agency

This chapter utilizes the Pan-African Centered Perspective (PACP) to illuminate two significant experiences within African history that had important impacts of Nkrumah’s Pan-African awareness. After reviewing the periodization of Pan-African Nationalism offered by Nantambu, it addresses the symbolic importance of Abyssinia from the Berlin conference of empires to the historic Pan-African conference of 1900 held in London. Secondly, the history of West African nationalism against European imperialism up to the 1900 Pan-African conference is examined. In both cases, the lessons feeding Pan-African ideation are looked for.

PERIODIZATION OF PAN-AFRICAN NATIONALISM

An early event of historical importance is the union of two earlier polities, under Narmer (also known as Menes) to form the first of 30 dynasties according to Manetho. The crown of lower KMT and upper KMT were merged as a sign of recognition. During these dynasties a number of nomes that made up each upper and lower KMT were consolidated into a great federation (Diop 1990, 63).

According to Nantambu, Pan-African Nationalism did not begin with the European contact or with incursion into Mother Africa in the 15th century. African peoples have resisted several disparate foreign invaders, including those whom today we call Europeans, thousands of years before the 15th century. In the BC era, African peoples in ancient Kemet (Egypt) resisted and fought against the following foreign invaders and conquerors:

- Hyksos or “Shepherd Kings,” in 1783 BC
- Assyrians, now known as the Syrians, in 666 BC
- Persians, now known as the Iranians, in 552 BC and 343 BC
- Greeks, the world’s first Europeans, under Alexander the Great in 332 BC
- Romans, Europeans, in 30 BC
- Arabs in 642 AD
- Turks in 1517 AD
Nantambu insisted that,

The first recorded Pan-African Nationalist unification among African peoples occurred circa 3200 B.C. when the Pharaoh Aha (also known as Narmer and renamed Menes by the Greeks; he was the first historic ruler of the first dynasty in Kemet) united upper and lower Kemet into one nation…. This was an act of Pan-African Nationalism of the first order—the unification of the upper Nile and the lower Nile, together as a whole, to form one country under one rule (dynasty) to be able to resist foreign aggression and invasion, inter alia…. Pan-African Nationalism was born as a reaction to struggle, and that unified struggle did not begin in the 15th century but circa 3200 B.C. (1998, 569)

According to Nantambu, there are four major historical periods that surface when Pan-African Nationalism is viewed Afrocentrically. They are:

1. The first period of unification was characterized by resistance against foreign invasions and dynastic governance/nation building in the BC era in ancient Kemet (Egypt).
2. The second period was characterized by continued resistance against foreign invasions into ancient Kemet (Egypt) at the dawn of the AD era and beyond.
3. The third period, from the 15th to the 19th century, was a period of “revolutionary Pan-African Nationalism” characterized by resistance to slavery inside and outside Africa.
4. The fourth period covers the 20th century and typifies Pan-African Nationalism into intellectual, geopolitical, scientific, and cultural. (1998, 569)

Nantambu’s model characterized Pan-African Nationalism as merely reactive to the intrusion of external populations. The catalyst mentioned may fit the modern era. It should not be seen, however, as the sole driving force throughout the history of Pan-African activity. More particularly, Nantambu’s ‘first period,’ the early unity of KMT did not need outside populations to declare itself. Nature provided the catalyst with challenges like an unruly Nile river to obviate the benefit of a stronger centralized social organization.

Pan-African responses included unity to reap the maximum benefit from all challenges. With this outlook the general periodization can be modified to show the cultural character of Pan-Africanism. As stated in the previous chapter, the ‘nominal’ Pan-Africanism is not the same thing as the ‘adjectival’ Pan-African cultural strain for maximizing African life chances.
This latter point inspires one to add a period that precedes Nantambu’s first period. Evidence of ancient rock paintings found in the Sahara has shown a Pan-African existence during the time of a lush and fertile Sahara. According to Diop:

The end of the glacial period in Europe brought major climatic changes to the lands south of the Mediterranean. The decrease in rain caused the nomadic peoples of Sahara Africa to immigrate to the Nile Valley in search of a permanent water supply. The first actual settlement of the Nile Valley may thus have begun in early Neolithic times (about -7000). The Egyptians then entered on a pastoral and agricultural life. (Diop 1990, 62)


Nantambu’s third period of Pan-African Nationalist activity, in order to be of analytical use, should mention the ever-larger evolving polities. Exemplary organizations, such as the states of Ghana, Songhay, Mali, Zimbabwe, Libya, and more recent configurations such as the Universal Negro Improvement Association and the Pan-African Federation are missing in Nantambu’s inventory of agents functioning in the third and fourth periods. Here Nantambu might have looked to Sékou Touré.

Touré’s typology included an ‘African world,’ that had a unity built on the foundations of historical realities, common cultural heritage and identity of fate vis-à-vis international capitalism. Touré states that this ‘African world’ cannot be obliterated because it is a material, intellectual and moral force. This statement of durability was philosophically supportive of the African world’s perennial nature (Touré 1974).

The most important era for this text is the last century of Nantambu’s third period as it is the century which precedes Nkrumah’s birth and the epoch which fertilizes the formal Pan-African movement, the nurturing element of Nkrumah’s agential development. Because the view of this book is centered on African agency, the great terror of the trans-Atlantic slave trade is only mentioned slightly. The greater focus is the battle within Africa to slow the encroachment of foreign interests and to reverse the stranglehold of such forces. This does not negate the tragedy of the trans-Atlantic offense but relegates that history to other chroniclers.

The history of these battles was the nutrient that fed Nantambu’s fourth period of Pan-African Nationalism. These battles are revisited below.

‘Liberty’ and ‘Unity’ as Pan-African Themes

Nkrumah became an icon of Pan-African Nationalism with the independence of Ghana in 1957. This status, however, emerged from a process of influential
precursors. That influence was not only the dramatic 1945 Manchester PAC but was preceded by other tributary activities and symbols that influenced the Pan-African movers and shakers in general. The concepts of liberation and unity were perennial in the movement to establish Pan-African Agency. As such, these concepts affected Nkrumah. The impact can be observed through the speeches that he made concerning the liberty and greatness that Ethiopia and West Africa once had.

At the First Conference of Independent African States on April 15, 1958, in Accra, Ghana, Nkrumah opened the gathering and informed the government representatives that the purpose of their assembly was to facilitate “the aim of forging closer links of friendship, brotherhood, co-operation and solidarity” (Meyer 1990, 6). Nkrumah then reflected on the history of the continent to sketch out the problems facing the participants. He told them that Africans had been victims of domination for too long and that the times were now changing. In fact, he continued, the meeting of African sovereign states was a shining proof of their mastery over their own fate. The ‘free will’ to speak openly about shared experiences, aspirations, dreams, and “hopes in the interest of Mother Africa” (Ibid., 7) was pointed to as further proof of the changed times.

Nkrumah, however, did not want his peers to become lethargic with the complacency of final resolve so he reminded them that the double problem of colonialism and racialism still plagued Africa. At this point in his presentation, Nkrumah became instructive. He informed his audience that there were two decisive factors in the molding of the history of Africa. First there was the devastation caused by the Slave Trade and secondly there was the ‘Rape of Africa’ in the form of colonialism. This latter crime was clearly blamed on the “Great European Powers” (Meyer 1990, 6–8). To drive home the affect of these abominations, Nkrumah added depth to his earlier statements. He informed the group that African development might have recovered from the nearly three century hemorrhage of African souls had not colonialism followed on the heels of the Slave Trade. Nkrumah’s exact words are succinct on this, “While the Slave Trade took away from Africa shiploads of our people, colonialism enslaved them in their own territories” (Meyer 1990, 8) In full professorial mode, Nkrumah spoke on the development of African agency from its formal arrest during the ‘Scramble for Africa,’ through the attacks on various territories, including Ethiopia, to the victorious phase of liberty that the participants were enjoying.

Ethiopia was a recurrent historic symbol that Nkrumah referred to with precision. This was reflected in his presentation made on December 1, 1960 at the Ambassador Hotel in Accra Ghana. The occasion was a State Dinner for Emperor Haile Selassie and the excerpt is as follows:

Ethiopia, because of her existence as an ancient and free state in Africa and the oldest continuously independent country in our continent, has always stood as a symbol of our political aspirations as a people. Ethiopia in our minds has stood for African freedom, African independence, African
dignity and African self respect. Even when we were not free, the struggle of Ethiopia to maintain her independence and integrity was regarded by us as our struggle. We always felt that so long as Ethiopia remained free there was hope that we too would be free.

I remember so vividly how inflamed I became when, as an ardent African nationalist in Liverpool in 1935, I was greeted one morning by the glaring front page headlines of the British press: “Mussolini Invades Ethiopia.” (Nkrumah 1997a, 211)

Other African nationalists were also outraged. The defense of Ethiopia had been an organized affair dating back to the historic battle of Menelik against the young Italian nation of the 1890s. Nkrumah worked with some of these nationalists, especially George Padmore, in Pan-African efforts to liberate all of Africa from European imperialism. The cast was dyed early.

Another piece of epic memory in Nkrumah’s background was the struggle of nationalists of West Africa against the encroaching European empire. In a speech delivered on August 6, 1960 in the Parliament House in Accra, Ghana, he reflected on the consequence of that encroachment and the role and responsibility of African agency or lack thereof:

Nothing is more pathetic than the attempt made by colonial powers to explain the upheavals of Africa as being due to external influences. It is undoubtedly true that where the situation is uncertain great powers will, in their own interests, attempt to obtain a foothold. What is, however, abundantly clear, is that the African revolution is inspired and generated from within and not without.…

Why was it that Ghana, which was in the eleventh century at least equal in power and might to England, disappeared as it did? The answer is obvious. It was through the disunity of the Africa[n] continent created by serious external influences and internal disharmony and discord. (1997a, 125–126)

The struggle to determine the cause of the devastating encroachment of Europe has been addressed by scholars such as Uzoigwe. Uzoigwe (1985) disagreed with the psychological and diplomatic theories that had been advanced to explain European imperialism. The psychological theories were classified into the following schools of thought: “Social Darwinism, evangelical Christianity, and social atavism” (21–22). Diplomatic theories have been subdivided into: “national prestige; balance of power; and global strategy” (23). This first set of theories looks at the imperial partition as a function of Europe’s moral obligation to civilize and uplift non-European populations. The second set of theories addressed a need for Europe to police, order and regulate the world for a perceived set of values deemed proper by various European ruling elites. Both set
of theories, “have treated Africa in the context of European history. Clearly, this is a major flaw” (26).

Uzoigwe’s preference for the economic theories and the African dimension theory is consistent with African centered paradigms, especially Nkrumah’s. Uzoigwe agreed with the need to place greater emphasis on the internal African realities. He saw these as the driving forces behind Europe’s relationship with Africa. The economic theories, on the other hand, stress the inherent contradictions of capitalist production relations, primarily within the European theater. European powers, in order to annex large areas of resources, would ameliorate the internal contradictions of inhabiting populations. Accepting this theory meant accepting the conclusion that Europe purposefully partitioned Africa. Two such purposes were, to exploit Africa’s wealth and to export Europeans and metropolitan contradictions to Africa.

The partition and its timing was directly related to Africa’s internal conflicts, atomization, and technological disadvantage in the face of armed invasion. There was an exception in the example of Abyssinia but that exception merely illuminates the rule.

Prior to the Berlin Act, European powers had acquired spheres of influence in Africa in a variety of ways—through settlement, exploration, the establishment of commercial posts, missionary settlements, the occupation of strategic areas, and by making treaties with African rulers. Following the conference, influence by means of treaty became the most important method of effecting the paper partition of the continent. (Uzoigwe 1985, 31)

Political treaties were in vogue during that time and were made directly by representatives of European governments or as commitments to protect private organizations. “Sometimes a weak African state would desire a treaty with a European power in the hope of using it to renounce allegiance to another African state that claimed sovereignty over it” (Uzoigwe 1985, 31). This was not always a sign of weakness, per se, sometimes it was just a clear miscalculation. The nineteenth century relationship between the Fanti and Asante, both subgroups of the Akan, serves as a case in point.

Abyssinia: A Pan-African Nationalist Symbol of a Liberated Zone

Ethiopia is on sacred ground in the Pan-African worldview. It is, many believe, on the ancestral home grounds of African classical civilizations. An increasing number of scholars are accepting this conclusion as the result of tumultuous evidence in recent years. Organized societies of Africans have existed in this area for more than 6,000 years. The layers of successive societies built on this sacred ground include Nubia, Kush, Meröe, Aksum, and Abyssinia, and the
namesake of the Greek-based nomenclature: Ethiopia. The social impact on their neighbors was tremendous. They engaged many of the governments of many of the world’s great empires and yet they remained mostly independent and respected.

As African societies became subdued and locked into the exploitative systems of chattel slavery and colonialism the value of independence increased. The dying flickers of symbolic liberty became threatened in the last hour of the Nineteenth Century. It was a time when Ethiopia was referred to as Abyssinia interchangeably. Abyssinia survived that threat only to be assaulted again in the Twentieth Century by a repeat offender. Pan-Africanists were impacted each time the ‘holy land’ was violated.

In Nkrumah’s Autobiography, he recalled the anger he felt for Europeans on hearing of Ethiopia’s violated space by the Italian aggressors.

At that moment it was almost as if the whole of London had suddenly declared war on me personally. For the next few minutes I could do nothing but glare at each impassive face wondering if those people could possibly realize the wickedness of colonialism, and praying that the day might come when I could play my part in bringing about the downfall of such a system. My nationalism surged to the fore; I was ready and willing to go through hell itself, if need be, in order to achieve my objective.

(Nkrumah 1973a)

The fury unleashed by this violation needs deeper exposure. Ethiopia (as was the case of Haiti and occasionally Liberia) was seen as a ‘liberated zone’ or at least as an oasis in the desert of European colonialism. Its standing in the hearts and minds of the African intelligentsia in particular, can be traced historically to the successful resistance it put up against the Italian aggression of 1897. From this time through the second period of overt Italian aggression Ethiopia remained a beacon of hope to those fighting against the ravages of European colonialism.

George Padmore was one of the key organizers of the 1945 Manchester PAC and had previously been a dominant organizer with the International African Friends of Abyssinia. This organization was formed in 1937 as a direct response to the second Italian invasion of Ethiopia (Abyssinia). Because Abyssinia had avoided colonization, it shared the distinct honor with, to a lesser extent, Liberia, as an emblem of African sovereignty. The sacrosanct nature of Abyssinia is directly connected to Italy’s violation of her freedom. Looking back askance to Italy’s earlier encounter with Abyssinia clarifies the episodic nature of their relationship.

In the epic memory of Pan-African Nationalism, the 1896 ‘Battle of Adowa’ is of historic importance. This event brought about the armed rejection of imperial Italy’s initial encroachment on Ethiopia. Italy’s actions, at that time, were reflective of the 1884–85 Berlin Conference, the so-called, “Scramble for Africa” conference. The conference produced documented commitment to the
cooperative pursuit of Africa’s exploitation. A particular document titled, General Act of the Berlin Conference was addressed to:

1. The Empress of India;
2. The emperors of Germany, Austria, the Russias, the Ottomans;
3. The Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland;
4. The kings of Prussia, Bohemia, Hungary, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, and Norway;
5. The Grand Duke of Luxembourg; and

While this conference focused primarily on the “free navigation on the two chief rivers of Africa flowing into the Atlantic Ocean…” (288) it also addressed the criteria of settling the African coast. Part of a document issued from that conference provides a glaring example of the latter:

Chapter 6. Declaration relative to the essential Conditions to be observed in order that new Occupations on the Coasts of the African Continent may be held to be effective.

**ARTICLE 34**

Any Power which henceforth takes possession of a tract of land on the coasts of the African continent outside of its present possessions, or which being hitherto without such possessions, shall acquire them, as well as the Power which assumes a protectorate there, shall accompany the respective act with a notification thereof, addressed to the other Signatory Powers of the present Act, in order to enable them, if need be, to make good any claims of their own.

**ARTICLE 35**

The Signatory Powers of the present Act recognize the obligation to insure the establishment of authority in the regions occupied by them on the coasts of the African continent sufficient to protect existing rights, and, as the case may be, freedom of trade and of transit under the conditions agreed upon. (Ibid., 299–300)

Italy was a relatively young “national” entity at this conference. It had become a nation-state in 1861. National unity for Italy required a battle for liberation against the Bourbons. Garibaldi successfully led that battle (Davidson 1992).
England was his ardent supporter and under his lead England’s approach toward Africa was mimicked.

After the unification of Italy in 1861 the new Italian nation-state would turn quite shamelessly to colonial enterprises in Africa. The very steamship company whose boats had carried the Thousand to Sicily would be foremost in Italian colonialism; and Garibaldi himself would speak in favor of loading on Africans the chains of servitude that Italy had struck from itself. (Davidson 1992, 127)

“By the time Italy and Germany became colonial adventurers in Africa, they were barely three decades young” (Tibebu 1995, 23). The Red Sea port of Assab was declared an Italian colony in 1882 after being obtained by the Societa Rubattino, a private Italian shipping company. The shipping company itself had acquired the port from an Italian Lazarist missionary named Giuseppe Sapeto. Mr. Sapeto had purchased the port from a local sultan for “6000 Maria Theresa dollars” (Akpan 1985, 265).

The fact that such penetration was possible reveals the fragile situation in that part of Africa at that time. Competing empires plagued Africa during this century and the horn of Africa was no exception. As Italy encroached, the emperor of Ethiopia, Yohannes, was more concerned with the suffocating pressure of Egypt, which then ruled much of the Red Sea, Gulf of Aden coasts and the port of Massawa. Egypt, however, had come under the occupation of the British Empire in the same year of the Italian purchase of the port of Assab. Egyptian concerns in the area became British concerns and both were primarily concerned with the Sudanese uprising of the Mahdists.

The advance of the Mahdists and the retreat of the British caused Egyptian rule to collapse on the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden area bordering Ethiopia. Britain was temporarily rebuffed. Opposition to the British Empire existed on two fronts: rebellious Africans and imperialist competitors. The empire chose to retreat and regroup.

Brilliant in its ability to manipulate affairs of states, Britain sought the support of the Abyssinian ruling class in its evacuation efforts. Abyssinia pledged cooperation but requested that England return territory bordering Egypt to Ethiopia as well as the port of Massawa and the city of Harar. To the first part of this request, Britain feigned capitulation as it was not able to maintain a presence in those areas. Concerning the port, “Britain merely promised free transit ‘under British protection’ for Ethiopian goods, including arms and ammunition” (Akpan 1985, 267). Both parties signed an agreement to this arrangement on June 3, 1884. With this agreement the Ethiopian military relaxed and fell into Britain’s counter offensive.

The British counter offensive was the advance of Italy on the port of Massawa in 1885. This advance was done with Britain’s consent and with the intent of surrounding the French beachhead at Aussa, which included the areas of Obok
and Djibouti on Ethiopia’s northern border. The Italians promised the Ethiopians that their agreement was not disturbed but the falsity of this statement became apparent as the Italians began to close off the import of arms to the ruling group in Ethiopia. Ethiopia responded in 1887 with a military stance at Dogali. Not desiring a mountainous campaign Italy called on Britain to negotiate the crisis. Britain sent an envoy to Yohannes asking him to consider ceding portions of Ethiopia. Angered by Britain’s reneging Yohannes wrote to the Queen of England and told her that there would be peace only when Italians were back in Italy and Ethiopians were in Ethiopia.

War was imminent so Emperor Yohannes pulled his troops from the Sudanese border to reinforce the front against the Italians. The Mahdists realized this opportunity to advance and did so. In response to the new situation, the emperor rushed to the Matamma area to resist the disturbance with some of his army. Though the Ethiopian troops were victorious, the emperor was killed with a stray bullet. The year was 1889.

Yohannes’ army did not survive the news of his death. The central state dissipated. Northern Ethiopia was suffering from cattle plagues, resulting famine and disease. During this time of confusion the Italians advanced and established the colony of Eritrea. Self-confident in its future as an empire, Italy endorsed the ascendancy of Menelik, a leader of the Shoa region of Ethiopia, to the position of Ethiopia’s emperor. Italy felt somewhat safe with Menelik because its relationship with him had been cordial during the altercations with the previous regime.

Because of this friendship with Italy, Menelik was able, as King of Shoa (1865–1889), to forcibly conquer the rich regions of Arussi, Harar, Kulo and Konta to the south and southeast, and Gurage and Wallaga to the southwest. On May 2, 1889, Menelik and Italy signed a treaty at the Ethiopian village of Wuchale. In this agreement Menelik recognized Italian sovereignty over most of Eritrea. Italy recognized Menelik as the emperor of Ethiopia. The agreement, however, was problematic and short-lived.

The treaty was craftily written in both Amharic and Italian. The Italian version implied that Italy had sovereignty over all Ethiopia. This was unacceptable to Menelik and he sent an envoy to Rome to reissue the treaty in its original form. Italy did this but on 11 October 1889, reasserted its claim to a protectorate over Ethiopia to the other European powers. When Menelik informed them of these same powers of his coronation to take place on 3 November 1889, they embarrassed him by informing him that they could not communicate directly with him since he and Ethiopia came under the protection of Italy. Britain went as far as to negotiate the borders and frontiers of Italy’s claims between 1891 and 1894.

Feeling able to do so, and in accordance to the Berlin Treaty, Italy advanced from Eritrea farther inland to Tigre. Italy occupied the town of Adowa in January 1890 and informed Menelik that they would not withdraw until he recognized the Italian version of the Wuchale treaty (Akpan 1985). In a secure manner, Italy staked its claim in Europe and negotiated frontiers with Britain.
Menelik was also busy during this apparent standoff period. He intelligently manipulated the competitive nature of European empires to increase his advantage. He imported large quantities of arms from Russia and France. Using this technical advantage he forcibly consolidated Shoa’s neighboring polities into a centralized military state. Yohannes had imagined and elaborated Ethiopia but it was under Menelik’s management that it was consolidated (Tibebu 1995). Backed by 82,000 rifles and twenty-eight cannon, this consolidated Ethiopia denounced the Wuchale treaty on February 12, 1893.

Under this new Ethiopian posture, a liberation movement emerged behind the Italian front. Led by Batha Hagos, an Eritrean rebellion broke out in December of 1894. By the end of December 1895, the Ethiopian army had defeated the Italians in the towns of Amba Alagi and Makalle. Italy fell back to the town of Adowa.

Italy was at a quantitative and qualitative disadvantage. Ethiopia had 1,000,000 men with modern rifles. Italy had 17,000 troops, one third of which were Eritrean conscripts. Italy had 56 cannon to Ethiopia’s 40 but this was not decisive. Ethiopia had the advantage of familiarity with the terrain while the Italians’ maps were erroneous. The most significant factor was the collusion of the local population with the Ethiopian army. These populations had experienced the direct oppression of Italian colonialism, which had begun the process of seizing land to support Italian settlers. Local populations enhanced the eyes and ears of the Ethiopian Army enabling them to roundly defeat the Italian colonialist force. On October 26, 1896, the Italians capitulated and agreed to the Peace Treaty of Addis Ababa. This treaty nullified the Wuchale agreement and recognized the complete independence of Ethiopia. It did not, however, mention Italy’s abdication of Eritrea.

Nevertheless, the Ethiopian victory garnered global respect in the only way a nation could obtain respect during that time of imperial expansion. Diplomatic missions arrived in Ethiopia from France, Britain, the Sudanese Mahdists, the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, and the Tsar of Russia. V.B. Thompson equated the battle of Adowa to the battle of Issandhlawana in 1879 (1969), in which the British were temporarily shaken. The routing of Italy, however, was more complete.

The outcome of the battle, the greatest victory of an African over a European army since the time of Hannibal, was of major significance in the history of Europe’s relations with Africa. The Ethiopians acquired prestige throughout the Red Sea area, as noted by the Polish traveler, Count Potocki, who remarked that the Somali displayed ‘race-pride on the victory of their neighbours over a great European power.’ (Akpan 1985, 272–273)

The development of an African supra-identity and a sense of being a victorious in the face of an encroaching outsider are evident by the above passage. This
feeling not only aroused Africans at ‘home’ on the African continent, but also ‘abroad’.

As the last independent state in Africa, Ethiopia drew increasing interest from African intellectuals globally. Akpan (1985) reports on an account of a William H. Ellis, an African described as being “of Cuban descent” (273) but reared in the United States, who visited Ethiopia “twice in 1903 and 1904 with various plans for economic development and the settlement of black Americans” (Ibid.)

Benito Sylvain, one of the early collaborators of the 1900 Pan-African Conference, traveled four times to Ethiopia from 1889–1906. During these travels he carried correspondence between President Alexis of Haiti and the Emperor of Ethiopia (Akpan 1985, 272).

Benito Sylvain was born and reared in Haiti. He lived in France for a number of years and was known for organizing the Black community in Paris. “The Emperor Menelik actually made Sylvain a sort of representative of Ethiopia, a sort of diplomat” (Martin 1993, 11). He also attended the Pan-African Conference of 1900 representing Ethiopia and Haiti. Sylvain founded the Black youth Association of Paris in 1898. He found little opposition to his work in France since France had a desire to see a victorious Ethiopia against an Italy-Britain partnership.

An Ethiopian impact was also felt in South Africa where the biblical prophecy about Ethiopia stretching forth her hands unto God had aroused South Africa by 1900. Increasing awareness of Ethiopia was later manifested by the appearance in 1911 of the Gold Coast intellectual J.E. Casely Hayford’s book, *Ethiopia Unbound*, which was dedicated ‘to the sons of Ethiopia the World Wide Over’. (Akpan 1985, 272–273)

In fact, Ethiopianism in South Africa preceded the battle of Adowa. “Ethiopian” churches, which reflected nationalist tendencies, began appearing in southern Africa in the 1870s (Martin 1983). The later victory of Adowa, in 1896, must have been an amazing boost to these churches. Their faith in eventual victory was probably heightened as if prophecy was being fulfilled in the battle of Adowa.

**Factors of Military Victory and Defeat**

Tibebu attributed the Ethiopian victory to three deciding factors:

1. Ethiopia imported more firearms from Europe than any other place in Africa at that time.
2. Ethiopia had a history of centuries of statehood with varying degrees of centrality. During the latter part of the 19th century there existed a part of the state that specialized in the art of war making as a vocation. This ‘warrior class’ (*chawa, watadar*) was an armed body that existed separate from the rest of the population, similar to a standing army.
3. Ethiopia had a cultural unity, a sense of oneness that was established ideologically through the Ethiopian Orthodox Church. Ethiopians developed an identity that saw ‘others,’ beyond their righteous borders, as heathens (Tibebu 1995, 51).

To these points should be added: (1) the forced, yet timely consolidation of the various Ethiopian local polities, (2) the competitive nature of the European imperialists, and (3) the oppressive treatment of the indigenous population by Italy.

In modern history, the collusion of imperialist agents has ensured the collision of social groups in various formations. African culture responded with a shock wave of activity and consciousness. The epicenter of the first jolt was the battle of Adowa, in 1896. It was there that Italy suffered defeat and left Africa its oldest political entity as the symbol of independent African agency. Ethiopia would serve as a beacon of hope and potential until the Italian revenge of 1935.

Some of the factors for Ethiopia’s initial success against Italian imperialism mentioned above became the factors of its fragile defense against a recuperated aggressor. Garvey commented on the failure of Ethiopia’s ruling group to upgrade its ability to resist Italian aggression. Looking critically at the shortcomings of Emperor Haile Selassie, Garvey fell out of the good graces of some of the activists in England when he presented the following:

He kept his country unprepared for modern civilization, whose policy was strictly aggressive. He resorted sentimentally to prayer and to feasting and fasting, not consistent with the policy that secures the existence of present-day freedom for peoples whilst other nations and rulers are building up armaments of the most destructive kind as the only means of securing peace…and protection…. The results show that God had nothing to do with the campaign of Italy in Abyssinia, for on the one side we had the Pope of the Catholic Church blessing the Crusade, and the other, the Coptic Church fasting and praying with confidence of victory…. It is logical, therefore, that God did not take sides, but left the matter to be settled by the strongest human battalion. (Blackman, January 1937, 8)

Garvey, who had earlier sang the praises of the former Abyssinia that had defeated the Italians, recognized that more than tradition was necessary to hold the imperialist at bay. This became a continuous concern and theme of Nkrumah’s in a later period when he would face the dilemma of tradition versus innovation.
The Liberated Ghanaian State and Pan-African Nationalism

To the participants at the first Pan-African conference (1900) Ethiopia’s victory over European colonialism was seen globally as an impetus to African pride in a vain similar to Haiti’s defeat of European colonialism. The significant symbolic difference was that the battle of Adowa took place within the Motherland. At the 1900 Pan-African Conference, Sylvain highlighted the achievements of Toussaint L’Ouverture and Menelik II as reasons for Europe to respect persons of African descent. The presidents of Haiti, Ethiopia and Liberia were made honorary members of the Pan-African Association at this conference (Esedebe 1982).

Here one can see, even if only symbolically, the role of liberated states within the Pan-African Nationalist movement. One would have to admit that while these states were elevated in status by Pan-Africanists, they did not sufficiently reflect a Pan-African self-consciousness of the latter states of Ghana and Guinea (Conakry). Nevertheless, these states were reflections of the possibility of the African Personality in world affairs. What elevated the African identity at that time was the fact that a part of the European empire was outgunned and out strategized by the Ethiopian military during the reign of Menelik II. Italy experienced an embarrassing defeat of its imperialist designs and the hope of African Redemption became enamored. This enamoring came to affect Nkrumah as did the battle to free Ghana.

In his famous address titled, “Motion of Destiny,” delivered July 10, 1953 in Accra before the Assembly, Nkrumah laid out a succinct outline of the development of West African efforts to reestablish its days of independence and glory. His message was aimed primarily at the government body but included a message to the British colonialists. He informed them that there was a great reservoir of goodwill towards Britain if it could cease and desist its colonial relationship with those it kept under their control.

Then, as if to explain why there was so much bitterness toward the colonial system, Nkrumah spoke of the earlier days of glory when Ghana of old reigned. He described the expanse of the empire to highlight its massive size and explained that before England had assumed any importance Ghana was a great empire, which continued into the eleventh century. Nkrumah went on to describe the presence of a bounty of trade in staples and minerals, the regularity of lawyers and scholars, and the weapons of gold and silver within the empire before it was conquered by the Moors.

He told the audience that they should be proud of the name, Ghana, not due to any romanticism but as an inspiration. “It is right and proper that we should know about our past. For just as the future moves from the present so the present has emerged from the past” (Nkrumah 1973a, 163). Nkrumah let them know that the past had its share of glory and should not be an item of shame. He urged the audience to see the glory of that past as an impetus of a glorious future based in social progress and peace. Nkrumah informed his audience that the important
battles were those against anachronisms that kept people ensnared in greed and that bred hatred and fear. He praised the future heroes that would enlighten the Ghanaians masses and create that brotherhood that Christ had proclaimed but had yet to appear.

At that point, Nkrumah paid tribute to the ancestors he credited with laying the national traditions. He also called for the recognition of the continued resistance enacted by Africans that were enslaved and spirited away to the United States and the Caribbean. He recalled that the perennial theme of resistance was also present within the borders of Ghana in the face of colonialism. Within this thematic portion of Nkrumah’s presentation he recanted summary explanations about the rise of the Ashanti nation, the Fanti Confederation, the Aborigines Rights Protection Society, the National Congress of British West Africa, and finally the United Gold Coast Convention. Nkrumah also invoked the names of notable persons in those struggles, which included, Okomfo Anokye, Osei Tutu, Nana Prempah the First, Mensah-Sarbah, Atta Ahuma, Sey, Samuel Wood, Casley-Hayford, and Hutton-Mills. The presentation was peppered with the successes and challenges of these organizations and individuals. Nkrumah also exposed the role that Britain played in retarding the scant progress that Africans made over that time period.

We have experienced Indirect Rule, we have had to labour under the yoke of our own disunity, caused by the puffed-up pride of those who were lucky to enjoy better opportunities in life than their less fortunate brothers; we have experience the slow and painful progress of constitutional changes by which, from councils on which African were either absent or merely nominated, this august House has evolved through the exercise by the enfranchised people of their democratic right to a voice in their own affairs and in so doing they have shown their confidence in their own counymen by placing on us the responsibility for our country’s affairs. (Nkrumah 1973a, 165)

Nkrumah saw this history as an important epoch to recant. Lessons and experiences gained in his early environment informed his nationalism. Nkrumah had many teachers that influenced him but it was his first educators—his elders, family and intellectual mentors, that initially formatted his consciousness.

At the outset it is important to reiterate that the inhabitants of modern Ghana are by and large migrants from the ancient empire of Ghana and from participants of the larger political entities of Mali and Songhay. They were probably on the fringes of these empires and eventually developed in diverse ways. The Fanti, for instance were not as centralized as the inland empire of the Ashanti. Their respective political infrastructure represented this diversity at the time of their encounter with European empires.

The settlement of the Fanti portion of the Akan along the coast of what is now known as Ghana predates the arrival of the Portuguese to the West African coast
in the fifteenth century (Osae, Nwabara and Odunsi, 241). The Fanti and other Akan groups along the coast had experienced the roguish behavior of the Portuguese in the fifteenth century, witnessed their being joined by the Dutch in the sixteenth century, and other aliens competing for space and trade in the name of the French and British by the seventeenth century. By the opening of the eighteenth century, “twenty-eight forts had been built by the Portuguese, Dutch, English, and Danes on the Gold Coast, in what is modern Ghana” (Murphy 1978, 264). By the mid-nineteenth century the British imperialists were encouraging a general instability among the Akan in preparation for direct dominance.

“Fanteland” was a loosely knit union of Fanti villages and towns in the eighteenth century. It was a fluid and decentralized polity in comparison to its northeastern neighbor, the Asante. The eighteenth century was a time of expansion and consolidation for the Asante who had previously thrown up the likes of central rulers such as Osei Tutu and Opoku Ware (Osae, Nwabara and Odunsi 1973). The Asante made their centralized authority known to all populations in the area as they became the politically dominant group of the Akan. Added factors that contributed to Asante’s relative strength were, 1) their proximity to the former inland empires, 2) their roles as intermediaries between these empires and the gold producing populations, and 3) their magnitude of population and urban organization compared to the loosely knit polities to their south and east (Wilks 1993).

Thus, by 1750, nearly all of what is today called Ghana was obliged to pay tribute to the Asantehene with the exception of the Fanti and a few smaller states. The buffer states between the Asante and the Fanti were often obliged to pay tribute to the Asante. Nkrumah’s group, the Nzima, was one of these buffer groups on the periphery of the Asante and the Fanti.

The first altercation between the Fanti and the Asante came in 1765 after the two had initially collaborated against one of the smaller states between them, the Dinkyira (Osae, Nwabara and Odunsi 1973). Trade between Accra and Elmina was deemed crucial by the Asante because both ports provided European trade access. The Asante used this access to procure weapons in an effort to further consolidate its authority. In 1765, Denkyira challenged the authority of the Asante to pass through their territory, effectively disturbing Asante trade routes. The Asante appealed to the Fanti for assistance in the matter and the Fanti complied. The combined group amassed a force that caused the Denkyira to stand down. After advancing into Fanti territory to admonish the rebels, however, the armed Asantes were slow to retreat. The Fanti sensed a threat to their sovereignty. After a tense standoff, the Asante departed from Fanteland. The British traders occupying coast settlements at this time were nervous that a war between the Asante and Fanti would disturb their business. Peace between the Asante and Fanti was short lived.

“During the course of the nineteenth century the Asante and Fante were at war for no fewer than nine times. The nineteenth century wars should in reality be...
called Asante-Fante-British wars, for the British were more or less actively involved in all of them” (Osae, Nwabara and Odunsi 1973, 243). The British assisted the Fanti from coming under the yoke of the Asante only to snare them into the web of the British Empire.

Sensing encroachment from the British authority the Fanti sought to unify in a confederation and seek recognition from the British. As they had allied with Britain against the Asante they “now proposed an alliance with Britain to establish self government” (Dubois 1965, 38). A constitution was constructed and adopted by the Fanti in 1871. It was then forwarded to the British who recognized the document by incarcerating its authors and charging them with treason. After the Fanti collaborators were reduced to colonial subjects the British went after the weakened, but not yet beaten, Asante. The British were no longer interested in negotiating with any competing powers in the area.

Guided by the business interests of its nationals, Britain went from peacemaker, to Fanti ally, to Fanti colonial master, to stalker of the Asante. The British led a war against the Asante by 1874. By the end of this war the Asante Empire was reduced greatly. The areas that remained under the control of the Asante experienced confusion, civil war, and population displacement. Calm and order did not reappear until the 1880 ascension of the new Asantehene, Kwaku Dua III, also known as Prempeh I.

It was, however, too late to reconsolidate the Asante empire. The British and other European empires, decided that the time was ripe to administer direct control over areas that could not resist. The British were euphemistic in their demand for capitulation when in 1891, the British offered the Asantehene “protection.” Prempeh I, just as politely, refused.

This did not save him or his nation. In 1896 Asante was surprised and tricked by a British led military expedition to Kumasi. Prempeh I was seized and taken to the coast and finally deported to the Seychelles Islands in the Indian Ocean off the East African coast. Asante was annexed by the British. (Osae, Nwabara and Odunsi 1973, 242)

The Asante were not the only Akan group to agitate the British. Even after collaboration and subsequent subjugation, the Fanti fought back in other ways. Farsighted Fante leadership realized the importance of knowing the world of these coastal traders. The Fante, like the Asante, had literate elites that served the collective polity. As European trade became permanent, leadership of the Akan groups felt it necessary to send some of their citizens to the educational institutions of these imposing foreigners. It was generally deemed good for business, or so it was thought, and it provided an occasional advantage when non-military battle was required. On the other hand, the British on occasion required the youth of African royalty to be drafted to areas of European control for “security.” Nevertheless, in good times, the “educated elites” worked in unity with the royal elite. In the best of times, both served the African populace.
The Fanti were on the verge of the best of times in 1865. The British, who had become more troublesome allies than they were worth, were under a mandate from a British Parliamentary Select Committee to abandon the Gold Coast settlements. A couple of reasons stand out for their decision. One, the British forces were humiliated in their war with the Asante in 1863, suffering considerable loss of life and a great deal of prestige. The prestige loss resulted from failure to protect the Fanti and other groups that had been earlier coerced into the protectorate treaties of 1844 and 1852. The British were also discouraged by the lack of Dutch resolve to oppose the Asante. Second, and more important, the British felt that their control of the coast was ineffective as long as their settlements were interlocked on the coast with the Dutch. If they could control the coast completely, the British postulated, they could monopolize trade and impose tariffs and taxes making the colonial venture more profitable (Osae, Nwabara and Odunsi 1973).

A British Select Committee instructed its colonial force to depart gradually as to reduce confusion while the Africans seized control of their own affairs. What this actually meant was, ‘reduce the loss of influence.’ A particular move to place the Fanti under the administration of the Governor of Sierra Leon was repulsive to the Fanti. The Fanti elites pondered the departure of the British and organized themselves to resume their affairs as they had done before the British intrusion. Then a change in circumstances, probably provoked by the British, disturbed the plans.

In 1867, however, an exchange of forts was arranged which put the Dutch on one side and the British on the other of the coast. Serious trouble attended the execution of this arrangement. The people of Komenda refused to allow the Dutch to occupy the British fort there and even began to attack the people of Elmina. The Dutch decided amidst the general chaos to pull out of the Gold Coast altogether, offering to sell their forts and possessions in the country to the British.... [The British] could now collect revenue to pay for their administration by imposing duties on trade. So the 1865 Select Committee’s idea of withdrawal was quickly dropped. (Osae, Nwabara and Odunsi 1973, 253)

The British must have been aware that the Dutch and the Asante had a strong relationship with each other and the enemies of the Asante were also aware of this relationship.

The real root and ground of their objection was the fact that, Elmina, where the seat of the Dutch government was, had always been friendly with Kumasi and they feared in the end, submission to the hated Ashantis. In this objection they were strongly supported by the Fantis.
The outcome was great confusion. The Fantis regarded the British as having forsaken them and declared that they were being handed over to slavery. (Balmer 125, 149)

It was known to the British that the Dutch were still involved in the slave trade and would be looked upon unfavorably by the Fanti and other neighboring groups on the western portion of the Gold Coast. It was apparent that the Dutch had never thoroughly abandoned nor suppressed the slave trade (Balmer 1925). The Dutch were known to obtain persons enslaved by the Asante to use as soldiers in Java and other parts of the Dutch empire. The Dutch promises of returning the enslaved Africans after a period of service were disbelieved because of the small number that actually came back. Many Fanti believed that this could become their fate. The British knew the fears of the Fanti on this matter.

The British also must have calculated that the Asante, fearing a blockade of their direct trade route through Elmina, would respond violently. It was also predictable that the population surrounding Elmina would respond with hostility toward the disturbing of their livelihood, which was usually tied to the post and/or fort. Previous conflict had revealed the close ties between the population affiliated with the Dutch outposts and the Asante. In a sense, these populations were under the joint protection of the Asante and the Dutch. Thus, the Asante saw a possible loss of both an established seaport outlet and the reduction of a coastal support population. Acceptance of this situation was tantamount to fiscal suicide.

Of course, if the Dutch settled in prosperously to their new destinations in the West, new benefits might be made available to the Asante. However, the Asante knew the Dutch as the Fanti knew them. It was believable that the greed of the Dutch, especially when out of the reach of the Asante, would attempt to eliminate the middle connection. In other words, Dutch raiding of the less formidable Fanti was to be expected and less trade would go on with the interior. The all around economic forecast for the Asante was not good. Finally, the British had to know that the Dutch would fall for this tactic and see it as a way to accrue profits from the “weaker, decentralized” states through extortion and enslavement, something not possible with the Asante.

According to W.T. Balmer, who wrote in 1925, the British asked the Dutch and Elminas if the swap would be acceptable. Both parties concurred with the arrangement. The Asante, however, upon hearing of the proposal sent a letter of concern about their historical relationship with Elmina to the British. In this letter the British were informed that Asante collected rent from parties that sought to use Elmina. The Dutch then informed the British that the money sent to Kumasi (the Asante capital) was “given as a complimentary present to secure the goodwill of the king and to encourage trade” (Balmer 1969, 156). Thus, the British sent what they considered a generous complimentary gift, “much more valuable than the Dutch had ever sent” to Kumasi together with a letter of the
understanding parlayed by the Dutch. The ambassador that took the gift returned with a letter, later thought to be a forgery, stating that the arrangement described was not accurate, nor acceptable. Nevertheless, the British took possession of the castle at Elmina and the entire coast by 1872.

The maneuver worked well. It was not long before mayhem broke out. The population from Elmina supported the Dutch as they sought to set up in Kommenda. The Elminas thought that the Kommendas would be under their control and acted accordingly. The Kommendas put up a determined resistance. The Dutch resorted to bombardments and destroyed the town causing the inhabitants to flee to the nearby forest.

When the disturbance was over the swapping of forts began, the Fanti chiefs combined to support Kommenda against Elmina, the latter being allied with the Asante. There were also attacks on the new Dutch positions. Finding themselves in hostile territory, the Dutch escalated the battle only to incur the wrath of a larger Fanti force. Exasperated, the Dutch quit the Gold Coast and sold their remaining stores to the British for £4,000 (Balmer 1969).

The Fanti leadership came together and formed the famous Confederation. Between 1870 and 1871 the Fanti ruling body and intelligentsia formed a political movement and constitution that advocated:

1. the creation of friendship and cooperation among the Kings and Chiefs of the Fanti, especially for common defense;
2. the improved building of roads and schools;
3. improving agricultural technique;
4. improving mineral extraction technique;
5. rendering “assistance as directed by the executive in carrying out the wishes of the British government” (DuBois 1965, 39);
6. creation of a “Confederacy Government with a General Assembly” of elected members, both chiefs and non-chiefs. The Assembly would have power to make laws and to levy taxes” (Osae, Nwabara, and Odunsi 1973, 254).

While the British might have welcomed this document in 1865, their new consolidated position did not lend itself to supporting a competing authority, even if a cooperative one. Submission to the Queen of England was to be total so the authors of the Fanti constitution were arrested and debased. British officials propagated that the leaders of the confederation were a small clique of agitators and discontented elements who merely wanted personal power. The fact of the matter, as mentioned above, was that traditional rulers and the new professional elite worked together in the constructing of the Fanti confederation. As the Confederation sought cooperation with the British they were somewhat shocked at the treatment received.
It is an everlasting blot on the escutcheon of British Colonial Governors in the Gold Coast that Mr. Charles Spencer Salmon, Administrator, should so have misinterpreted the object of this movement as to have arrested and imprisoned the leading members of the confederation who went as envoys to lay the written constitution before him, charging them with what he called a “conspiracy to subvert the rule of Her Majesty the Queen on the Gold Coast.” It is true that Her Majesty’s Government has since dissociated itself with Mr. Salmon’s high-handed act; it is true that the Administrator-in-Chief, then stationed at Freetown, Sierra Leone, (Mr. John Pope Hennessey) strongly condemned Mr. Salmon’s action in an 1872 despatch to the Secretary of State; it is further true that Mr. Herbert Taylor Ussher, Administrator, declared the arrest and treatment of the confederate leaders to be erroneous, illegal, imprudent, offensive, unjustifiable and irritating; but the oppressive deed had been done,… (Danquah 1969, 15)

The Fanti confederation can best be understood as a nationalist movement for those populations on the coast. Kofi Hadjor (1988) placed the Confederation’s effective life from 1868 to 1873. Hadjor went farther to say that it “was the first movement Ghana had seen where its traditional rulers had joined together with the educated elite to fight for independence in common cause” (1988, 24). This author is in agreement with Hadjor’s statement on the unity part however; the assertion that this was the first time this happened is false. The point disregards the role of learned persons who were educated through traditional institutions or Islamic sponsored learning. With this allowance the statement is accurate for the period under review. This unity, unfortunately, was fragile.

The Fanti federation was designed to unify the Fanti in defense of their liberty from the Dutch/Asante threat and the perceived British abandonment, as well as for the “modernization” of Fanti infrastructure. The British took the opportunity of Fanti unity to organize the further consolidation of the Gold Coast. The Asante realized that the departure of the Dutch would insure the increased harassment of their trade routes to the sea and cut off the income that was paid as a tribute or tax from Dutch trading rights. The Asante wanted assurances that the British would honor the previous agreements obtained from the Dutch.

The British responded first by joining the battle between the Kommenda and Elmina by attacking Elmina. Meanwhile, the British continued negotiations with the Asante, which included a swap of prisoners, Europeans held in captivity in Kumasi for an Asante chief of Akyempon who had been expelled from Elmina and held at Cape Coast.

The Ashantis, however, were determined on war, and made extensive and secret preparations. They fully understood, now that the British had the whole sea-shore in their possession, that this would be their last opportunity to assert their dominion over the coast. In addition, they were
deeply wounded in their pride at the loss of Elmina, which was their last
foothold on the shore. The British offered to pay twice the annual sum paid
by the Dutch as a present. But it was power, not presents, tribute, not thanks
which the Ashantis desired. (Balmer 1967, 157)

There were internal struggles going on within the Asante. The Kotoko, or great
council, surrounding the Asantehene was pressuring the government to move
swiftly to rectify the dangerous position that the Asante had been thrust into. The
Asante launched a war effort against the Confederation and the British in order
to secure a favorable position in the shifting arrangements. Victory was expected
over the Fanti front since the Asante had defeated them previously. However,
Fanti unity, fortified in the recent opposition to Dutch control, strengthened the
resolve of the Fanti and their stubborn defense caught the Asante by surprise.
This allowed the British to beat back the Asante to the northern borders of
Fantiland. The British wanted to finish off the Asante and march into the heart of
Kumasi. However, for this they had to wait for British reinforcements for the
Fanti had no desire to invade the Asante. The British received their reinforcements
and marched on Kumasi.

Internal civil war related to defeat from previous engagements and encouraged
by British efforts made the complete colonization of the Gold Coast possible by
1896. The Fanti morale had been weakened when the British had repressed their
reasonable confederation and the Asante had been suppressed by way of
deteriorating political unity. Between 1894 and 1895, the newly recognized
Asantehene sent a delegation of 300 persons to England to negotiate a
respectable peace. The British Colonial Office responded by refusing to see the
degradation and redirecting them back to the on-site administration. Upon the
degression’s return they found that while they were in England the governor of
the colony was instructed to offer the Asante an ultimatum. This ultimatum
required that the Asante pay a war indemnity of 50,000 ounces of gold. The
Asantehene refused. The British marched to Kumasi in 1896 and deported the
Asantehene, first to Sierra Leone, and then to Seychelles in 1900 (Gueye and
Boahen 1985, 132). Were it not for the durable structure that the Asante built
around the Queen Mother, the Asante might have perished.

Alas, both the Asante and Fanti were united in submission. Both became,
‘aborigines,’ which reflects the power of the conqueror to assign identity to the
vanquished. The face of British colonialism, now secure in their control of the
Gold Coast and inland, exposed its ultimate interests. The British sought to
establish direct control over land, which it deemed as vacant. To this end they
circulated in 1894 and in 1897, the Lands Bill. In response, the Aborigines’
Rights Protection Society (hereafter referred to as the Society) was formed
(Kaniki 1985). Following in the footsteps of the Fanti Confederation and the
normal organization of the Asante nation, the educated elite worked with
traditional rulers. The Society, “organized nation-wide protest and despatched
[sic] a delegation to England in 1898, to demand that the Colonial Office rescind
the new laws” (Padmore 1969, 374). The delegation was successful in persuading the Colonial Office, in May of 1898, to drop the Bill “on the grounds that there were no vacant lands in the Gold Coast and that every piece of land was owned by one extended family or another” (Kaniki 1985, 392).

During the battle to resist the consolidation of British Imperialism the West African intelligentsia increasingly took part in Pan-African activity. Though held in London, about one third of the attendees to the 1900 Pan-African Conference were directly from Africa (as opposed to Europe or the Americas) (Esedebe 1982). The “most prominent being J.Otonba Payne; James Johnson; the Sierra Leonean Councilor G.W.Dove; A.Ribero, a Gold Coast barrister; F.R.S.Johnson, formerly Liberia’s attorney-general, and Benito Sylvain, Aide-de-camp to Emperor Menelik II of Abyssinia. (49)”

In fact, the nexus between West Africa, the Americas, and Europe reflected not only increasing Pan-African activity but the assertion of an ‘African based nationalism.’ Incipient Pan-African Nationalists like J. Casely Hayford and Edward Blyden before him were cases in point of the important West African contributions made in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century to Pan-African ideation. While Blyden’s concept of African Personality was heavily loaded with the race notions of Pan-Negroism, Nkrumah echoed his cultural synthesis of Islamic and Christian impacts upon a traditional African base.

Casely Hayford, whose brother, the Reverend Mark C.Hayford, participated in a 1912 International Conference sponsored by Booker T.Washington at Tuskegee, composed a letter which reminded the conference that such a thing as an ‘African Nationality’ existed which was not necessarily the same thing as Pan-Negroism (Langley 1973). Newspapers and organizations sprang up in the Gold Coast and other parts of West Africa to fight for its redeemed sovereignty. The Gold Coast seemed to emerge as one of the models for developing ideas on Pan-Africanism.

CONCLUSION

The Battle of Adowa and the struggle to maintain and regain independence in the Gold Coast must have figured into the epic memory of those that were Nkrumah’s first educators. The events were too magnanimous to be ignored and too inspirational to have been overlooked. The spirit of resistance of those enslaved from the Gold Coast area left a legacy both in Brazil and in Asanteland. This spirit must have entered the stories told at the time of Nkrumah’s impressionable youth.

Nkrumah was well aware of events in the history of the formal Pan-African movement as is made clear in his published works. His knowledge of the Pan-African congresses that took place from 1919 through 1945 was documented in his text Africa Must Unite. His commentary about being influenced by the text Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey, lets one know that he was aware of the experiences of the Universal Negro Improvement Association. His speeches
show that he was aware of the numerous uprisings of Africans that fought against the oppression of enslavement and colonialism but the two case histories described in this chapter were to have special impact on him.

For his 1942 graduation oration, Nkrumah chose the subject, “Ethiopia Shall Stretch Forth Her Hands Unto God”. He felt that independent states like Ethiopia and Liberia had particular roles to play in advancing the liberation of the rest of the African continent (Nelson 1985). Nkrumah’s horror at the invasion of Ethiopia reflected the epic memory of Pan-African Nationalism and Black pride.

Nkrumah’s struggles to unite the Gold Coast colony and elevate it to the glory of the former Ghana reflected his deep knowledge of the exigencies for a reascent Africa. Nkrumah has already informed us that he was an ardent nationalist at the time that he reached England in 1935. His mentorship, under the educator Kwegyir Aggrey and encouragement from the West African nationalist Nnamdi Azikiwe, had to have deepened his interest in the struggles of his locale. He also informs the reader in his *Autobiography* that the knowledgeable Sam Woods, who must have imprinted the history of Gold Coast Nationalism in him before he left Africa, tutored him. Then there are the obvious tales that had to have been told to him by his beloved mother and close kin. Even his birthday was referenced by symbols of colonial intrusion—the ship called Bakana, which became shipwrecked while carrying oil from Nigeria to England.

Too often, Nkrumah’s biographers have overlooked these factors of epic memory. The next two chapters in this book will chronicle Nkrumah’s contribution to the organization of Pan-African Agency during the periods of 1945 through 1966.
CHAPTER 6
Nkrumah and the Pan-African Movement
1945–1966

What follows is a chronological report of activity and pronouncements illuminating Nkrumah’s direct involvement in the development of Pan-African Nationalism during the years 1945–1966. This chapter is organized in three parts covering the following years: 1945–1951, 1951–1957, and 1957–1966.

PART 1:
PAN-AFRICAN CONFERENCE TO LEADER OF GOLD COAST GOVERNMENT 1945–1951

Nkrumah and the 1945 Manchester Pan-African Congress

In 1945 Kwame Nkrumah’s most important Pan-African accomplishments were his participation in the Fifth Pan-African Congress (1945 Manchester PAC), his networking, and his organizing of future African statesmen. The connections that he cemented in England from 1945–1947 would be crucial in his future Pan-African activity. The early preparation that he received in the Gold Coast colony, enhanced by his political maturation in the USA, combined to make Nkrumah an effective politician among African students and workers in Europe.

Nkrumah left New York for London in May 1945. Upon arriving he was met by George Padmore and Joe Appiah. Nkrumah only mentions Padmore in his Autobiography and states that Padmore was the only person that he knew in London at that time. Nkrumah wrote that he had read some of Padmore’s works before meeting him (1973a) and was so impressed with Padmore’s writings that he wrote him before leaving the USA asking if Padmore might be able to meet him upon arrival. Nkrumah left too soon to await a reply. Padmore, however, met him at the Euston Station.

Nkrumah’s expectation of Padmore’s arrival was a sound one. Padmore had long been a familiar face with the Gold Coast Student Association (GCSA) and the West African Student Union (WASU) which was a sister organization of the African Student Association, USA (ASA-USA). Nkrumah had been the popular and well known President of the ASA-USA just a couple of years previous. Padmore’s association with WASU went back as far as 1933 (Adi 1998).
Padmore probably knew of Nkrumah from Nkrumah’s sharing of a platform with Amy Ashwood Garvey at a conference sponsored by the Council on African Affairs in March 1944 (Sherwood 1996). Nkrumah’s presentation was impressive and a portion of it was published in the proceedings. Nkrumah was an able speaker who had honed his skills by delivering sermons and speeches throughout Philadelphia, Washington D.C., and New York (Sherwood 1996); and observing soapbox orators on Harlem street corners (Nkrumah 1973a). He was also an informed speaker who had been a lecturer and teacher in a variety of settings and subjects, most notably African History.

Padmore had been a colleague of Mrs. Garvey as far back as their political association within the International African Service Bureau, of which she was a Vice-President. She more than likely mentioned Nkrumah. Mrs. Garvey’s mission was to also encourage DuBois and Paul Robeson to support the efforts to organize another Pan-African Congress at the conclusion of the war (Esedebe 1982). Padmore’s political sophistication and the demands of the Pan-African Federation to organize the upcoming Pan-African Congress provided a strong impetus for him to greet and impress another comrade with a reputation as a determined hard-worker. Especially one already imbued with the ideas proper for the cause.

Padmore took Nkrumah to the West African Student Union’s (WASU) hostel upon his arrival (Nkrumah 1973a). Nkrumah took a room there but felt that the atmosphere of the hostel was not accommodating so he sought residence elsewhere. This proved difficult due to the general racist attitudes prevalent in England at the time. He fortunately connected with Ako Adjei an affiliate from the USA days and who worked with him on the African Interpreter. Adjei trekked with Nkrumah until he found adequate accommodations.

Though Nkrumah had gone to London to further his studies, his political activities soon overwhelmed him. Besides continuing his well-connected relationship with West African students, Nkrumah plunged into activity with Padmore, T.R. Makonnen, and Peter Abrahams and later with W.E. B. DuBois around the Pan-African Congress to be held in Manchester, England in October 1945. Within one month he was immersed in the organization work for the Congress (Ibid.).

Nkrumah played no small role in this Pan-African gathering and held the official title as a Regional Secretary of the Pan-African Federation during the Congress’ preparatory phase (Sherwood 1996). During the organization of this activity he revealed himself to be a tireless worker, an able organizer, and a conscious revolutionary. By the conclusion of the conference it was clear that he was to be the recipient of the baton that DuBois had carried since the Pan-African Congress of 1919. The stamp that seemed to reflect Padmore and Nkrumah’s style of merging the intelligentsia with the laborers was reflected at the 1945 Manchester PAC. Nkrumah did much of the presenting and facilitated the session on “Imperialism in North and West Africa” (Esedebe 1982, 165).
Nkrumah literally became the spokesperson for the Pan-African Nationalist of West Africa from this point on.

Two declarations were adopted and approved by the congress participants. The first one was drafted W.E.B. DuBois and was titled, Declaration to the imperial powers of the world (Sherwood 1996). The second one was written by Nkrumah and was titled, Declaration to the Colonial Peoples of the world (Nkrumah 1973c). The former declaration, in the tradition of most resolutions from previous conferences of this type, was a protest declaration to the oppressive forces. Nkrumah’s declaration, however, was a declaration of agency. It extolled self-government and self-responsibility in the political and economic spheres. It went on to declare:

The Fifth Pan-African Congress, therefore, calls on the workers and farmers of the colonies to organize effectively. Colonial workers must be in the front lines in the battle against imperialism.

This Fifth Pan-African congress calls on the intellectuals and professional classes of the colonies to awaken to their responsibilities. The long, long night is over. By fighting for trade union rights, the right to form cooperatives, freedom of press, assembly, demonstration and strike; freedom to print and read the literature which is necessary for the education of the masses, you will be using the only means by which your liberties will be won and maintained. Today there is only one road to effective action—the organization of the masses. (Nkrumah 1973c, 44)

Nkrumah’s political currency increased through his association with this historical conference. His ability to organize and to articulate the interests of the liberation movement impressed a number of intellectuals and labor organizers that would come to affect the history of Africa and the world.

Among the delegates at the Congress were many Africans who were to assume leadership positions in the future: those who became most eminent were Dr. Hastings Banda (Nyasaland—Malawi) and Jomo Kenyatta (Kenya) who led their countries into independence; Obafemi Awolowo (Nigeria), Ibrahim Garba-Jahumpa (Gambia), Jaja Wachuku (Nigeria) and Ako Adjei (Ghana) who became ministers of state; J.S. Anan, F. Kamkam-Boadu, Eddie DuPlan, all to serve in various Nkrumah administrations.... (Sherwood 1996, 123)

Under the presidency of DuBois, Nkrumah became the General Secretary of a working committee resulting from the conference. It was also around this time that he was approached by Ashie Nikoe, Wallace Johnson, Bankole Akpata, Awooner Renner and Kojo Botsio and convinced to become the General Secretary of an organization called the West African National Secretariat
Wallace Johnson became the chairman while Nikoe, Mr. and Mrs. Renner all served as officers (Langley 1979).

**West African National Secretariat**

December 1945 was the month that WANS was launched as a “co-ordinating body of nationalist movements in West Africa and as a regional body of the Pan-African Federation (Langley 1973, 357).” It sought to organize the masses as the most assured way of establishing African agency. WANS was also to “serve as a clearing house for information on matters affecting the destiny of West Africa in particular and Africa in general; and to educate the peoples and the working classes in particular” (Ibid., 358) about imperialist designs against their agency. WANS was to foster unity and solidarity throughout West Africa and to thwart dangerous and debilitating territorial divisions that might be artificially set. An explicit aim of the organization was the unity of all Africans that were opposed to imperialism and other forms of exploitation. With the exception of West African nationalism as a precursor, these goals were never to be abandoned by Nkrumah.

The fundamental belief of WANS is well stated in the following passage from their by-laws:

> Principles alone, when diffused among a people, manifest their right to freedom and liberty. The test of faith in action, and thought and action represent an integral concept of man’s struggle for freedom. The economic and political ideas and aspirations scattered among the West African peoples but lacking in co-ordination need to be reduced to a system for a united action…. (Langley 1979, 358)

Nkrumah established a London office for WANS. With the assistance of Akpata, he started an organ of WANS called, *The New African*. Its first issue was subtitled, “The Voice of the Awakened African” and displayed the motto “For Unity and Absolute Independence”. The following excerpt from the inaugural March 1946 issue of the paper gives an indication of Nkrumah’s outlook on the struggle for liberation at that time:

> Behind six years of world destruction, and six months of political poker playing with the small Powers, and the Colonies as “the jackpot,: it should be plain to the working classes of the world, whatever their colour, that there is only one freedom worth having, and that is freedom to manage their own affairs. (“Riding on the Lion” by Gemini a.k.a. Nkrumah)

WANS was affiliated with WASU but it had a more radical character and was designed specifically to bring about the movement called for at the Manchester Pan-African Congress. Nkrumah served as the Vice President an Executive
Board Member of WASU while he was the General Secretary of WANS. While serving in the capacity as the latter Nkrumah made two trips to France to consolidate relationships with the African members of the French National Assembly. Nkrumah held audiences with Sourous Apithy, Leopold Senghor, Lamine Gueye, Houphouet-Boigny and other Africans residing in France.

WANS threw two West African Conferences which sought to promote the nationalism and unity of African students studying in Europe and the USA. Sourous Apithy’s and Leopold Senghor’s participation was a direct result of Nkrumah’s travels. From that point WASU stayed in touch with African student organizations in France. Here it is apparent that two important ‘firsts’ were accomplished. First, the colonial-lingua barrier was broken. Secondly, the African anti-imperialist struggle became rooted in an openly socialist direction. These approaches would remain consistent thrusts in Nkrumah’s agency.

**The Circle**

Besides holding positions as Regional Secretary of the Pan-African Federation (PAF); the General Secretary of the PAF and WANS; the Vice Presidency of WASU; and organizer with the Coloured Workers’ Association of Great Britain—an organization concerned with the well being of African expatriates in England, Nkrumah also began a clandestine organization. This latter organization was called the Circle and had the following aims:

1. To maintain ourselves and the Circle as the Revolutionary Vanguard of the struggle for West African Unity and National Independence.
2. To support the idea and claims of the All West African National Congress in its struggle to create and maintain a Union of African Socialist Republics. (Nkrumah 1973c, 48)

It was an organization established to safeguard the increasingly zealous African masses. Specifically it was to protect the masses from “demagogues, quislings, traitors, cowards and self-seekers (Ibid.).” It saw West Africa as one nation, which it sought to liberate from the imperialist enemy. Its members had to pledge an oath, which was reminiscent of the oaths of secret societies in some traditional African cultures. Jomo Kenyatta mockingly called it “juju, and childish” (Sherwood 1996, 125) which, in some sense showed his dislocation, or, more accurately, his ‘other-location’

Circle members had elaborate duties to expand the West African Revolution as an integral step in the African Revolution. There were monthly rituals that they were to perform and there were organizations that they were to infiltrate and influence. All members were to pay dues, attend Circle meetings, and maintain communication. A secret handshake was shared between them and the method for performing it was included in their founding document (Nkrumah 1973c).
The Grand Council of the organization was to have a special meeting per annum to decided general policy.

Other members of the Circle were not from West Africa. The notable among them were Padmore, Kenyatta, and Makonnen. Nkrumah remained true to his oaths and never revealed the names of the membership. During this period, Nkrumah was advocating the ‘eventual’ unity of all of Africa and African descendants abroad. The goal of the circle was stated as follows, “At such time as may be deemed advisable THE CIRCLE will come out openly as a political party embracing the whole of West Africa, whose policy then shall be to maintain the Union of African Socialist Republics” (Nkrumah 1973c, 50). Years later Nkrumah would abandon the notion of West African Unity as a preliminary step to African unity.

Organization of the United Gold Coast Convention (UGCC)

Two years to the month after the founding of the West African National Secretariat the United Gold Coast Convention (UGCC) was ‘officially’ launched in the Gold Coast colony by a group of lawyers, academicians, and businessmen (Nkrumah 1973c). Ako Adjei, who had arrived back in the Gold Coast in May of 1947, wrote to Nkrumah inviting him to return to serve as the General Secretary of the UGCC. Nkrumah had his doubts due to the class make up of the UGCC but wrote to Adjei telling him that he would consider the invitation. J.B.Danquah later sent a second letter urging Nkrumah to accept the invitation. At the encouragement of WANS members (Nkrumah 1973a) and Padmore (Sherwood 1996), Nkrumah accepted the position. He notified the UGCC and wrote to Adjei that he and Botsio would soon depart.

Nkrumah was intent on putting into practice the plans that had been made in the PAF, WANS, and the Circle. After being harassed by the British police in Liverpool because of his affiliation with British communists, Nkrumah and Botsio departed for Africa in mid-November 1947. On the way to the Gold Coast Nkrumah took care of more WANS' business. He spent two weeks in Sierra Leon and two weeks in Liberia attempting to drum up support for a proposed upcoming West African Conference to be held in Lagos. He was also attempting to form regional associations that would theoretically smooth the way for a later transition into a federal West African nation. In these endeavors he spoke to large crowds and to groups of political leaders.

Nkrumah encountered two difficulties that influenced his strategic thinking on African unity. The first problem appeared in Sierra Leon where the political leadership was torn over the person of Wallace-Johnson, the former chairman of WANS. Nkrumah met with the leadership and encouraged them to embrace unity for the sake of the greater West African national cause. He would launch similar efforts in future meetings with African Freedom Fighters. Nkrumah’s second challenge came when he arrived at Liberia, which, though it was considered a liberated state, was rather disappointing to Nkrumah. He was keenly
aware of the reticence that Liberian officials displayed when asked to participate in a conference with organizations that had not obtained ‘state power’. This experience influenced Nkrumah’s later approach to organizing the unity of Africa. Thus, Nkrumah developed both a ‘state approach’ with its attendant protocol and a ‘people’s organization approach’ with its liberating character, to achieve the successful conclusion of the African Revolution.

Nkrumah arrived in the Gold Coast and after meeting with his family he assessed the political climate from the ‘ground level.’ He had done investigations from abroad through conversations with Africans and others who had traveled to and from the colony. The political climate was ripe for his plans and the African masses only required the systematic organization of their collective agency. All that remained was his official installment in the UGCC. The process leading to his installment would cement Nkrumah’s doubts about the group he was to work with. His testimony is both illuminating and somewhat satirical.

The members received me enthusiastically and made many speeches of welcome before we finally settled down to the business in hand. The first item on the agenda was my appointment as general secretary. This, it was agreed by everybody, should be confirmed forthwith. When the question of salary arose, however, there was diversity of opinions. The hundred pounds a month and the car had obviously, I realised, been used only as a bait for I soon discovered that the Convention (which itself lacked any kind of programme or mass organisation) had no funds at all and had not even attempted to open a banking account. As the payment of a hundred pounds was quite out of the question, they compromised by offering me twenty-five pounds a month instead. I realised that even this sum was going to be difficult for them to find and I proposed that I would work for nothing so long as they would take care of my board and lodging expenses. The whole room full of them turned to look at me in astonishment. As each one was making an income of around two or three thousand a year, they must have thought I was either a pretty queer character or that in a shrewd way I was trying on something too clever for them to see…. They obviously intended taking no chances for they would not agree to my proposal and insisted on paying me twenty five pounds a month. It mattered little to me one way or the other, and I accepted their offer. In January of the next year, therefore, I began my official duties as general secretary of the U.G.C.C. (Nkrumah 1973a, 58)

Nkrumah set out immediately to do organizational work according to a program of action he put before the Working Committee of the UGCC. The work of implementing the platform fell into three periods.

The first period was to include the coordination of the various organizations under the control of the UGCC. These included “Political, Social, Educational, Farmers’ and Women’s Organizations as well as Native Societies, Trade Unions,
Co-operative Societies, etc. (Nkrumah 1973c, 53)” which were to be granted affiliate membership with the UGCC. Existing branches were to be consolidated and new branches were to be established in virgin territories throughout the colony. Odikros7 were to be persuaded to become patrons of the UGCC. Weekends ‘Convention schools’ were to be opened wherever there were UGCC branches for the purpose of “political mass education of the country for Self-Government” (Nkrumah 1973c, 53).

During the second period, political crises were to be made use of by constant demonstrations to test organizational strength. These actions would be expanded in the third period to include boycotts and strikes to bring pressure to bear on the colonial forces to allow Self-Government. The third period also included the convening of a Constitutional Assembly of colonial subjects of the Gold Coast (Nkrumah 1973a, c).

Nkrumah discovered that only a couple branches of the organization existed. Within six months he established 500 branches. Dues began to flow in and a bank account was established for the UGCC. As Nkrumah traveled throughout the country establishing branches of the organization he became even more aware of the frustration of the population. He began to politically educate the masses. Nkrumah spoke to about two thousand persons of the Nzima group at Aboso in February 1948. He told them that only the united support of the people could bring about success. He went on to say,

> Without organizational strength we are weak; unity is the dynamic force behind any great venture. In whatever sphere of labour you are placed we want you to work so well that when the time comes for you to serve your country you will be the right man at the right place. (Nkrumah 1973b, 3)

In a typical fashion he went on to extol the virtues of working with the UGCC by starting a branch.

A rapid series of events and altercations between the populace and the colonial administration provided Nkrumah with the opportunity to advance to the second phase of his strategy within a year.

Even before the leadership of the UGCC, the traditional structures and other organizational forces were in rebellion. “A countrywide boycott of European and Syrian merchants had been called by a sub-chief of the Ga State, Nii Kwaben Bonne, in an attempt to force foreign shopkeepers to reduce the high prices of their goods. The boycott spread quickly and lasted about a month. (1973c, 54–55)” The boycott was called off on 28 February 1948. On that same day the colonial authorities were responsible for an altercation at a demonstration of the Ex-Servicemen’s Union that resulted in the death of two demonstrators and five wounded. The resultant uprising lasted for several days, “during which some twenty people were killed and 237 injured” (1973c, 55).

Nkrumah gave his first mass presentation in Accra at the Palladium Cinema at the end of January 19488 to an overflowing crowd. There were thousands of
youth in attendance. His topic was “The Ideological Battles of Our Times” (Nkrumah 1973a). This presentation, taking place during an economic boycott, allowed Nkrumah the opportunity to link the economic crisis to the political situation. He encouraged the audience to help pass the control of government into the hands of the people. He became pointed and told his audience:

A fierce fight against the economic system is raging. It does not matter whether those who have promoted that economic system are black or white. The Convention is against anybody who identifies himself, be he black or white, with that economic system. The present struggle is a historical one, for down the ages this fight has been raging with unabated intensity and has pointed all along to one goal-complete independence for West Africa. (Nkrumah 1973b, 4–5)

The long applause and response from the youth was inspiring and no doubt worried the colonial authorities. At this presentation Danquah told that audience that Nkrumah would never fail them. Soon after, the famous ‘Accra rebellion’ mentioned above ensued.

The UGCC was implicated in the uprising for two reasons. First, the speech given by Nkrumah was considered provocative. The second factor that implicated the UGCC resulted from their response to the fracas. Acting quickly, Nkrumah assembled the UGCC Executive Committee and they called the colonial administration to abdicate governance to the chiefs and the people. The UGCC leadership was promptly arrested and deported to Kumasi. They were later taken further north because of fear from a rumor that the youth of the Ashanti were going to physically break them out of confinement. The rumor was well founded as Nkrumah had reached out to the youth at every opportunity. They appreciated his militancy and the response in Accra to Nkrumah’s presentation was probably well known by the colonial authorities. While the UGCC’s leadership was released after six weeks of being under arrest, the pressure of this and other activities prompted them to separate from Nkrumah.

Nkrumah knew that the separation was inevitable and he was not idle. He continued to travel and speak to the masses. He launched an independent school known as the Ghana National College for students from various colleges and secondary schools who had gone on strike. They were subsequently expelled when the UGCC leadership was arrested. The opening ceremony took place on 20 July 1948 at which Nkrumah explained to the audience that the task of the college was to liberate the minds of the youth to enable them to tackle the problems of the time. He further instructed them to combine the best of Western culture with the best in African culture (Nkrumah 1973a). “The magic story of human achievement gives irrefutable proof that as soon as an awakened intelligentsia emerges among so-called subject people, it becomes the vanguard of the struggle against alien rule” (Nkrumah 1973a, 74). At the end of his presentation he advised them to use their education to build a united Gold Coast
and a united West Africa (Nkrumah 1973a, 74). The school thrived and in the following year had 200 students.

Nkrumah formed the Youth Study Group that evolved into the Committee on Youth Organization (CYO). The CYO was comprised of the Youth Study Group, the Ashanti Youth Association and the Ghana Youth Association of Sekondi.9

**Organization of the Convention People’s Party (CPP)**

The UGCC Executive Committee opposed the organization of the youth and other militant activity, along with Nkrumah’s hiring of a secretary at four pounds a month and they relieved him of his post as General Secretary on 3 September 1948. On that same day Nkrumah launched the *Accra Evening News* with its motto: “We prefer self-government with danger to servitude in tranquility.” The UGCC was also opposed to the establishment of the paper. Nkrumah was moved to the position of treasurer, though the UGCC had earlier claimed he had no understanding of the value of money as witnessed by his proposal to not be paid during his installment negotiations as the General Secretary. The UGCC was afraid, and rightly so, of Nkrumah’s following if they sacked him completely.

The inevitable split was imminent. Early in June 1949, during a special conference in Tarkwa of the CYO, it was decided that we should break away from the UGCC and form our own political party quite separate from it, and that the party should be called the Convention People’s Party (CPP). It was to be a mass-based, disciplined party pursuing policies of scientific socialism. (Nkrumah 1973c, 57)

The CPP’s motto was “Forward ever-Backward never.” It had six national objectives, which were:

1. Independence of Ghana for the people and their Odikros10
2. Serve as a political vanguard against all oppression and for democratic government
3. Secure and maintain unity of the entire colony
4. Incorporate kindred organizations movements in appropriate joint political and other action
5. Work speedily for a reconstructed Ghana with free chiefs and people that govern themselves
6. Promote the emancipation of the working people on the political, economic, and social levels. (Nkrumah 1973c, 59)

The International objectives of the CPP were:
(I) To work with other nationalist democratic and socialist movements in Africa and other continents, with a view to abolishing imperialism, colonialism, racialism, tribalism and all forms of national and racial oppression and economic inequality among nations, races and peoples and to support all action for World Peace.

(II) To support the demand for a West African Federation and of Pan-Africanism by promoting unity of action among the peoples of Africa and African descent. (Nkrumah 1973c, 59)

The CPP was a mass organization. It was organized down to the local level with responsibilities on two levels of membership. The affiliate membership allowed persons to remain in their original organization and still claim a relationship to the CPP while also allowing the CPP to claim them.

Individual memberships were under the direct control of the CPP and the criterion to belong was more stringent. Membership at this level required sworn rejection of imperialism, colonialism, tribalism, and racialism. One could not belong to an organization that could be construed to compete with the CPP—that is one had to declare sole membership to the Party. Of the two types of membership, the CPP’s constitution displayed a clear preference: “Affiliations are apt to cause divided loyalties; so as much as possible only individual membership should be encouraged, though the Party should be on the closest of terms with the various organizations. (Nkrumah 1973c, 60)”

The CPP was to be Nkrumah’s basic power base throughout his stay in Ghana. It went through a number of qualitative changes over that period. Nkrumah sought to make it an organization that would transform itself from a mass movement to a conscious socialist vanguard of a Pan-African Nation. In this Nkrumah was partially successful.

In December of 1948, Nkrumah spoke to an assembly of 3,000 at a Youth Study Group meeting in Accra. Nkrumah considered this one of his most successful speeches made during that period (Nkrumah 1973b). In a presentation that lasted longer than an hour, Nkrumah traced the history of the colony since the Europeans had arrived. From that subject he went on to advocate for a new constitution and to issue this warning, “Imperialism thrives only where the people are divided and are ignorant of their rights. That is why the educational system is so bad. In fact there is no system at all. It is one big muddle” (1973b, 13). The image Nkrumah painted to this group of anxious youth was that the Colonial administration was inept and behaving irresponsibly toward the population it claimed to protect and develop.

It was clear also to the British that Nkrumah was building a significant force for action among the youth, women, farmers, workers and ex-servicemen. During the early part of 1949 the British increased their troop placements in the Gold Coast colony and the Governor departed quietly for London. Nkrumah’s forces sought to belittle colonialism at every step. Thus, they seized upon every action and reaction to discredit colonial operations. Nkrumah enhanced the
courage of the Ghanaian populace through the *Evening News* and let it be known that neither bullets nor British troops could stop the drive toward independence and self-government. All that remained, according to Nkrumah, was for the people to “Organise! Organise!! Organise!!!” (1973b, 15) and this they did.

On 12 June 1949, the CPP was officially launched and by January of the next year the Party confronted the Imperialist authorities directly in the campaign known as “Positive Action.” This campaign of non-compliance greatly disturbed the British order of affairs and promptly landed Nkrumah and other leaders of the CPP in jail. This did not stop the CPP for it was truly mass-based and, for a while at least, had a talented echelon of leadership that retained communication and order among the members. The machinery that would empower Nkrumah’s Pan-African designs was being molded in the struggle against British Imperialism.

The CPP had successfully garnered the majority of seats in the Assembly during Nkrumah’s internment and since he was the leader of the Party he was entitled to the position of Leader of Government Business. This entitlement came from an imposed constitution, which Nkrumah stated was “‘bogus and fraudulent’ but would serve as a stepping stone to self-government” (1973a, 136; 1973b, 23). Nkrumah was released from James Fort prison on 12 February 1951 as an elected official of the colonial government.

**The Accra Evening News and Other Publications**

Nkrumah consistently advocated that political freedom was necessary to achieve other aspects of liberated agencies. From 1948–1951, he spent his time educating the Ghanaian constituency on the importance of identifying both the enemy and the optimal zone for agential development—a liberated Ghana in a liberated Africa. To this end he used the *Accra Evening News* as a propaganda instrument of the CPP. The first issue subliminally portrayed a Pan-African symbol in its editorial that began in the following manner: “Ethiopia stretches forth her yearning hands! Africa moves on towards her emancipation! The Gold Coast advances into the arena of world politics and recognition (Vol. 1, No 1, September 3, 1948).”

Each issue tended to quote famous persons that had opposed colonialism and tyranny. The first issue quoted the *American Declaration of Independence* and Abraham Lincoln’s statement on the birth of a free nation under God and a government “of the people, by the people, and for the people,” that would not perish from the earth. Nkrumah’s alter ego, the Rambler, would extol the virtues of Ghanaian women and the youth in his column “Accra Diary.” Soon the paper developed in content and began to feature regular newsletters from the CPP. It became well known for its agitation columns by the Rambler. It also featured occasional articles by Padmore and news of other colonies rising up against the British Empire. The *Accra Evening News* was eventually forced to rename itself...
due to the libel suits, which were frequently lodged against it. It became the *Ghana Evening News* and finally the *Evening News*.

The *Accra Evening News* started as a one-page upstart of a newspaper yet by June 1949 it had successfully evolved to become a daily organ of the CPP’s political education. As radio was in the complete control of the colonial authorities the newspaper had to suffice and suffice it did. So successful was the *Accra Evening News* that Nkrumah launched the *Morning Telegraph* in Sekondi in June 1949 and the *Daily Mail* in Cape Coast in December 1949. These newspapers, in fact, prepared the way for the next phase of struggle to take place.

Nkrumah tried to avoid advertising for fear that it would impact negatively on the content of the paper. He had been unable to avoid advertisements while he was incarcerated for fourteen months due to his participation in the ‘Positive Action’ campaign.

**Pan-African Agency in the Gold Coast Colony**

Nkrumah needed the power of a macro-agent in order to execute the plans of the 1945 Manchester Pan-African Congress. His first task, therefore, was the establishment of a zone in Africa in which African agency was the ruling power and had a self-developing character. The elements of this agency were present in the Gold Coast Colony in 1947. Nkrumah helped to unite these elements which included the collectively powerful ‘market women,’ the farmers, trade unionist, ex-soldiers, militant youth and the revolutionary intelligentsia.

Breaking from the slower pace of the UGCC, Nkrumah began to develop Gold Coast’s Pan-African agency by formatting the mass consciousness with the following concepts:

1. The rightness of Ghana’s support for other peoples fighting for justice and egalitarian treatment, especially Africans;
2. Immediate self-government (S. G. Now) for political control of the wealth through the agency of organized collective unity; and
3. Europe’s colonial politics and economics were inimical to African liberty and well-being.

Even before the launching of the CPP, Nkrumah gave speeches to the massive audiences and small gatherings in which he would advise them to prepare for independence. In this way he would both encourage the masses to imagine themselves as the responsible agents of the country’s development and encourage the political ‘delinking’ from the European empire.
PART 2:
FROM LEADER OF GOLD COAST GOVERNMENT TO LEADER OF PAN-AFRICAN LIBERATED ZONE 1951–1956

Global Reconnections and the Push for West African Unity

Two months after being released from prison and being installed as the Leader of Government Business in 1951, Nkrumah and Botsio met with Padmore in London. The meeting lasted for hours and served the purpose of updating its participants in happenings that transpired since they were together in 1947. This important meeting took place in the first part of Nkrumah’s trip to the USA to receive a Doctor of Laws degree conferred upon him by the Board of Trustees at Lincoln University. They were obviously aware of their alumnus’ impending position of power in Africa. So too was the USA State Department which received Nkrumah’s party formally.

Nkrumah reconnected with some of his important contacts in the USA and initiated meetings with Ghanaian businessmen and other business interests, to consolidate support for the independence movement. There were important meetings with British and American officials but probably most important were the meetings that Nkrumah had with African descendants that he encountered both at Lincoln University and in New York. At Lincoln University a number of African graduates expressed a desire to go and assist in the work that Nkrumah was doing. He explained to them that as soon as independence came he would be able to receive them and utilize their support. This was encouraging as was a special event that took place in New York described by Nkrumah below:

In the evening the Mayor of New York arranged a large dinner party in honour of Kojo and myself. All the leading Negro dignitaries and officials were present and I gave a speech on the political development of the Gold Coast and on our hope to become self-governing in the near future. I expressed the desire that all those who wished to return to help develop the country would be most welcome after independence when we would be free to open our arms to whomsoever we pleased (emphasis mine). (1973a, 137)

After departing from New York, Nkrumah met again with Padmore and other important persons in England. Padmore and some students met Nkrumah as his plane arrived. While Nkrumah does not go into depth about this second meeting with Padmore it is clear from subsequent events that these ‘alums of the Circle’ advanced their plans to achieve the goals of the Manchester Pan-African Congress. Padmore went to the Gold Coast colony in 1952 and published a book on its revolution in 1953.
Upon leaving England, Nkrumah met with the CPP’s Nigerian branch. His move for the consolidation of a united West Africa was being put into place. Nkrumah’s ascension was being recognized by all and towards the end of 1952, President Tubman of Liberia extended an official invitation for a state visit from Nkrumah. Unlike Nkrumah’s 1947 trip to Liberia, the highest echelons of government were present to welcome him when he arrived in 1953.

The visit to Liberia and the discovery of its improved infrastructure under the presidency of Tubman impressed upon Nkrumah the possibilities of African agency once it seized control of the state machinery. Nkrumah passed up no effort to fire the enthusiasm of mass gatherings organized to hear him in Liberia. One particular gathering, which Nkrumah remembered fondly, was of a meeting held at the Centennial Pavilion in Monrovia.

At that presentation, Nkrumah spoke on his vision. After thanking the crowd on behalf of the ‘chiefs and people of the Gold Coast’ he began to expound on two of his consistent speech themes. The first was the preference of self-government with danger over servitude in tranquility and the second was judging agencies (in this case the Liberian populace and its government) not by the heights that they achieved but the depths from which they emerged. Nkrumah explained how he projected an African world image on his audience in the following passage:

I pointed out that it was providence that had preserved the Negroes during their years of trial in exile in the United States of America and the West Indies; that it was the same providence which took care of Moses and the Israelites in Egypt centuries before. ‘A greater exodus is coming in Africa to-day,’ I declared, ‘and that exodus will be established when there is a united free and independent West Africa…. Look at the whole country of Africa to-day! With the possible exception of Liberia, Egypt and Ethiopia, the entire continent is divided and sub-divided, partitioned and re-partitioned—look at the map!’…

I was getting into my stride and receiving as much encouragement from the enthusiastic crowd as I did from my own people at the Arena in Accra.

‘Africa for the Africans!’ I cried. (emphasis mine) (1973a, 152–3)

Nkrumah distinguished his statement from that of Garvey’s, probably because of Garvey’s conflict with the Liberian government in previous decades. Nkrumah said that his statement was an advocacy for self-government for Africans, without which a people would be “silly and absurd” (1973a, 153). Then Nkrumah invoked a Pan-African historiography on the consciousness of his audience:

We should aim at an even greater glory and majesty than that which existed in the days of ancient Ghana, the land of our forebears. I explained that long before the slave trade and the imperialistic rivalries in Africa began, the civilisations of the Ghana Empire were in existence. At
that time in the ancient city of Timbuktu, Africans versed in science, arts, and learning were having their works translated into Greek and Hebrew and were, at the same time, exchanging teachers with the University of Cordova in Spain. These were the brains!’ (1973a, 153)

Then, in complete Garvey-style exhortation, Nkrumah continued:

...‘And to-day they come and tell us that we cannot do it. We have been made to believe that we can’t do it. But have you forgotten? You have emotions like anybody else; you have feelings like anybody else; you have aspirations like anybody else—and you have visions. So don’t let people come here and bamboozle us that the African is incapable of governing himself!’ (1973a, 153)

Using a theme, which was reminiscent of Sylvain’s famous presentation to the 1900 Pan-African Conference, Nkrumah evoked the accomplishments and names of the likes of Anthony William Amoo, the acclaimed Nzima philosopher; and Toussaint L’Ouverture the successful African descended warrior of the Haitian battlefield. He gave a summary of the battles against foreign invasion in the Gold Coast and then re-established the key persons and organizations that struggled for West African independence and unity. Finally, he brought the crowd up to date with the movement for independence in the Gold Coast. In closing, he told them the campaign for a United West Africa had begun and that the countries in West Africa should begin to “think in terms of unity and solidarity with one another. It was only by uniting the people that we would be able to hold our own in the world, that we would demand respect from other nations because we would have this force behind us” (1973a, 154–5).

The Pan-African significance of Nkrumah’s Liberian visit was two fold. On one hand it allowed Nkrumah a formal entrée into the club of African state administrators. Nkrumah would come to maximize this membership in the name of Pan-Africanism and the African Revolution. More importantly, Nkrumah became a “trans-national” or “trans-statal” Pan-African advocate. Not only was he a dynamic speaker imbued with a Pan-African historiography, he was also a statesman. Before Nkrumah, this combination had been unknown since the domination of European imperialism.

With CPP members in Nigeria, the state visit to Liberia, and the consolidating of state power in the Gold Coast the tentacles of Pan-African nationalism were being rooted in West Africa. The trips to Europe and the USA were helpful in massaging old contacts and securing new ones. The Pan-African agenda was advancing, as was the CPP’s rise to complete dominance in Ghana.
The Opposition

There were problems in the CPP during this time and opposition forces launched a counter-offensive. The inevitable independence of Ghana was at hand and Nkrumah, during this period, was promoted from Leader of Government Business to Prime Minister. At the same time, Nkrumah was preparing the political contest to be elevated in a more formidable branch of government—the traditional branch. Nkrumah knew that this would be the ultimate consolidation of power in Ghana. It was this experience, more than any other was, which would be a training ground for the challenge of uniting West Africa and finally Africa.

Securing control of the newly formed states required only the mobilization of the vote of the masses. The securing of control of the traditional powers involved the winning over of the chiefs, the people, and the ancestors. Some traditional rulers and earlier activists within the Gold Coast were encouraged by colonial interests to develop an opposition to Nkrumah’s rule. “The National Liberation Movement and the Asanteman Council, headed by the Asantehene, joined to form the opposition” (1973a, 80). They began to resist a united Ghana and offered a federated system as a way to avoid the direct central authority of a union government. Nkrumah’s forces vigorously fought this proposal in a fight that was to have an everlasting impact on Nkrumah’s approach toward African unity.

The arguments given for a federal form of government in Ghana were similar to the arguments that Nkrumah would hear later from other statespersons who became his peers as heads of states. This could be considered a pre-cursor to that later struggle. It provides a rationale to explain Nkrumah’s iron clad resistance to regional unity in Africa after that time.

It was a time in which division was rampant and used as an effective weapon in the hands of conservative forces. Before the 1954 General Elections the CPP was hit with widespread internal violations of election policy and disciplinary measures led to the expulsion of 81 members that individually decided to run against official Party candidates. Smarting from the expulsion, this element supported the formation of an opposition organization known originally as the Northern People’s Party (NPP). The NPP served as a unifier of Nkrumah’s opposition within Ghana. Nkrumah offered recognition to the NPP as an “unofficial Opposition” in that they lacked sufficient support to run an alternate government and they represented only one region—the North. The NPP soon took an antagonistic position toward the government and emerged as the National Liberation Movement (NLM) (1973c, 117). As such, the NLM campaigned for a federal form of government.

The Asantehene joined the effort as did Ashanti persons opposed to a tax policy designed to use Cocoa revenues toward development outside of the regions that cultivated it. In other words, they did not support the distribution of resources outside of their regional areas of procurement. This was a direct
challenge to the primacy of the composite Ghanaian identity. The situation really became heated in Ashanti areas and many CPP members had to flee for safety. There was even an assassination attempt on Nkrumah when a bomb exploded at his house in Accra.

Crucial time was lost countering the internal division first of the CPP and then of the NLM upon the CPR. NLM refused assembly discussions and called for another election with the central issue being the establishment of a federated form of government. These signs of disunity were threatening the momentum for independence. NLM tactics of non-compromise lost them face in the political arena. Since their unity was based in anti-CPP activity or nostalgic privileges their collective work bore small fruit. The general election was a victory for the CPP and its position of central government over regional configurations but the cost was heavy. Reflecting on this battle, Nkrumah would later come to say:

By employing the oppressor’s own methods of parliamentary procedure, and through the tactics of Positive Action, we had been able to exert sufficient pressure on the colonial power to force a negotiated independence. The political, or nationalist revolution had been won, and without the necessity to resort to armed struggle. But the struggle for true freedom in the wider context of the African Revolution and the world socialist revolution was only just beginning. In order to liberate and unify Africa under an All-African Union Government, and to defeat the forces of imperialism and neocolonialism, and construct socialism, it would be necessary in the future to employ all forms of political action, including armed struggle (emphasis mine). (1973c, 120)

The reference to armed struggle was a later revelation for Nkrumah but the question of federation versus union became immediate. So bitter was this earlier battle that Nkrumah would soon abandon proposals for regional groupings in Africa and he began to realize them as obstacles to a union government. The war for unity took place on other levels also.

Nkrumah witnessed the crafty hand of European imperialism as it sought to safeguard its interest during the inevitable demise of classic colonialism. European imperialism did not sit idly by while the Opposition performed acts of terror and lawlessness; it encouraged such activities. It also encouraged irredentism12, which played into the deterioration of fledging states. This is what Nkrumah referred to as balkanization. Not only was it encouraged in states coming into independence (successfully in Nigeria) but also it was employed between states. The object of its employment was the reduction of a people’s agential effectiveness.

In this light Nkrumah appealed for African unity as a solution to the plight of the Ewe of Togoland and the Nzima, which straddled borders of Ghana and Ivory Coast. Both of these populations suffered from the arbitrariness of colonial
wars and boundaries with total disregard for the generations of people that preceded colonial rule.

All of this pushed Nkrumah further and faster ahead as he organized the Party, people and supportive chiefs for Ghana’s political independence. The date, 6 March 1957, would become a watershed mark in the development of Pan-African Nationalism. It was both the official day of Ghana’s independence as well as the official declaration of a Pan-African Liberated Zone—probably the first of its type in centuries on African soil.13

PART 3:
FROM LEADER OF PAN-AFRICAN LIBERATED ZONE TO FOUNDER OF PAN-AFRICAN NATIONALISM 1957–1966

Ghana Becomes Independent and Nkrumah Declares Pan-African Policy

“With the achievement of Independence, the main theme of my speeches changed. I began to concentrate on the long-term objectives; economic freedom for Ghana, and African emancipation and unity” (Nkrumah 1973b, 111). On 14 January 1957, Nkrumah addressed the inaugural ceremony of the All African Regional Conference of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, which was held in Accra. He encouraged the unions present to take a national liberation stance and realize the particular needs of their populations. He advised them against uncritically mimicking the trade unions in America or Europe. This was important advice as the trade unions often set themselves in opposition to their employers, which in America and Europe were private enterprises but in newly liberated zones the employers were often the government. Keenly sensitive to the trade union perspective, Nkrumah told the gathering:

All of you as trade unionists will know the stock suggestion that labour is inefficient because the workers do not work hard enough. It is a charge brought against workers everywhere and I do not believe it is any more true in the Gold Coast than it is elsewhere. Nevertheless the problem of increasing the productivity of labour remains and it is a problem which it is the duty of the trade union movement to assist in solving.

There is no doubt that it is in the field of human rights that trade unionism in individual African territories, and as a world movement, will encounter its greatest challenge. In Africa, the attitudes to labour will have to undergo radical examination and radical changes as well. In the traditional society, there can be no dependence on slave, serf, or forced labour and in the multi-racial societies the gulf that makes it difficult for ordinary human sympathy to be extended to the worker must be bridged.
We intend to encourage in Africa not only the dignity of labour in workers’ movements, but the dignity of man whose needs constitute the ultimate end of all productive enterprise. We intend to demonstrate that a man is entitled to the fruits of his labour. (Nkrumah 1973b, 88)

With this message, Nkrumah intended to remind the trade unions in Africa that they should not separate their interest from the interest of their newly inherited polities. Nkrumah was aware of the distinction between unions functioning in the capitalist metropoles and those in upcoming states. On the eve of independence, Nkrumah wanted to ensure that this crucial group supported the united agency of the liberated zone and not its own sectarian interest at the expense of the struggling total population.

Besides attempting to bring organize labor on board, Nkrumah also found it necessary to stress discipline. This became clear in his address to the National Delegates of the CPP on 24 February 1956 as he prepared them for the upcoming era of independence. Nkrumah was aware of the potential lethargy that would set in if a fighting organization like the CPP could no longer identify its opposition. With independence looming, that scenario was possible. Nkrumah proceeded to explain that the new adversaries were “deceit, debauchery, dishonesty, superstition and greed, want, disease, illiteracy and economic ills besetting our country” (1973c, 90). He reminded them that political independence was to be used to accomplish economic independence, African liberation, and African unity. He wanted Ghana to be an inspiration to the rest of Africa by showing others how to improve the lives of the masses.

On 4 March 1957, Nkrumah hosted a state dinner as part of the Independence ceremonies in which he delivered a presentation that reflected two overlapping Pan-African and Afrocentric themes. The first theme showed Nkrumah’s sense of African renaissance. He told his audience “the Ghana which is being reborn will be, like the Ghana of old, a centre to which all the peoples of Africa may come and where all the cultures of Africa may meet” (Nkrumah 1973c, 96). The other theme central to Pan-African and Afrocentric understandings concerned the reality of existing Africanisms outside of the continent proper. On this Nkrumah informed his audience that “there exists a firm bond of sympathy between us and the Negro peoples of the Americas. The ancestors of so many of them come from this country. Even today in the West Indies, it is possible to hear words and phrases which come from various languages of the Gold Coast” (Nkrumah 1973c, 96). Nkrumah took every occasion to hint at the Pan-African future he had in mind for the Ghanaian liberated zone. He sought to construct the rationale needed to prepare Ghanaians to receive an influx of Africans sharing in these Pan-African aspirations.

In a straightforward manner, Nkrumah informed the Parliament on 5 March 1957 that he intended to assume the Portfolios of Defense and External Affairs immediately upon the achievement of independence. The assumption of these
responsibilities was to enable him to make good on his pledge of making Ghana an instrument of Pan-African agency. Explaining his move, Nkrumah stated:

The Government of Ghana will direct its efforts to promote the interests and advancement of all African peoples in their pursuit of freedom and social progress. The sacrifices made by the people of Ghana in their struggle for independence are only the first stage in the common advancement of their brothers all over Africa. The Government hopes that, as a free, sovereign and independent state, Ghana can become the centre for the discussion of African problems as a whole and that, with the cooperation of all other African territories, we shall be able to foster a common attitude to local problems and world problems which will ensure that problems peculiar to Africa will receive the attention which they have not had for so long. Our aim is to work with others to achieve an African personality in international affairs. (Nkrumah 1973b, 98)

After discussing other issues in the Parliament and reiterating Ghana’s commitment to view all challenges from an ‘African standpoint’ Nkrumah pointed to a number of particular areas that Ghana should address for Africa. Acknowledging the challenge of a multiplicity of languages, he urged the studying of the living languages of Africa so that the African Personality would grow through the development of cross-continental discourse and discussion (1973b, 103). Thereafter Nkrumah declared Ghana’s intention to establish an academic base for the study of all crucial aspects of Africa’s development. He expressed this step as a necessary one for the fortification of African agency.

Likewise, Nkrumah explained the importance of synthesizing issues of traditional land tenure, industry, and commerce with systems that had imposed themselves on Africa since colonialism. In approaching all these issues Nkrumah reminded the Parliament that “here again is a problem to which we should seek an African solution” (1973b, 104). He brought closure to the session by explaining to the assembly that Ghana’s success or failure would have repercussions throughout Africa.

In dramatic style, Nkrumah left the government meeting and joined a crowd of about 100,000 persons at the Polo grounds awaiting the mid-night pronouncement of independence. As the appointed time arrived, Nkrumah addressed the masses in his typical ‘Garveyesk’ style:

At long last the battle has ended! And thus Ghana, your beloved country is free for ever. And here again, I want to take the opportunity to thank the chiefs and people of this country, the youth, the farmers, the women, who have so nobly fought and won this battle. Also I want to thank the valiant ex-servicemen who have so co-operated with me in this mighty task of freeing our country from foreign rule and imperialism!… Today, from now on, there is a new African in the world and that new African is ready to
fight his own battle and show that after all the black man is capable of managing his own affairs. We are going to demonstrate to the world, to the other nations, young as we are, that we are prepared to lay our own foundation.

As I said in the Assembly just a few minutes ago, I made a point that we are going to see that we create our own African personality and identity; it is the only way in which we can show the world that we are the masters of own destiny. (Nkrumah 1973b, 106–7)

At the conclusion of Nkrumah’s speech he invoked the names of Aggrey and Garvey and others who he felt had dreamt of this day. He made note of Garvey’s incomplete efforts, which he said were now being completed. In honor of Garvey’s work Nkrumah initiated the Black Star Shipping Line which raised the Ghanaian flag over its first boat, the s.s. Volta River on 17 December 1957.

The Independence celebration should also be seen as a celebration of the declaration of Ghana as a Pan-African liberated zone. “Fifty-six nations sent delegations: the United States was represented by Richard Nixon, Britain by R.A. Butler (as he then was), Russia by its minister of state farms, Tunisia by Bourguiba himself, and the head of the new state of Ghana, by the Duchess of Kent” (Thompson, W.S., 1969, 28). Britain sent out the invitations to the affair and since they had no diplomatic relations with Egypt at that time, Egypt was not invited.

Padmore and Makonnen attended with the latter remaining until the 1966 coup. Padmore left Ghana for England in May 1957 but returned in September as Nkrumah’s advisor on African Affairs. Also in attendance were Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.; Martin Luther King, Jr.; Ralph Bunche; A. Philip Randolph; Norman Manley from Jamaica; and Mrs. Louis Armstrong (Walters 1993). “Others had been invited, among them Dr. DuBois, but his passport had been confiscated by the anti-communist State Department of John Foster Dulles” (Walters 1993, 97).

As glorious as this year had been it was actually anticipated four years prior. Those who were opposed to Nkrumah set it back by forcing an extra election on the populace (Thompson, W.S., 1969). Nevertheless, the next phase of Pan-African activity was on the horizon and during the independence celebrations Nkrumah reached out to other independent African states to secure a future conference. The states concurred and the machinery was set in place.

Nkrumah wrote to the independent African States six weeks after the celebrations to confirm the upcoming conference. “At the 1957 Commonwealth conference, Nkrumah arranged for the African ambassadors in London to lay the groundwork for the gathering” (Thompson, W.S. 1969, 32). Nkrumah sent two missions to Cairo to consult with the Egyptian government. The first mission was in the person Mr. Ako Adjei in August 1957. In early 1958, Padmore accompanied Adjei to each of the other independent African states to consolidate the conference.
In 1958, Nkrumah played a leadership role in inaugurating three trajectories of Pan-African agency: the Conference of Independent African States (CIAS), the All-African People’s Conference (A-APC), and the Ghana-Guinea Union (G-GU). Any Pan-African historiography worth its metal will recognize the significance of this year.

In March 1958 Ghana held its first Independence Anniversary celebration and nationalists from not-yet-liberated territories were present. The nationalists heard of Nkrumah and Padmore’s plans to host a great Pan-African conference of political parties that would occur later in the year. Some of those present included Nyerere, Mboya, Azikiwe, Murumbi, Apithy, Garba-Jahumpa, and Bakary Djibo. The areas that they represented were known as, or would come to be known as, Taganyika (later Tanzania), Kenya, Nigeria, Dahomey, Gambia and Niger. This conference was to be preceded by another that involved already independent African states. Some of these ‘nationalists’ stayed in Ghana after the anniversary celebrations so that they might observe the conference of independent states.

The conference was one of Ghana’s first major expenses in support of Pan-African nationalism. Explaining the importance of the upcoming conference Nkrumah broadcast a message to the Ghanaian public. A portion of this broadcast is as follows:

For the first time, I think, in the history of this great continent, leaders of all the purely African states which can play an independent role in international affairs will meet to discuss the problems of our countries and take the first steps towards working out an African contribution to international peace and goodwill. For too long in our history, Africa has spoken through the voices of others. Now, what I have called an African Personality in international affairs will have a chance of making its proper impact and will let the world know it through the voices of Africa’s own sons. (Nkrumah 1973b, 125)

Nkrumah went on to explain that the conference was to allow the exchange of views on issues of common concern and would specifically look at political, economic, social, and cultural matters. He lamented the fact that the conference was restricted to the independent states and then hinted about a future gathering in which voices from dependent territories would be heard.

Nkrumah assembled the heads of independent African states and formed them into a configuration known as the Conference of Independent African States (CIAS). The organization of the meeting had taken careful and thorough diplomacy. The conference began on 15 April 1957 and ended on 22 April 1957. Participating states were: Ghana (host), Libya, Ethiopia, Liberia, Morocco, Tunisia, Sudan and the United Arab Republic (Egypt and Syria at that time).
South African government had been invited but said that it would only attend if the colonial governments were invited. At that point it was clear that South Africa was not ‘truly independent’.

Nkrumah was elected to chair the gathering and was generally pleased with the rising interest for African emancipation and unity that resulted from the conference. The meeting initiated direct communication between African states and ushered in an unprecedented era in cross-continental African agency. The basis for an ‘African Group’ at the United Nations was also established. While not all issues were resolved at this first session many were raised and this was a very positive start in Nkrumah’s view. Ghana became known throughout the world, as a leading base for unified African action.

Nkrumah used the new Broadcasting House of Radio Ghana to propagate the proceedings and the successes of the conference. Every accomplishment was to have a propaganda value in elevating the consciousness of the masses to what was possible through Pan-African agency.

**Nkrumah’s Trip Abroad**

Nkrumah took a 15-person entourage, including Padmore, on a follow-up tour to each of the seven states that attended the conference. This gave Nkrumah the opportunity to meet with those heads of states that had not attended the conference personally and to see how these older states were developing their societies. Most impressive to Nkrumah was his Egypt stop. The modern developments and the ancient wonders of Africa caused the Egyptian leg of this tour to be the longest. The entire tour lasted from 29 May 1958 to 28 June 1958.

On 5 July 1958 Nkrumah broadcasts the results of the tour to the Ghanaian masses and everyone else that could receive the signal. Approximately two weeks later Nkrumah was in North America making diplomatic connections first in Canada and on his way to the USA at the invitation of Eisenhower, which Nixon had delivered when he attended Ghana’s Independence ceremony.

This tour provided him another opportunity to popularize the distinctive ‘African personality’ that surfaced at the First CIAS. At a presentation made to the Council on Foreign Affairs he explained three factors, which he said, was common to all emergent African states. “The first is our desire to see Africa free and independent. The second is our determination to pursue foreign policies based upon non-alignment. The third is our urgent need for economic development” (Nkrumah 1973b, 142).

In Harlem Nkrumah received a welcome that was reminiscent of the Garvey days.

A typical newspaper headline describing his wildly enthusiastic reception by Black Americans said, “Harlem Hails Ghanaian Leader as Returning Hero.” On July 27, his twenty-five-car motorcade was met by ten thousand cheering people on Seventh Avenue in Harlem and as the parade reached
the Armory at 143rd St. and Fifth Avenue there were a reported 7,500 “cheering persons packed inside.” Once inside, Nkrumah emphasized that Africans and African Americans were held together by “bonds of blood and kinship” and appealed to doctors and lawyers and engineers to come and help us build our country.” [article quotes from *New York Times*, July 28, 1958, p. 1] (Walters 1993, 98)

A similar reception awaited Nkrumah in Chicago. He aroused the spirit of African descendants residing in the USA and some viewed Nkrumah as a symbol of what was possible in Africa and of Africans. His decade living in the USA and experiencing racism there increased his attraction among those African descendants that welcomed him. When Nkrumah, clearly a native born African, said that all Africans were related he gave a significant boost to the concept of African identity to Pan-Africanist living in the USA. His call for Africans to return to the motherland to help build it was met with encouraging results.15

Nkrumah had other goals for his trip abroad but his goal of expressing the distinctive African Personality in global affairs was advanced in his trip to Canada and the USA. His tour ended on 1 August 1958 and he returned to Ghana. It was necessary that Nkrumah keep his base machinery informed on the developments being undertaken in its name. He delivered a presentation to the Ghanaian National Assembly on 3 September 1958 recapping all that had been done in foreign policy since Ghana’s Independence Day in 1957. Besides the recap, Nkrumah sought to develop the concept of ‘Positive Neutrality’, which spoke to the need of African states to avoid the antagonistic relationship between the Nkrumah explained this concept as the underlying rationale behind Ghana’s approach with other international bodies such as the Commonwealth. In this session he explained Ghana’s continued commitment to the liberation of all of Africa as the purpose for its sponsorship of the upcoming All-African People’s Conference to be held in December. What was to happen in November, however, was not discussed.

**Ghana-Guinea Union (G-GU)**

On 2 October 1958 Guinea, Conakry became independent and by 23 November 1958 the Ghana-Guinea Union was declared. Nkrumah considered this “a first step toward the political unification of Africa” (1973c, 135). The two states were coming together to form a nucleus for a Union of African States (UAS). The two states arranged for an exchange of resident ministers whose task it was “to provide the practical day to day cooperation between the two countries” (Nkrumah 1973c, 135). The assignment of resident ministers of this type was unprecedented in the history of political practice (Nkrumah 1973b, 198). Nkrumah had hoped that all other African states would join this union, though it was not to be so as would be seen by the Liberian maneuver of 1959.
The All-African People’s Conference (AAPC)

Following the launch of the UAS came the influential inauguration of the All-African People’s Conference. This conference was probably the most endearing Pan-African activity of the year to Nkrumah. His succinct reflection best states its intent.

By the end of 1958 there were clear indications that foreign powers, far from withdrawing from Africa, were in fact increasing their exploitation of the continent. In many of the so-called independent states, neocolonialism replaced the old-style colonialism; while in the States still under colonial rule, or suffering government by racist minorities, imperialist aggression took the form of increased repression. The process could not be seriously challenged until collective imperialism was confronted with unified African effort in political, economic and military spheres.

In 1958, there were already in existence throughout Africa well developed trade union and co-operative movements, and also progressive movements of youth, women and others concerned with the freedom struggle. Delegates from 62 nationalist organizations attended the All-African People’s Conference in Accra in December 1958.

The primary aim of the Conference was to encourage nationalist political movements in colonial areas as a means towards continental unity and a socialist transformation of society. In my address inaugurating the Conference I spoke of the four main stages of Pan-Africanism:

(i) national independence  
(ii) national consolidation  
(iii) transnational unity and community  
(iv) economic and social reconstruction on the principles of scientific socialism

After long discussion during which political and trade union leaders from all over Africa expressed their views and shared their experiences, it was agreed to:

(i) work actively for a final assault on colonialism and imperialism  
(ii) use non-violent means to achieve political freedom, but to be prepared to resist violence if the colonial forces resorted to force  
(iii) set up a Permanent Secretariat to co-ordinate the efforts of all nationalist movements in Africa for the achievement of freedom  
(iv) condemn racialism and tribalism wherever they exist and work for their eradication, and in particular to condemn the apartheid policy of the South African government  
(v) work for the ultimate achievement of a Union or Commonwealth of African States
While in 1958 some progressive leaders of Africa still hoped to achieve their aims by non-violent methods, it has since become generally accepted that all methods of struggle, including armed struggle, must be employed in the face of the increasingly violent and aggressive onslaught of imperialist and neocolonialist forces and their indigenous agents. (Nkrumah 1973c, 130–31)

This meeting etched Ghana and Nkrumah into the history of African Liberation and the history of African Unity. The preparatory committee was comprised of representatives from Ghana, Egypt, Morocco, Nigeria and Somaliland (Esedebe 1982). Padmore, Nkrumah’s advisor on African Affairs and long time comrade, was the Secretary-General of the preparatory committee. Padmore also became the Secretary-General of the permanent secretariat that resulted from the conference. Ghana contributed close to £30,000 toward the effort. Nkrumah attended the conference as the head of the CPP rather than the head of a state. His style, charisma, and intense commitment to the conference endeared many of the liberators to him. He would be remembered for such devotion and assistance by them (Thompson, W.S. 1969).

Many future-leading organizations utilized the meeting to share information and seek concrete aid from the independent states through the machinery provided by the Ghanaian ‘liberated zone.’ Besides some of the personalities mentioned above, other important participants from outside of Ghana that participated in this conference included Frantz Fanon and four other comrades from Algeria; Patrice Lumumba from the Congo; Felix Moumie from Cameroon; Ntau Mkhehle from Basutoland; Roberto Holden from Angola; Tom Mboya and Peter Mbiyu Koinage from Kenya; Julius Nyerere from Tanganyika; Kenneth Kaunda from Northern Rhodesia (later Zambia); Joshua Nkomo from Southern Rhodesia (later Zimbabwe); Kamuzu Banda from Nyasaland; and John Kale from Uganda. Notable participants from outside of Africa included Lincoln University’s first African descended president Horace Bond and journalist Dr. Marguerite Cartwright, also an African descendent residing in the USA. Shirley Graham DuBois read a historic message from her husband, W.E.B. DuBois, at the conference in which he advised all present to put their African identity and unity above their local and parochial identities.

Nkrumah, who opened and closed the conference with inspirational presentations, made mention of the Africans outside of Africa and their contribution to advancement of Africans in general. Below is an excerpt from Nkrumah’s 13 December 1958 closing presentation:

Fellow Fighters for African Freedom, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am happy to be here this morning to say farewell to you and to congratulate you on the way you have shaped up to the heavy responsibilities set by the Conference Agenda.
I am delighted to see so many people of African descent from abroad attending this Conference. Although, as I said in my opening speech this is primarily an All African People’s Conference, it has warmed us to see here so many of our brothers from across the seas.

We take their presence here as a manifestation of their keen interest in our struggles for [a] Free Africa. We must never forget that they are part of us. These sons and daughters of Africa were taken away from our shores and despite all the centuries which have separated us, they have not forgotten their ancestral links.

Many of them have made no small contribution to the cause of African freedom. Names which spring immediately to mind in this connection are those of MARCUS GARVEY and W.E.B. DuBois. Long before many of us were even conscious of our own degradation, these men fought for African national and racial equality. (Meyer 1990, 67)

This conference shared a similarity with the conference held in Manchester 13 years prior. Both conferences merged the efforts of the nationalists and trade unionists. John Tettegah of Ghana, Abdulaye Diallo of Guinea Conakry, and Tom Mboya of Kenya were all present and playing significant roles at the Conference. Tettegah, a joint-secretary of the proceedings, was the head of Ghana’s Trade Union Congress and previously a leader of AFRO, the regional trade union organization affiliated with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU). Tettegah was also the vice-president of the National African Socialist Student’s Organization (NASSO). Diallo, soon to become the Secretary-General of the A-APC permanent secretariat, had been a long time trade unionist affiliated with the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU). Finally, Mboya, appointed chair of the proceedings by Nkrumah, was the Secretary-General of the Kenya Federation of Labour (KFL).

Both Nkrumah and Padmore advocated and labored in the past for linking organized labor with liberators. Nkrumah connected these agents in an effort to ensure a socialist synthesis within the Pan-African nationalist movement. For Nkrumah, the Pan-African aspect of this agency reflected the distinct African Personality and that called for exclusive African allegiances that would cause Mboya to later rebel and opt out.

Overall, 1958 was the year that Nkrumah’s Ghana made most of the first moves to fortify the African Personality, establish the African Community, and reduce the stronghold of classic European imperialism in Africa. The organization of independent African states was initiated on two levels, alliance and union. Africans outside Africa could point to the amazing possibilities of independent African agency and the strength of its unified voice. In addition, in this year African freedom fighters received much needed support from their already successful comrades. The year 1959 brought about a number of challenges to these initial steps.
Inauguration of the All-African Trade Union Federation

The Pan-African activity that took place in Ghana in 1958 rippled throughout the African continent in 1959. New momentum had been given to the African Liberation Movement (ALM). Uprisings broke out in Central and Southern Africa. It was also a year in which difficult times became magnified. During 1959 President Tubman of Liberia sought to slow down the development of the UAS; treachery in the CPP threatened to undermine Nkrumah’s base; and Padmore passed on to the ancestors. There were, however, clearer indications of the way forward for African liberation and unity.

The trade union movement provided an important avenue to a section of the African populace that shared a common interest and potential. Wallerstein (1967) described this force as an avant-garde with its own distinct characteristics.

The group that has had relatively the most solid claim to persistently avant-garde positions is the African trade-union movement. There are several reasons for this, rooted in the social structures of contemporary Africa. First of all, national trade-union leaders have also very often been second-level political leaders. It is important to understand what this has meant. In almost every case, they have been active participants in the political process, with ties to the nationalist parties, and they viewed their trade-union activities as part of their larger political commitment. As trade-unionists, however, they have not been the top political leaders, although trade-union leadership has often been a channel for political ascent. Yet once such men as Sékou Touré, Djibo Bakary, Rashidi Kawawa, and Tom Mboya became full-time political office holders, they ceased to be in any meaningful sense trade-union leaders. (177)

Trade unions in Africa were originally used by the 'right wing' trade unions in the colonial metropoles to strengthen the position of metropolitan workers in their relationship with employers who otherwise might farm out work to the semi-skilled and skilled colonial subjects. The 'left wing' trade unions in the colonial metropoles saw the opportunity to boost their membership roles through attaching the colonized labor forces as appendage or affiliates. This then provided a double-edge sword for African nationalists. On one hand trade union associations, which often crossed tribal and colonial boundaries, provided a politically educated segment of African agents with a broader and deeper understanding of financial exploitation. Thus, they would be more prone to understand socialism as an option for economic development. On the other hand, the relatively privileged position of the African trade unionist might give rise to self-seeking behavior that would sabotage the Pan-African and nationalist efforts. The challenge of this dichotomy presented itself to Nkrumah who resolved that a proper prioritization of agential control was required. As he did in 1957,
Nkrumah explained that the highest role of the trade unions was to serve the nationalist movements.

Inspired and guided by the ideals and goals of the All-African People's Conference at its historical inauguration in 1958, the first Pan-African Trade union nucleus was created by the formation of the General Union of Workers of Black Africa in January, 1959…

From the beginning in 1959, the Ghana Trades Union Congress began to play a dual international role. The first was to continue the promotion of international co-operation on the levels of co-ordination and exchange. The second was to acknowledge its obligation to Pan-African Trade Unionism and to intensify co-ordination of the various nuclei established by Trade Union Organizations in Africa in order to achieve continental unity.

(Tettegah 1962, 127)

The above excerpt of Tettegah’s report to the G-TUC’s First Biennial Congress explains the genesis of an important organization in Nkrumah’s Pan-African agential hierarchy. The organization that Tettegah refers to as the General Union of Workers of Black Africa was formally called Union Générale des Travailleurs d’Afrique Noire (UGTAN) and its Secretary-General was Sékou Touré. Tettegah became the Vice-President of UGTAN at its meeting in the city of Conakry of the newly independent Guinea. The mission of this union was completely in line with the Ghana-Guinea Union and the dominant spirit of the A-APC.

While Nkrumah saw the worker as a key agent in the advancement of Pan-Africanism he knew that the worker’s self-identification determined his or her patriotism. Connections with international trade union confederations based in Europe, therefore, would not ensure the African workers loyalty to the advancement and development of the African populace. This was especially true since history had shown that the European worker was keen to the interests of Europe. Nkrumah’s years abroad and more particularly the colonial policies of the Labour Party while he was in England made these facts clear to him. Again, the issue of delinking became an important one.

The Ghana TUC was still a member of the ICFTU by mid-1959 but had stopped cooperating with it. By December of 1959 formal disaffiliation had been declared. Nkrumah influenced this decision when he spoke before the Steering Committee of the A-APC on 6 October 1959 and advised the gathering, “we must guard against any attempt by foreign powers to use African soil for their own political and economic advantage. In short, we must be vigilant in safeguarding our independence” (Nkrumah 1973b, 186). At another meeting he stressed that the Steering Committee call for a regrouping of all the trade union movements in Africa.

In the past, African trade unions had been grouped in either the World Federation of Trade Unions, or in the International Confederation of Free
Trade Unions. It seemed to me that the new African outlook, evident in the conception of an African personality within an African community, merited the foundation of an All-African Trade Union Federation. Such a federation would be independent of any other organisation, and dedicated to the movement for the total emancipation of Africa. (Nkrumah 1973b, 187)

From 4–9 November 1959 the Ghana TUC hosted a Preparatory Conference in Accra, which decided to convene a constituent congress of the All-African Trade Union Federation (A-ATUF) in mid-May 1960 in Casablanca (Wallerstein 1967). For some, this was a bold stand and not all were in agreement with its need as Tettegah discovered when he approached Mboya on the idea. Mboya sought the assistance of British labor in his battle in Kenya. Similar feelings existed with some of the unions in Nigeria. This refusal to delink was characteristic of a neo-colonial mindset and not incidental to style.

The Sanniquellie Agreement

At the agential level of states there was also some divergence in 1959. On 23 April Nkrumah initiated three weeks of touring Guinea in an effort to consolidate the Union between Ghana and Guinea. Nkrumah and Touré conferred on how to bring others into the fold of a Union of Independent African States. Both were then invited by Tubman to confer in Sanniquellie, Liberia in July on the question of African liberation and unity.

Tubman’s recommendations, at first, were not much different than the resolutions passed at the earlier First CIAS. Nkrumah saw the proposals as a positive first step but not a sufficient solution to address Africa’s exigencies. After tough negotiations some success was claimed. However, different visions on the unity of states and methods to arrive at it were apparent. Nkrumah assessed the meeting in the following passage:

At the end our talks we issued a Declaration of Principles explaining the nature of the organization we agreed to form which was to be know as the Community of Independent African States. The community was not a political union of states, but an economic, cultural and social organization designed to promote African unity by building up a ‘free and prosperous African Community for the benefit of its peoples and the peoples of the world, and in the interest of international peace and security’. However, item 6 clause (c) of the Declaration stated that a main objective of the Community was to help accelerate the liberation of African states still subjected to ‘domination’.

We agreed to submit the Declaration to a conference of independent states and states which had fixed dates for their independence. The
conference would discuss and work out a charter which would achieve the ultimate goal of unity between independent African states.

The conference opened in Addis Ababa on the 14th of June 1960. Members confirmed the decisions of the Accra Conference of Independent African States, and adopted resolutions calling for greater co-operation between the states in the assistance being given to the liberation movement.

But already it was becoming very clear that there were wide differences in the policies of the various independent states on the methods to be adopted in order to achieve the ultimate objective of a totally liberated and unified Africa. Some advocated a gradualist approach, emphasising economic co-operation and regional and sub-regional organizations as a prelude to political association. The more progressive states, however, argued that imperialist and neocolonialist aggression made speedier progress essential, and that African unification based on an All-African Union Government was the only possible framework within which the fullest development of Africa could be achieved. (Nkrumah 1973c, 135–36)

Careful scrutiny of this above passage shows that while Nkrumah hailed the Sanniquellie Declaration as a success on his return to Ghana, in his October presentation to the A-APC’s secretariat and in his text, I Speak of Freedom; he knew that the agreement fell far short of his preference for political union. Liberia became an opponent to Nkrumah’s plans of optional Pan-African agency through continental union government. Any and all capitulation on the part of Tubman was probably reflective of Nkrumah’s influence and popularity among the Liberian population (Thompson, W.S. 1969).

Over the next few years debates between the states began to heat up. Nkrumah’s popularity threatened to circumvent statesmen in disagreement with his approach. Nkrumah had the ability to reach their populations directly either through the numerous publications sponsored by his African Affairs Bureau, radio broadcasts from Ghana, or his academic and training institutes that sought to prepare cadre for the African Revolution. These organs of agency gave Nkrumah’s opponents the feeling that he was everywhere at once. Nkrumah, however, knew that this was not possible even if desirable. Nkrumah was well aware that his policies throughout Africa required a constant upgrading of the African Revolution within Ghana.

With that in mind Nkrumah began to reform Ghana by radically transforming its key agencies. The populace and its leading organizations had to be made aware of the successes attained and the struggle ahead for the African Revolution. First to be retooled and refitted was the leading organization, the CPP. It had been an adequate instrument to bring about the political kingdom but had to be qualitatively upgraded to handle the economic revolution that was to follow according to the Nkrumah formula.
In 1959 and 1960, Nkrumah launched a series of reforms, which he laid out in two presentations to the CPP. The first presentation took place on 12 June 1959, the CPP’s tenth anniversary and the second was on 8 January 1960, the tenth anniversary of the Positive Action campaign.

Nkrumah recapped the success that had been made toward the liberation of Ghana since the imposition of British rule in the first speech. “Our many sacrifices were rewarded. We were now the masters of the citadel” (Nkrumah 1973b, 162). He informed the Party members that they should be proud that they did more to improve the lives of the total population in a decade than Britain had done in a century. Now, he informed them, the challenge was to successfully execute the upcoming Seven Year Development Plan that would usher in the economic revolution. This plan was designed to alleviate poverty and provide modern amenities to the general population by establishing economic independence. From these praises and plans, Nkrumah set out the challenges that remained.

As a mass organization, the CPP had become quite heterogeneous which was acceptable only if its interests were homogenous. Nkrumah warned the Party that class enemies were operating within. These enemies were referred to as “petit bourgeois elements” that were “unsympathetic and sometimes even hostile to the social aims to which the Party is dedicated” (Nkrumah 1973b, 163). These forces were seen as inimical to the “welfare state based upon African socialist principles” that Nkrumah was advocating (Nkrumah 1973b, 163). For Nkrumah these African socialist principles stood for the elimination of all exploitation and the assertion of universal suffrage.

On one hand the Party was to be expanded into every village while on the other hand ‘reactionary tendencies’ were to be expurgated. The organizational principle of Democratic Centralism was to be applied to allow for a dialectical
relationship between free expression, open discussion, and loyally executed decisions. Discipline became the watchword as Nkrumah explained that the Central Committee of the Party wanted to tighten the organization’s operation. They intended to “tighten up on all echelons of the Party, from the Central Committee down to the humblest Branch” (Nkrumah 1973b, 164).

‘Vanguard Activists’ were to be drawn from the most politically educated sections of the party and trained in special CPP courses. They were then to integrate themselves among the masses. Nkrumah explained that it was the common person and the masses that made all things possible. “We must never lose this contact, but rather we must constantly deepen and strengthen it. For if we turn away from the mass of workers and farmers, we shall lose the support which has enabled us to reach the heights we have attained” (Nkrumah 1973b, 165). He then became pointed in his critique of the Party leaders and warned them against arrogance and opportunism.

The Convention People’s Party is, above all, a dynamic Party with a clear-cut social goal and political ideology to guide it. We aim at creating in Ghana a socialist society in which each will give according to his ability and receive according to his needs. We are not therefore, a mutual admiration society of frustrated and disgruntled intellectuals out to destroy what we cannot build. We can only attain our aims by discipline and hard work and study.

All of us need to go back to the Party school from time to time to relearn some of the things we may have forgotten in the hustle and bustle of our daily routine. (Nkrumah 1973b, 165)

Nkrumah mandated all leaders to attend Party political education seminars and then addressed other sacrifices that would be required in executing Ghana’s development plan. An alliance between the CPP, the Ghana Trade Union Council (G-TUC), and the Ghana Farmer’s Council was announced. To show good faith to the farmers, who had been suffering under collapsing cocoa prices, the Central Committee of the CPP decided that a significant section of leadership within the Party would reduce their salaries by 10 percent.

Nkrumah reminded the Party and listening public that Ghana was now working for itself and not the colonial powers. Its approach, therefore, would have to be fundamentally different in the area of production. Growth of industry was important and all the technical and administrative talent that could be summoned was necessary—from wherever it came. Ideally those trained in Ghana’s institutions of higher learning would provide it. On that note, however, Nkrumah had this to say:

It pains me to have to say that these institutions are not pulling their weight. The returns which we are getting for the money poured into these institutions is most discouraging. I have already aired my criticisms on
another occasion about the Kumasi College of Technology. Let me here look at the University College. Over 90% of the student body is being maintained by Government scholarships. It costs us more to produce a graduate at Legon than in many other Universities abroad. We have provided with unparalleled lavishness all the facilities necessary. It is a common opinion that our students are ‘feather-bedded’. And what is the result? With few exceptions University College is a breeding ground for unpatriotic and anti-Government elements.

But the students are not alone to be blamed. The staff bears a heavy responsibility for the anti-Government atmosphere which prevails. We are not fools. We know all that is happening and we can pinpoint those elements, both native and foreign, around which this unhealthy state of affairs revolves. (Nkrumah 1973b, 166–67)

Nkrumah warned these institutions that the Government would not continue to fund anti-government activity and that academic freedom did not mean irresponsibility nor could it protect the guilty from prosecution. Reforms were to come either from within the institutions or from without but they would come!!

Nkrumah then addressed the African Personality in international affairs by reiterating Ghana’s independence in relation to Africa’s liberation. He explained that commitment to the latter goal would bring Ghana into closer relations with other states in Africa. He also took this as an opportunity to assault tribal chauvinism in an effort to prevent disintegration. He told his audience, “We are all Africans and people of African descent, and we shall not allow the imperialist plotters and intriguers [sic] to separate us from each other for their own advantage” (Nkrumah 1973b, 168).

On 16 December 1959 Nkrumah addressed the Ghanaian National Assembly in which he informed them of Ghana’s intent to pursue the policy of ‘non-alignment’ in an effort to promote peace and security among the world’s nations. He also took the opportunity to recall Ghana’s leading role in the CIAS, the A-APC, and the Sanniquellie Conference. “My Government will continue to pursue this policy of independence and unity of Africa with all the vigour and resources at our command. We believe that until the whole of Africa is free, independent and united, there will be no lasting peace in the world” (Nkrumah 1973b, 197).

Then, in the defense of Africa, Nkrumah condemned proposed French atomic test in the Sahara and while on the subject he addressed the accusation of Ghana as a center of anti-colonial activity and agitation:

On our part, I wish to say that this accusation is perhaps the greatest tribute that the enemies of African freedom could pay to Ghana. If, indeed, the attainment of independence by Ghana, or the attendance at conferences in Ghana by youths from other parts of Africa has provided the spark of inspiration for nationalist action in the several African territories, then this
is a situation of which we can justly be proud…. Ghana has no apologies to render to anybody; nor have we any excuses to make…

We call upon the world to witness and to take note that there is a new Africa dedicated to the task of complete emancipation. Her sons and daughters will not rest until the last vestiges of domination and discrimination and colonialism in any form have been obliterated for ever from her soil. Africa is on the march. There is no turning back. (Nkrumah 1973b, 198–99)

**Tenth Anniversary of the Positive Action Campaign**

By the beginning of 1960, Nkrumah fine-tuned his plans for the new offensive in his presentation to the CPP celebrating the decade since the launching of the Positive Action Campaign. He began to clarify the new form of the problem facing African agency: neocolonialism. Nkrumah informed the audience that between economic imperialism and political imperialism there was no difference. “Any independence which makes the territory still economically dependent on the colonial power is not real” (Nkrumah 1997a, 6). During this presentation, Nkrumah advocated three formulas:

1. Political independence is meaningless without economic independence
2. Persons of color would enjoy liberty only after the death of colonialism and imperialism
3. “What must unite the continent of Africa is an ideology—our common Africanism” (1997a, 10).

A number of internal structural measures were mentioned to prepare Ghana for its prosecution of the economic and industrial revolution. Party members were again inspired to keep all divisions and personal differences in check. Nkrumah also wanted the Party to inspire the youth with a sense of service and a sense of adventure. “We must learn to love and serve Ghana and Africa. We must be imbued with a deep sense of patriotism for our country and inspired by an equally deep sense of mission to work for Africa’s emancipation” (Nkrumah 1997a, 10). In line with this last statement the announcement was made that the Central Committee had decided to initiate still another conference.

At this next conference, unlike the ones that preceded it, only African political parties that were committed and involved in the fight for African freedom were to participate. Nkrumah wanted the invitees to forge an ideology that would strengthen the African liberation and unity movements. He hoped to encourage a purposeful oneness that would mould the participating parties into a steeled force with the ability to end colonialism and bring about a “Union of African States” (Nkrumah 1997a, 11).

Nkrumah wanted to ensure that newly liberated countries were committed to African unity from the outset of their independence. He thought that this could
only happen if in their preparation for liberation this message was included. He had already experienced the hesitancy toward complete unity in his relations with the independent states. He was also aware of the divisions that existed in various liberation movements. Nkrumah rightly assessed that these divisions might reverse the forward motion of African liberation and unity. The Freedom Fighters Conference, therefore, was designed to unify the combatants before and after the struggle for independence.

Prior to the execution of the Freedom Fighters Conference a number of other conferences, which were previously launched in Ghana, were to continue until they evolved into other formations. These included the Second A-ACP, which was held in Tunis during January 1960 and a third meeting in Cairo from 25–31 March 1961. The CIAS, which had also been initiated in Ghana, held its second meeting in Addis Ababa in June 1960 and a special session at the ministerial level in Leopoldville from 25–30 August 1960.

The Freedom Fighters Conference

The Freedom Fighter’s Conference took place in a clandestine fashion between the last week of May and the first week of June 1962. According to Tawia Adamafio (1982), there was concern about the likelihood of compromising the plans of the Freedom Fighters by making their meeting a public activity. To prevent that scenario the meeting was held secretly and only the closing ceremony was announced to the press and the public. It was advertised, however, as the opening ceremony. At this ceremony, Nkrumah gave an informative and inspiring presentation, which illuminated a summary of his experience within the African Revolution up to that point in time. Nkrumah’s shift in thought on the inevitability of armed struggle was apparent.

Speaking before freedom fighters that were still not independent, Nkrumah remained the political educator. He reiterated the theme of the enemy being imperialism and colonialism and then proceeded to give a description and history of modern imperialism. He also spoke of potential friends and supporters within the metropoles but stressed the fragility and danger of depending on any forces outside of Africa. He emphasized the need for unity within the ranks of the liberation organizations and within the continent among independent states. Disunity, he explained, was a dangerous weapon, which supported the imperialists. He urged the freedom fighters to avoid polemics while struggling for freedom and reminded them that they were fighting for liberty and not leadership positions. Nkrumah warned them about the subtlety of neo-colonialism and the slyness of enemy agents within their ranks. Finally, Nkrumah warned the participants to not allow the imperial press to define and categorize African reality as they had done with the so-called Casablanca and Monrovia groupings. He said that this type of categorization was just another effort to focus on differences and to foster disunity.
Education was not the only support that Nkrumah gave to these freedom fighters. Adamafio, who was in Nkrumah’s confidence during this era, illuminated this point in the following reflection (1982):

They [the freedom fighters] understood Dr Nkrumah’s call to action and responded in their numbers and Ghana became their Mecca. It is true to say that they found succour and support in our revolutionary stand and we did all we could to give them necessary guidance and help in practical terms. Nationalist leaders from many parts of Africa came to consult Kwame. Many others became refugees and found a home in revolutionary Ghana from where they continued the struggle.

Camps were set up to give the fighters proper training in guerrilla activity and organization and all over Africa fighters knew Ghana as a sanctuary for freedom fighters… He brought together at those conferences, members of freedom fighting organizations and political movements from French, Spanish, Portuguese and British territories including those from the settler areas for the discussion of their peculiar problems. (103)

The Organization of African Unity

Before the formation of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) there were a number of sub-continental groupings. One such grouping, the Pan-African Freedom Movement of East and Central Africa (PAFMECA), was created as an inspirational response to the CIAS meeting in Accra. On 17 September 1958 in Mwanza, Tanzania, it held its first meeting. Regardless of its name, it was essentially an East African organization until 1960 (Wallerstein 1967). It became PAFMECSA by 1962 as it began to include liberation movements in Southern Africa. Eventually the A-ACP was replaced by a Freedom Fighters formation with headquarters in Ghana. Thus, Ghana’s commitment and influence to the liberation movements remained consistent.

The Congo crisis of 1960 and lack of agreement on how to respond to it crystallized the formation of two ‘blocs’ of states. The events surrounding this crisis were covered in detail in Nkrumah’s Challenge of the Congo (1967a). The crisis revealed contradictions within the Ghanaian military that before that point had been contained. Nkrumah explained this in his book, Dark Days in Ghana (1969a):

A Ghanaian army with British officers could have no influence in Africa. In the first place, while British officers were prepared to be loyal to the regime they were serving they were not prepared, as General Alexander, the last British Commander of the Ghanaian army says very frankly in his memoirs, to follow a policy abroad which was contrary to what they conceived to be Britain’s interests. Secondly, even if the British officers had been pure mercenaries, with no allegiance other than to their
paymasters, they would still have been rightly distrusted by other African states. Once therefore the Congo crisis arose, irrespective of any question of internal security, it became necessary to dispense with the British officers. (37–38)

The crisis also revealed the weakness of the loose bonds of unity in place between African states at that time. Throughout the crisis Nkrumah urged a closing of the ranks and militant action. This did not happen and tragedy ensued. The lingering symbol of the tragedy was the brutal murder of the elected Prime Minister, Patrice Lumumba.

Nkrumah had been particularly close to Lumumba, who had been a participant at the A-APC in Accra. The two had signed a secret agreement in Accra dated 8 August 1960 declaring the establishment of a Union of African States. They were to have a “Republican Constitution within a federal framework” (Nkrumah 1967, 31). The agreement, which included Nkrumah’s strategic canons of a common foreign affairs approach, common defense, common currency, and common economic planning and development never took place because of the breakdown of Lumumba’s government and his subsequent assassination.

During the crisis, Ghana, Guinea, Mali, and the UAR (Egypt) had placed troops under the control of the United Nations (UN) within the Congo. Nevertheless, the failure of the UN to protect the legitimate government caused a meeting to be called in Casablanca from 3–7 January 1961. The meeting was attended by King Mohammed V of Morocco (who called for the meeting); Nasser, President of the UAR; Nkrumah, President of Ghana; Touré, President of Guinea; Keita, President of Mali; Abbas, Prime Minister of the Provisional Government of Algeria; Allam, Foreign Minister of Libya; and Perera, Ambassador from Ceylon.

At this meeting, true to his vision of the proper role of African agency, Nkrumah argued vigorously for African troops to remain in the Congo. He felt “that if Ghana withdrew her troops from the Congo, that would constitute a betrayal not only of the Congo but also of the African revolutionary cause” (Nkrumah 1967, 105).

Nkrumah was concerned that the image drawn would show Africa as incapable of resolving its own problems. He lost the debate on this issue but felt that issuance of the Casablanca Charter was a positive outcome of the session. This charter asked other independent states to join in on its declaration, which advocated the creation of four committees: (a) African Political Committee, (b) African Economic Committee, (c) African Cultural committee and (d) a Joint African High command. The charter also called for an African Consultative Committee and a Liaison Office. The Casablanca Powers, as they became known, had two subsequent meetings before the Conference of African Heads of States and Governments.

Two other formations of independent states were formed between 1960 and 1963. One of these formations, composed primarily of territories that had been
previously colonized by the French minus Guinea and Mali plus Nigeria, was called the ‘Brazzaville Group.’ Another formation, which included Ethiopia, Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leon, Somalia, Togo and Tunisia, was formed six months after the Casablanca group held its meeting. This group, which met in Monrovia, became known as the Monrovia group. The Monrovia and Brazzaville groups proposed a more gradual approach toward continental unity and advocated economic unity before political unity (Nkrumah 1973c).

From 22–25 May 1963 in Addis Ababa at the Conference of African Heads of State and Governments, a proposal was ironed out for the formation of the Organization of African Unity. Thirty-one representatives were present and all existing ‘power blocs’ within the continent were accounted for. A preparatory meeting at the level of foreign ministers had been held in the previous week. It was, however, deadlocked as to which of four charter proposals to advance.17

Nkrumah had distributed his proposal to the Emperor of Ethiopia and to other heads of state six months before the meeting. He also published a book, dedicated to George Padmore and “the African Nation that must be” titled, *Africa Must Unite* (1973c). The book and proposal were essentially similar in content and both presented a rationale for the possibility and necessity for an African nation in which the independent states would become interdependent states.

More specifically, the proposal recapped the historical conferences held on the continent since 1958. It then proceeded to outline the need for:

1. a common foreign policy and diplomacy;
2. a common continental planning for economic and industrial development of Africa;
3. a common currency, central bank, and monetary zone; and
4. a common defense system.

*Africa Must Unite* was comprehensive in its explanation of the above measures and provided a deep historical and economic presentation of the facts. In the text Nkrumah showed the logical contradiction of African states that desired to compete with or contest mega-states like the USA, Soviet Union, or China. He also explained how the rational organization, production and distribution of Africa’s wealth could quickly eliminate poverty throughout the continent. He warned, however, that this could only come about once the prerequisite political unity was established. The sense of a composite Pan-African nationalism that Nkrumah projected is captured in the following passage: “To us, Africa with its islands is just one Africa. We reject the idea of any kind of partition. From Tangier or Cairo in the North to Capetown in the South, from Cape Guardafui in the East to Cape Verde Islands in the West, Africa is one and indivisible” (1970b, 217).

Nkrumah lobbied at the meeting with all the resources available to him for a more effective form of unity but he only received the support of Obote from Uganda and Youlou from the Congo (Brazzaville). His historical awareness of
the pitfalls resulting from loose federations and associations was not shared amongst his peer heads of states. None of them had shared his experience within the Pan-African movement nor his training in the core of the greatest imperial center—the USA. Some of them feared Nkrumah’s intentions and suspected that his ulterior motive was to usurp their positions of power.

In the spirit of compromise, Nkrumah endorsed the charter advanced by the OAU though he recognized it as a charter of positive ‘intent’ and not ‘positive action’. The Charter had many high sounding goals, which synthesized practically all of the previous charters from earlier associations of states. The one element missing was the element that made the goals achievable—political organization. The administration of the goals remained loose and lacked the resolve of an organically united body.

By the second OAU summit, which was held in Cairo from 17–21 July 1964, the problems in Africa had become worse.

Serious disputes had broken out between Ethiopia and Somalia; between Morocco and Algeria; and between Somalia and Kenya. There had been army mutinies in Tanzania, Uganda, and Kenya, which were suppressed not with the assistance of troops from a sister African state, but with the help of British troops. Foreign interference in the Congo’s internal affairs was continuing to cause untold misery and suffering to the Congolese people. Mozambique, Angola, Guinea Bissau, Bechuanaland, Basutoland, Swaziland, and other territories in Africa were still suffering under colonialism. (Nkrumah 1973c, 276)

Nkrumah raised these problems on 19 July 1964 in his address to the conference. In addressing past errors Nkrumah stated that unfulfilled declarations of Union had frightened the colonial powers into fortifying their allies but in weakening the liberation movements. He also told those gathered that in a united Africa there would be no reason for the border conflicts that had arisen. Delving deeper into the threat facing the rising nations from the colonial powers, Nkrumah commented:

Now that their technological impetus is such that they need Africa even more as a market for their manufactured goods than as a source of raw materials, our economic backwardness no longer makes sense for them any more than for us. The output of their great industrial complexes is no longer the primitive and simple implements like hoes and shovels. They now need vaster and more prosperous markets for heavy agriculture tractors and electronic machines. They wish to sell to us, not Ford motors propelled by magnetos or turbo-prop transport aircraft, but the latest in supersonic jets and atomic-powered merchant vessels. Which of us, trading separately in these highly developed market areas, can survive more than a year or two...
without remaining either economically backward, indebted, bankrupt or re-colonized? (Nkrumah 1973c, 283)

Nkrumah went on to explain how even imperialist were in a quandary about the disunity of Africa because of the effect that abject poverty would eventually have on the metropolitan areas that sought a stronger purchasing power in its neocolonial areas. These imperialists, warned Nkrumah, would regroup because they only balkanized when they could not colonize. After successful balkanization they would seek to successfully re-colonize. Nkrumah warned the heads of states to not rest on their laurels because of the wave of independence witnessed in recent years.

He then brought up the other problems that presented themselves during the year and assigned the blame to the lack of resolve and the avoidance of substantial unity. Nkrumah then changed the subject to concrete possibilities that would come with political unity. Stressing the benefits of a large population and landmass, he explained how Africa could industrialize through a unified approach and thus, improve its trading position in the global economy.

In a major diplomatic move of compromise, he told participants that they would not have to sacrifice their individual sovereignty to unite around the basic areas that he was suggesting. He also ensured the conference participants that Ghana did not seek to be the headquarters or Secretary-Generalship of the OAU. Nkrumah was a shrewd politician and knew the fears of his peers.

The next OAU summit meeting was held in Accra but was boycotted by Ivory Coast, Upper Volta, Dahomey, Niger and Togo, all of which claimed that Ghana was supporting or organizing subversive activities against them. The OAU summit was nevertheless held after much wrangling and negotiations. A watered down version for an executive structure was offered by Nkrumah and passed by a significant majority at this session however there were not enough votes to enact the proposal. It was to be considered again at the next summit meeting but by that time Nkrumah had been overthrown and tensions increased between the heads of states. Those states, which boycotted the Accra—hosted OAU summit because of Ghana’s alleged support for subversive activities, rushed to recognize the new Ghanaian government that had subverted Nkrumah.

The OAU did not resolve the fundamental question of the primacy of an indivisible “African People” versus “African Peoples.” J. Nyerere, the first president of Tanzania once debated Nkrumah over regional versus continental unity as the base of Pan-Africanism. In his book, Uhuru na umoja, Freedom and socialism, (1968), Nyerere regretted to the error of ossifying state identities at the expense of Pan-African identity in his article titled, “The dilemma of the Pan-Africanist.” As a result, as Nkrumah predicted, the OAU remained as weak as the states that comprised it.

What should be remembered for the sake of this analysis is that Nkrumah consistently, at every OAU meeting he attended, drove home the point that the political unity of Africa in some form of Union or Federation would advance the
development of the continent and alleviate the legacy of poverty characteristic of colonial exploitation.

In summary, Nkrumah attempted to enforce the agency called for at the 1945 Pan-African Congress by establishing a base of operation on the African continent. Once the base was established he sought to develop it into an effective support base from which to liberate and unify the entire continent into one powerful nation. Nkrumah formulated that this achievement would not only improve the lives of the African masses but it would also support world peace by removing a significant portion of the world’s population and land mass from the contest between the warring super powers. In the march toward this goal, Nkrumah introduced two significant phenomena to the Pan-African movement: the African State as a Pan-African agent and the concept of Continental African Union Government.

The next chapter of this book highlights Nkrumah’s efforts to organize certain key sectors to support this quest.
Besides independent states, liberation movements, and trade unions there were other significant agential sectors that Nkrumah was instrumental in organizing and mobilizing. They were African women, youth, educators, farmers and journalists. This chapter addresses the first three segments of this group as Nkrumah made his most thorough impact with them.

Nkrumah’s perspective on the organization of women remained consistent from at least 1942. In that year he had written a letter to a Liberian named Philip Brown in which he expressed an urgency to train the women to become aware of the magnitude of their “responsibility as mothers, wives, workers and inspirers in the movement” (Sherwood 1996, 76). Nkrumah also expressed in that letter the need for complete inclusion of women in all plans (Ibid.). At the level of practical politics, Nkrumah’s belief in the correctness of universal adult suffrage meant that he had to have an effective campaign to appeal to the women electorate of the Gold Coast colony, which as Adamafio noted (1982), vastly outnumbered the men.

In terms of strategic socio-economic positions the majority of women fell into two categories: petty traders and farmers. Nkrumah’s mother, in fact, came from this former group, which played a significant role in the battle to empower the CPP. Nkrumah, however, also recognized the importance of organizing the farmers, both women and men, to feed the nation on one hand and to democratize the economy on the other.

Nkrumah wanted his government of Ghana to be judged by its ability to improve the wellness and appreciation of freedom of the populace. To achieve this, Nkrumah felt that it was necessary to diversify the agricultural production of the country as well as to increase the productivity of agricultural pursuits. Mechanization and technical training for the farmers, especially the youth in rural areas, was to be combined with cooperative structuring to achieve these goals (Dadson 1993). It was hoped that through education, rural youth would become better-qualified farmers and this would result in a higher yield in agriculture.

Nkrumah’s concern, however, was not restricted to education for technical production. In fact, he was mostly concerned with education’s ability to rejuvenate the populace’s awareness of African accomplishments. In this regard he presented at a number of conferences concerning African Studies in particular
and Higher Education in general. He also seized control of the institutions of higher learning within Ghana. His message to the administrations of these institutions was informative and is reviewed in part below.

Nkrumah’s direct involvement with educational institutions was rooted in his desire to develop a youth that was dedicated to the path of Pan-African nationalism. His success with youth and youth organizations can be traced back to his days as a student and his teaching days before leaving the Gold Coast colony. While in the United States and later in Europe, it was clear that he would retain a leadership role within the intelligentsia. Like Aggrey before him, he was aware of the revolutionary potential of the youth and he acted upon his awareness.

More than likely he and Botsio had planned early on to pull the youth under their wing as they moved to organize Ghana’s independence. Both of them had worked in WASU and in WANS and returned to Africa together. Botsio returned to become the Vice-Principal of Akim Abuakwa State College while Nkrumah assumed the position of General-Secretary of the UGCC. By 1949 Botsio was the Secretary of the Committee of Youth Organizations (CYO) (Apter 1972). Batsa (1985), a youth at the time testified to Nkrumah’s popularity with the militant youth.

This chapter reviews Nkrumah’s interaction with the organization of African women and youth. It will conclude with a summary review of Nkrumah’s impact on, and directives to, that machinery primarily responsible for the production of new African men and women—the key educational institutions and educators.

ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN WOMEN FOR PAN-AFRICAN AGENCY

Much of the success of the Convention People’s Party has been due to the efforts of women members. From the very beginning women have been the chief field organisers. They have travelled through innumerable towns and villages in the role of propaganda secretaries and have been responsible for the most part in bringing about the solidarity and cohesion of the Party.

So fervent were these women, in fact, that while I was in gaol and the party organisation was at its most critical period, I learned at a rally in Kumasi a woman party member who adopted the name of Ama Nkrumah (‘Ama’ being the female equivalent of ‘Kwame’) got up on the platform and ended a fiery speech by getting hold of a blade and slashing her face. Then smearing the blood over her body, she challenged the men present to do likewise in order to show that no sacrifice was too great in their united struggle for freedom and independence. (Nkrumah 1973a, 89–90)
The organization and unification of African women was paramount in Nkrumah’s execution of the African Revolution. Women, as illustrated in Nkrumah’s statement above, were literally the backbone responsible for the CPP’s rise to power. It is somewhat symbolic that during the March 1948 police roundup of UGCC leadership Nkrumah “laid low for a while in the house of two women supporters and spent the time planning the development of the Conventions People’s Party” (Nkrumah 1973b, 7).

Once the CPP arrived on the scene it sought to enfranchise the most oppressed in Ghanaian society and that sector, according to Nkrumah, was the African women. This was not a whimsical statement for the women in Ghana and in some other parts of Africa occupied that segment of society that was responsible the terminal end of trade and distribution. In other words they were at the bottom of the distribution chain as petty traders. Many of these women were also cultivators of small farms. While male/female complimentarily was already on the decline when colonialism arrived (Manuh 1993) the system reduced it more so by manipulating traditional institutions.

Within traditional Ghanaian societies, women formed associations and groups for social, ritual and military purposes. Some of these groups were age-graded and initiated young women into puberty and adult life…. Aidoo also makes mention of female wings among the patrilineal Asafo groups of the coastal Akan. These were the Adsewa or Adenkum bands which provided support to the Asafo companies in war. There were also female captains and the Asafo nkyeremmaa, a type of rear-guard, who performed support service in war. With colonial rule, some of these female military associations particularly among the Fante, were co-opted for military services and acted as carriers. Similarly, the participation of women in communal labor societies was transformed into forced labor, and in Northern societies, a position of Magazia, an organizer of women, was created to organize women for forced communal labor. (Manuh 1993, 103)

Cultural values imposed by the intruding European institutions also played their part in devaluing the life chances of women in colonial society. Educational opportunities were disproportionately lower for women than they were for men. Women employed in the civil service were given less benefits and opportunities than men with the same skills were. The imposed Victorian values caused “female teachers who became pregnant but could not produce marriage certificates” to be dismissed (Manuh 1993, 104). Promotions were retarded if maternity leaves were taken and female officers in the civil services were asked to quit upon their second pregnancy. The elevated status of ‘mother’ in traditional society was now re-versed and penalized. This was the condition of the literate professional women. That of the masses was worse.

Remarking on the condition of this sector of women under colonialism Nkrumah (1970b) stated:
A substantial volume of petty trade came to be carried on by thousands of women street hucksters and market vendors. These women, a few of whom have accumulated some sizable capital, play an important part in our internal trade distribution. But they are reliant for their supplies on the monopoly firms, for whom they provide the cheapest kind of retail distributive system it has been possible to devise. (26)

A number of associations, each with their “queens” (Manuh 1993) were organized by these women to facilitate their lifestyles while in the towns trading. Families had to be cared for, products had to be secured, and order had to be maintained. These associations, however, were not organized for independence or for Pan-Africanism. These foci did not pre-occupy women organizations until the advent of the CPP.

When the CPP was launched a Women’s Section was launched with it. In the constitution of the CPP an annual ‘Women’s Day’ was slated for 24 May and a provision for a CPP Women’s League read as follows:

Individual women members of the Party shall be organized into women’s sections. Women’s sections may be organized on Branch and Ward basis. A General Council of Women’s Sections shall be established to co-ordinate the activities of the women in the Party. Leaders appointed by each Women’s Branch or Ward shall be responsible for the co-ordination of work amongst women in the Branch or Ward.

There shall be no separate status of women in the Party. A woman who becomes an individual member of the Party becomes thereby a member of the Women’s Section of her Branch. Women may join the Party through the Women’s Sections.

The Women’s Section shall hold rallies, dances, picnics and other social functions throughout the year. A special Ghana Women’s Day shall be observed once a year at Easter.

Each Party Branch shall have a Women’s Section to cater for the special interests of women, but the Women’s Section shall be part and parcel of the Branch. There shall be only one Executive Committee for each Branch, including the Women’s Section. (Nkrumah 1973c, 70)

Women participated on the Accra Evening News, in the Positive Action Campaign, and fearlessly fought and went to jail as did the male members. Four women were appointed Propaganda Secretaries and traveled throughout Ghana with Nkrumah assisting in recruitment and consolidation of Party branches. Progressive integration of women into leadership positions took place with the CPP after it came to power. A general improvement in educational access and professional job opportunities also took place under the CPP’s rule. Most importantly, African women’s agency was unified and strengthened after the formation of the National Council of Ghana Women (NCGW) that was
inaugurated on 10 September 1960. The NCGW was an integral wing of the Party that replaced the Women’s Section and had representation on the Central Committee. Its power was not cosmetic as “some of its members [wielded] considerable influence in national affairs” Manuh 1993, 119).

Nkrumah ensured the broadening of scope of NCGW when he included them as part of his delegations abroad. These were also opportunities for the NCGW members to examine the standards achieved by other women in other countries. The NCGW took advantage of its participation in continental and international meetings to build links with sister organization in other countries. As Manuh has pointed out, women had the most to gain from the CPP advanced revolution. The CPP, however, also gained a great deal from these women.

Not only did the women provide moral legitimacy for the organization, they also provided money. When it was needed, as it was after the budget criticism of 1961, the women provided a militant front of loyalty. “They could be seen spreading clothes on the ground for party functionaries to walk on at rallies and harassed opponents of the party and its policies” (Manuh 1993, 120).

In terms of African Unity, Nkrumah was able to direct the energies of the Ghanaian women to be in line with Pan-African Nationalism. Women staged marches protesting the murders committed by Portuguese imperialists against Angolans. Nkrumah appealed to the women directly at the Conference of Women of Africa and of African Descent held in Accra on 18 July 1960. Beginning with an acknowledgment of the glorious part that women played in the struggle for independence Nkrumah addressed the role of the women in the “great struggle of African liberation” (Nkrumah 1997a, 110). He essentially told them that their struggle was to commit to action in five areas: political, social, economic, cultural and educational. He urged them to inspire and push the men in their respective countries to support the liberation and unification of the African continent. In particular he encouraged the gathering to bring to bear all of their feminine influence for the execution of African unity.

There were positive results. “In furtherance of the Ghana-Guinea-Mali Union, a Council of Women of the Union of African States was formed. Meetings were held in member countries for the promotion of the foundation of the movement which would co-ordinate and harmonise the activities of organization of African women throughout the continent” (Manuh 1993, 121). At the second conference of this women’s council Nkrumah called for a new African women; “a woman of virtue, vision and courage, capable of the highest sacrifice” (ibid.). From this conference the women issued a communiqué in which they pledge their dedication to work for “the effective liberation and rapid emancipation of African women, to fight against illiteracy” (ibid., 122); the protection of children and their interest; and the establishment of world peace.

While not resolving all the social issues that plagued African women in Ghana or Africa, Nkrumah used his offices and influence to unite the vast organizations of women in Ghana to serve as a catalyst to the organization of all African women. The agency of these women, which was powerful from the start, was
magnified in their unity. Adamafio (1982) commented that women were the overwhelming majority of the politically active population in Ghana and their dogged determination was a power in itself. Nkrumah assisted in directing that power to becoming one that was committed to Pan-African agency.

**ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN YOUTH FOR PAN-AFRICAN AGENCY**

Apter (1972) revealed in his study on Ghana that the organized youth provided the early basis of leadership in Ghana’s nationalist politics. Nkrumah, for his part, had mentioned the students that he worked with while under tutelage of Aggrey before going abroad (Nkrumah 1973a). Nkrumah was gone from Africa from 1935 through 1947. During his absence, the youth in the Gold Coast colony had been organized in a rather timid and apologetic way by groups such as the Boy Scouts “fostered by the missionaries” (Apter 1972, 128). “For a time anything African was looked upon, by these educated youth groups, with a measure of embarrassment or even contempt” (ibid.). They were preoccupied in protesting racial differentiation by explaining the importance of environmental upbringing. This changed with Nkrumah and Botsio’s return.

It appears that Nkrumah did not really change the youth but he presented a radically different message from the organized nationalists than the messages that the likes of Danquah had presented earlier. Nkrumah invited the youth to take their usual position as the militant vanguard and supported the nationalist youth movement known as the Committee on Youth Organizations (CYO). The CYO was a combined group composed of the Youth Study Group, the Ashanti Youth Association and the Ghana Youth Association of Sekondi (Nkrumah 1973a). These youth became ardent supporters of the UGCC. When the leadership of the UGCC was arrested because of its alleged association with the uprisings of 1948 it was deported to Kumasi. Then, however, it was discovered that Ashanti youth, under the leadership of Krobo Edusei, had planned to attack the prison and break the leadership out (Nkrumah 1973a). The British quickly moved the UGCC further north.

With the exception of Nkrumah, the UGCC leadership was not impressed with the militancy of the CYO and actually saw it as a dangerous deficit. Conflict ensued within the UGCC over the existence of the CYO with the result being Nkrumah’s decision to leave the UGCC and to form the CPP of which some of the CYO’s older members became leadership.

The constitution of the CPP, declared on 12 June 1949 (Nkrumah 1973c) and published on 20 June 1949 (Nkrumah 1973b), was actually composed by the “CYO at the end of 1948” (Ibid.,16). It called for an annual ‘Youth Day’ slated for 21 January and a provision for a CPP Youth League read as follows:

The Youth of the country aged 15 to 30 shall be organized into the C.P.P. Youth League. The Central Committee shall appoint a member to serve on
the Party Youth League Executive, and each Branch of the Party shall also appoint a member of the Local Branch to serve on the Branch Youth League Executive. (Nkrumah 1973c, 70)

According to Dr. N.N.Tetteh (1985), a former member of the Young Pioneers, the Youth League originally served as a nurturing environment for children and wards of the members of the CPP. Since it did not yet exist in all regional centers it was not considered a national movement until the Party became a Ghana-wide phenomenon. It was, however, the original youth wing of the CPP and as the Party grew, so too did it.

After the 1951 general election, two important organizations were formed. The first was known as the League of Ghana Patriots, a “party within a party” (Apter 1972, 209) sponsored by Nkrumah. The socialist-minded members previously identified with the youth staffed this ‘Circlelike’ subsection of the CPR. Their particular task was to be close to Nkrumah at all rallies and political gatherings and to issue appropriate memorandum to Party bodies for implementation (Ibid.). Another organization, which was said to be a subsidiary of the first League of Ghana Patriots, was known as the National Association of Socialist Youth. It was “to form the nucleus for the future development of socialist consciousness” (Apter 1972, 209). This organization was no doubt the forerunner of the National Association of Socialist Student’s Organization (NASSO) “which was the ideological wing of the Party” (Nkrumah 1973b, 93). NASSO and the “Youth League were organizing themselves into effective units within the Party” (Ibid.).

As late as 18 February 1961 Nkrumah considered the NASSO “the custodian body of the party’s ideology and is composed of the most advanced ideological comrades, torchbearers of the party’s ideals and principles” (Nkrumah 1973c, 169). By 3 February 1962, however, NASSO had been transformed by the Central Committee of the CPP into “Party Study Groups” and Nkrumah remarked that these “metamorphoses and transformations are not concerned with aims and principles, but with tactics. Let us not forget that Marxism is not a dogma but a guide to action” (Ibid., 171).

On the Pan-African scale Ghana had been accused of inciting youth throughout Africa to rebel. This was said to be done through the All-African People’s Conference held in Accra in 1958. Rather than offending Nkrumah he took the accusation as a compliment (Nkrumah 1973b).¹

Youth were not only addressed in terms of militant liberation or as ideological catalysts. Their day-to-day attitudes were also a concern to Nkrumah. He wanted to raise patriotic, responsible and self-conscious citizens. This quest gave rise to the establishment of the Convention People’s Party Students’ Union (CPP-SU) at the University College in Accra and the Young Pioneers.²

The CPP-SU was a direct response to the treasonous atmosphere that dominated the campus environment at University College before Ghana becoming a republic. Nkrumah inaugurated this organization on 5 June 1960 at
which time he addressed its purpose and character. To Nkrumah it was an “almost historic event” (1997a, 78) because it provided an opportunity to debunk the accusation that the Convention People’s Party was “anti-intellectual and contemptuous of knowledge” (ibid.)

Nkrumah went on to explain that the CPP rated knowledge by how it was used. “The Convention People’s Party is not impressed by the mere acquisition of knowledge. It is only impressed when the knowledge acquired is applied to achieve positive and practical results for the upliftment of the people” (ibid.). He informed the CPP-SU’s new members that their subscription to the CPP’s program meant that they were a body of students that sought “knowledge to find truth” (ibid.) and that their membership in the Party did not contradict their status as students but complimented it.

To speak plainly, I must mention here that the University College of Ghana has hitherto been associated with anti-Convention People’s Party attitudes, which is the equivalent of saying that the University College is anti-government of the day. This has been rather unfortunate since that Party is not only composed of the greatest majority of our countrymen, but is also supported by a large number of Africans and people of African descent all over the world. (Ibid.)

Nkrumah told the audience that they were witnessing a double celebration that day in which, on one hand, they were bidding farewell to intellectual isolationism and on the other, they were injecting the CPP into the veins of the college. Becoming pointed, he explained that some of the isolated intellectuals were stragglers in the national stream.

They live in an ivory tower in a world of their own, escaping from reality and cutting themselves off from the practical life of the people. By so doing they miss the glorious opportunity of identifying themselves with the political and economic aspirations of the people and so deprive themselves of the ability to link their lives with the life of Ghana.

I have always stressed the fact that our young men and women must exemplify the excellence of knowledge by the intellectual humility which academic eminence breathes. I have described as “intellectual pomposity” that arrogance which is the hallmark of half-baked intellectualism. We are determined to take steps to ensure that that shall no longer be the lapel-flower of the youth turned out from our national institutions of learning. (Nkrumah 1997a, 79)

Nkrumah then announced his intent to arrange for students “to work in the offices, shops, the fields, the farms and in other work places” (ibid.) during their long vacations so they could get the experience needed to identify with the lives of ordinary people. He reminded them that these ‘ordinary people’ expected a
great deal from the students by way of service and practical knowledge. Nkrumah told them that this expectation was warranted since it was the ordinary people that sponsored the education the students received.

The University College has a great future provided it can shed the Don Quixote armour of unreality which has ruined so many modern institutions which have tried to live a life of self-deceit with both their head and feet in the clouds. My message to the student of this College is: “come down to earth.”

There are great changes with many values taking place in our country today [sic]. The problems that these changes bring are all clamouring loudly for solutions. It is up to this University College and our other institutions of learning to produce the right type of men and women who will stand shoulder to shoulder with their countrymen in finding the solutions to these problems. (Nkrumah 1997a, 80)

Wrapping up his presentation with a call for ‘practical intellectuals’ Nkrumah told them that the establishment of the organization was part of the overall effort to prepare for a political union of African states.

Nkrumah also made moves to improve the development of younger students who were being compromised by organizations like the Boy Scouts. To address this problem, the solution was the Young Pioneers (YP). Adamafio claims that the YP got its inspiration from a trip that Nkrumah took in Eastern Europe in 1961 but Nkrumah proposed the establishment of the YP in a 17 October 1959 presentation (1973b).

He clarified the proposal further in his speech to National Assembly on 6 December 1960. Addressing issues concerning teachers Nkrumah announced that he would like to see teachers “volunteer their services with the Young Pioneers” (1997a, 220). Nkrumah explained at that time that the YP would provide facilities for young boys and girls to pursue their hobbies and interests in after-school activities in an effort to find and develop their talents. “The organization aims at installing into the youth a high regard for the great virtue of patriotism and unselfish service to the country and to the community, while at the same time providing opportunities for healthy recreation” (ibid.). Nkrumah said that the organization was “truly educative [sic]” (Ibid.) and he desired its rapid extension in all regions of the country. Adamafio (1982) wrote that the YP rehabilitated a number of youths that had been previously delinquent. “The members of the organization were dressed in para-military uniform and this was an attraction for the youth who enlisted in their thousands” (Adamaño 1982, 121).

The Young Farmers League (YFL) was also sponsored by the CPP soon after the declaration of Ghana as a republic. It was set up to prepare educated youth and interest them in future careers as farmers (Dadson 1993; Tetteh 1985). The YFL established 39 “camps” (Dadson 1993, 311) or “farms” (Tetteh 1985, 3)
and “were given lectures in farming as a noble profession by prominent agricultural experts from the relevant institutions” (Ibid.). For organizational coherence the YFL was eventually subsumed within the YP.

By 1961 Nkrumah announced, “the Ghana Youth Pioneers, having been constituted as the sole youth authority in Ghana, has the responsibility for ensuring that all organizations of youth are conducted in accordance with our national directives and not in relation to any foreign concepts. The youth of Ghana must cultivate great pride and love for our nation and for our African brotherhood” (Nkrumah 1997b, 92–93).

The aims of the Ghana Young Pioneers were as follows: “To train the mind, the body, and soul of the youth of Ghana; to train them to be up to their civic responsibilities so as to fulfill their patriotic duties; to train their technical skills according to their talents; to foster the spirit of voluntaryism, [sic] love and devotion to the welfare of the Ghana nation; to inculcate into the youth, “Nkrumaism”—ideals of African personality, and economic reconstruction of Ghana and Africa in particular, and the world in general.” The pledge reads as follows: “In the cause of Ghana and Africa we are ever ready. We sincerely promise to live by the ideals of Osagyefo Kwame Nkrumah, Founder of the State of Ghana, initiator of the African personality.

“To safeguard by all means possible, the independence sovereignty and territorial integrity of the State of Ghana from internal and external aggression.

“To be always in the vanguard for the social and economic reconstruction of Ghana and Africa.

“To be in the first ranks of men fighting for the total liberation and unity of Africa, for these are the noble aims guiding the Ghana Young Pioneers.

“As a Young Pioneer, we will be a guard of workers, farmers, cooperators and all other sections of our community.” See Nkrumah Youth, Vol. No 1, November 1961, p. 7. (Apter 1970, 344)

The YP represented another incubator in which Nkrumah hoped to hatch new Africans durable and prepared for the final execution of the Pan-African revolution (Nkrumah 1970b).

The youth in Ghana not only inspired the revolutionary movement led by Nkrumah they also suffered a disproportionate amount of terrorist pain in various bombing outrages aimed at destroying the Nkrumah regime. Bombings by opposition forces were aimed at gatherings when Nkrumah was meeting with the children or when women were assembled. Fearlessly, they remained the shining warriors of the era.
The access to an education increased vastly across all levels during Nkrumah’s governance. Education also developed qualitatively in two ways. First, the general curriculum increased in technical and scientific training. Most importantly, however, education was purposely being designed to enhance Pan-African agency.

To facilitate these developments, Nkrumah intervened directly and seized control of Ghana’s institutions of higher learning to route out diehard colonialist attitudes and practices. He also sponsored the Encyclopedia Africana, the African Studies Institute at the University of Ghana, and the Ideological Institute at Winneba. Finally, he sought to direct the development of the world’s Africanists at the African Studies Association’s first conference.

Nkrumah’s general outlook on the role of a university was stated at a university dinner held at Flagstaff House, Accra on 24 February 1963. At that dinner he stated:

The role of a university in a country like ours is to become the academic focus of national life, reflecting the social, economic, cultural and political aspirations of the people. It must kindle national interest in the youth and uplift our citizens and free them from ignorance, superstition and may I add, indolence…. A university is supported by society, and without the sustenance which it receives from society, it will cease to exist. (Nkrumah 1997e, 11)

The foundation of Nkrumah’s thought on this matter can be traced to an essay he had written while working on his Master’s degree in Education. The essay was published in the November 1943 edition of University of Pennsylvania’s journal, Educational Outlook. The essay was titled “Education and Nationalism in Africa.” “About half of the essay recounts the history of missionary activity in West Africa and describes the existing system of education” (Sherwood 1996, 102). The rest of the essay addressed the threat of an escalated war after the completion of World War II if British imperialism and colonialism were restored. Nkrumah also encouraged the synthesis of the best in African culture with the best in western culture (ibid.). The theme of synthesis would be repeated frequently.

Nkrumah was inaugurated as the Chancellor of the University of Ghana on 25 November 1961. During that inauguration and a subsequent one at the Kwame Nkrumah Institute of Science and Technology on 29 November 1961, he laid out the history of higher education in the territory as a colony and then as an independent state. Following this he explained the mission for the educators.

Nkrumah began by explaining that:
Higher institutions of learning in Africa were in the past designed to suit the colonial order and their products therefore reflected the values and ideals of the colonial powers. Consequently, colonial institutions of higher learning, however good intentioned, were unable to assess the needs and aspirations of the societies for which they were instituted. (1997b, 138)

He went on to outline the history of Africa’s past centers of learning and culture and the subsequent arrest due to slavery and the slave trade. Even in this pathetic situation, Nkrumah listed a number of scholars that astounded the world. Names he evoked were Attobah Kwodjo Enu, William Ansa Sesraku, Anthony William Amo, Mensah Sarbah, Attah Ahuma, Casely Hayford, Phillip Quarcoo, and Kwegyir Aggrey. He also mentioned the multitude of Africans with the capability of repeating the Koran from memory and others versed in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldaic.

“The desire of learning has always been a marked feature of our life” (Nkrumah 1997b 141). After recounting the Fanti Confederacy’s 1871 charter and its specifics on education he came up to the more recent recommendations of the Asquith Commission on Higher Education in the colonies and the Elliot Commission. These recommendations, which were made in 1945, addressed the establishment of one university to be established in the West African colonies. While the intent was to establish it in Ibadan, there was effective pressure from Ghana to host its base. By 1948, the University College of the Gold Coast was established. This became the University College of Ghana after independence.

Nkrumah then recanted the slow and deliberate 13-year approach that he and the CPP used to ensure that the University remained accredited and recognized as a degree granting institution of high caliber. He publicly thanked the British universities for the help that had been given and proceeded to close this section of his presentation. In closing, he offered a restatement of the objectives advanced by the International Commission on University Education, which had been appointed by him in 1960. The points of the commission were as follows:

(1) To provide opportunities for education in all those branches of human knowledge which are of value in modern Ghana for the maximum number of Ghanaians who are capable of benefiting therefore.

(2) To equip students with an understanding of the contemporary world and, within this framework, of African civilisations, their histories, institutions, and ideas.

(3) To undertake research in all fields with which the teaching staff is concerned, but with emphasis where possible on problems—historical, social, economic, scientific, technical, linguistic—which arises out of the needs and experiences of the peoples of Ghana and other African states.

(4) To enable students to acquire methods of critical independent thought, while at the same time recognizing their responsibility to use their education for the benefit of the peoples of Ghana, Africa and of the world.
(5) To provided opportunities for higher education and research for students from parts of the world, and particularly from other African states.

(6) To develop close relationships with the people of Ghana and their organisations and with other universities. (Ibid., 144)

Nkrumah then turned to the topic of the Institute of African Studies to be established at the University. He acknowledged that he would have to have support at first from scholars overseas. “It is the Government’s hope, however that within a few years the institute will have a firm basis of African scholarship and that it will become an internationally recognized centre for the advanced study of African history, language, sociology and culture and of contemporary African institutions” (ibid.).

This institute was to have the mission of eradicating the colonial mentality that resulted from colonial experience. Nkrumah wanted the institute to help Africans to rediscover themselves with confidence and a distinct world outlook. “It is important for every student to maintain his links with the African scene, and thus understand the great cause of African unity to which we are committed” (ibid.).

He closed the inauguration by reiterating a statement from the First CIAS:

“There is a searching after Africa’s regeneration—politically, socially and economically—within the milieu of a social system suited to the traditions, history, environment and communal pattern of African society. Notwithstanding the inroads made by Western influences, this still remains to a large degree unchanged.

“In the vast rural areas of Africa, the people hold land in common and work it on the principal [sic] of self-help and co-operation. These are the main features still predominating in African society and we cannot do better than bend them to the requirements of a more modern socialistic society.”

This, ladies and gentlemen, is the foundation of pan-Africanism….

In all your work here one thing must be uppermost in your minds: The freedom and development and unity of Africa and the moral, cultural and scientific contribution of the continent to the total world civilisation and peace. (Nkrumah 1997b, 145–46)

In his inauguration at the Kwame Nkrumah Institute of Science and Technology Nkrumah added the role that he saw science and technology playing in speeding up the unification of Africa. In that presentation, he also drafted areas in which the Institute could assist other states that chose to participate in a Union of African States.

In 1962, Nkrumah played host to the First Africanist Conference. That gave him an opportunity to present an African historiography that featured the accomplishments of African civilizations from the era of KMT5 through the
great West African mega nations. He mentioned points that would later be repeated by Martin Bernal in his text *Black Athena*, mainly that ancient Europeans had deep respect for the accomplishments of African civilizations. He exposed the later corruption of studies focusing on Africa.

By the time the early European writings on Africa got under way, a new motive had begun to inform African Studies. Those early European works exchanged the scientific motive for one that was purely economic. There was the unbalanced trade in ivory and gold, and there was the illegitimate trafficking in men for which these writings needed to find some sort of excuse.

The point I wish to make at this stage is that much of European and American writing on Africa was at that time apologetic. It was devoted to an attempt to justify slavery and the continued exploitation of African labour and resources. African Studies in Europe and America were thus at their lowest ebb scientifically.

With the abolition of the slave trade, African Studies could no longer be inspired by the economic motive. The experts in African studies therefore changed the content of their writings; they began to give accounts of African society which were used to justify colonialism as a duty of civilization. Even the most flattering of these writings fell short of objectivity and truth. This explains, I believe, the popularity and success of anthropology as the main segment of African Studies.

The stage was then set for the economic and political subjugation of Africa. Africa, therefore, was unable to look forward or backward.

The central myth in the mythology surrounding Africa is that of the denial that we are a historical people. It is said that whereas other continents have shaped history and determined its course, Africa has stood still, held down by inertia. Africa, it is said, entered history only as a result of European contact. Its history, therefore, is widely felt to be an extension of European history. Hegel’s authority was lent to this a-historical hypothesis concerning Africa. And apologists of colonialism and imperialism lost little time in seizing upon it and writing wildly about it to their heart’s content. (Nkrumah 1973c, 208–09)

Nkrumah proceeded from that point to provide a litany of sources to correct the false notions he had mentioned. He informed them that a number of universities throughout Africa were doing research that was bringing the facts to light about the true history of African people. Nkrumah discussed the importance of including oral records and written records of all languages.

“The history of Africa has...been European centred” (ibid., 211) Nkrumah reasoned that it was no wonder that scholars of this persuasion were appalled when Africans sought to liberated themselves from colonialism. He went on to explain to the assembled scholars that Africans had a long history of democratic
practice and that democracy was more than a technique, in fact it was part of the methods of socialist pursuit. If these pursuits had been abandoned, continued Nkrumah, it was due to the corrupted education from Europe that prepared Africans for subservience. After his thorough critique, he charged the Africanists with revitalizing the cultural and spiritual heritage and values of Africa.

“African Studies is not a kind of academic hermitage. It has warm connections with similar studies in other countries of the world. It should change its course from anthropology to sociology, for it is the latter which more than any other aspect creates the firmest basis for social policy.

Your meeting here today as Africanists from various countries of the world, is truly historic. It emphasizes the idea that knowledge transcends political and national boundaries. It is incumbent upon all Africanist scholars, all over the world, to work for a complete emancipation of the mind from all forms of domination, control and enslavement. (Ibid., 212)

Nkrumah was not, however, dependent of this body of international scholars to advance his concept of African Studies. To push the concept forward he encouraged the development of the Institute of African Studies, which was launched at the University of Ghana. On 25 October 1963, Nkrumah gave three new charges to the Institute at its ‘Official Opening.’ By this time, the Institute had a team of 17 research fellows and 40 post-graduate students. Before delivering his charges, he asked the gathering a number of useful questions:

What sort of Institute of African Studies does Ghana want and have need of?

In what way can Ghana make its own specific contribution to the advancement of knowledge about the peoples and cultures of Africa through past history and through contemporary problems?

For what kind of service are we preparing students of this Institute and of our Universities?

Are we sure that we have established here the best possible relationship between teachers and students?

To what extent are our universities identified with the aspirations of Ghana and Africa? (Nkrumah 1997e, 128)

Most of these questions Nkrumah answered in his presentation. The first charge that he put before this body was the need for them to reinterpret and make a new assessment of factors that make up the Ghanaian and African past. He explained that he wanted them to move from the model of African studies still prominent in the West, which he identified as colonial studies. As he had told the First Africanists Conference, but in more detail, he demonstrated how British colonialism employed these types of studies to assist their domination of their colonial subjects. To implement this first charge, therefore, it was going to be
necessary that foreign professors and lecturers realize that “their mental make-up has been largely influenced by their system of education and the fact of their society and environment. For this reason, they must endeavor to adjust and reorientate their attitudes and thought to our African conditions and aspirations” (ibid., 129). He said that an essential function of the Institute was to “study the history, culture, and institutions, languages and arts of Ghana and of Africa in new African-centred ways—in entire freedom from the propositions and presuppositions of the colonial epoch (emphasis mine)” (Nkrumah 1997e, 128). He wanted them to reassert the glories and achievements of the African past to inspire future generations.

Nkrumah informed them to not stop there but to “include a study of the origins and culture of peoples of African descent in the Americas and the Caribbean, and you should seek to maintain close relations with their scholars” (ibid.). This was to ensure cross-fertilization between Africa and its descendants.

Nkrumah’s second charge, or guiding principle, was the need for the Institute to search for, edit, publish and make available sources of all kinds. He wanted the Institute to recover vital source material and to cooperate in that effort with Centers for African Studies in other African States. These materials were deemed necessary in order to properly upgrade and Africanize other elements of education within the society. Nkrumah wanted the other fields of study and disciplines to reflect the indigenous personality of Africa, which in many ways he compared with the African Genius. “It is only in conditions of total freedom and independence from foreign rule and interferences [sic] that the aspirations of our people will see real fulfilment [sic] and the African genius find his best expression” (ibid., 31).

Nkrumah went on to explain the distinctive elements of the African genius and the practical uses to which it could be put. He then stressed that this new knowledge was to serve the people and should therefore be distributed to them. The information was also to become part of textbooks that would be distributed through the schools and training institutes.

Nkrumah’s third and final charge was that the Institute study Africa “in its widest possible sense” (Ibid., 136). From this Nkrumah meant that the charge of the Institute was to study Africa in its connections and interactions with itself and the world. It was not merely a Ghanaian nor West African focused Institute. Its research was to cross space and time in greater sweeps than the micro focus of the African Studies centers and departments of that time. In his presentation, Nkrumah made a relatively avant garde statement that would resurface years later in debates between C.A.Diop, T.Obenga, and other scholars commissioned by UN-ESCO to construct a multi-volume set on the General History Africa. That statement is as follows:

Similarly, we cannot hope to understand adequately the medieval civilisations of West Africa-ancient Ghana, Mali, Songhay, Kanem, Bornu, Oyo—without taking full account of the civilisations which
emerged in Eastern, Central and southern Africa—Meroe, Aksum, Adal, Kilwa, Monomotapa, Mogadishu, Malindi, Mombasa, Zanzibar, Pemba, Chang, Amir exploring the problems of their interconnections, their points of resemblance and difference. In North Africa, too, powerful enlightened civilisations had grown up in Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco. (Nkrumah 1997e, 137)

Finally, Nkrumah reiterated the need for the discovered information to be disseminated widely throughout Africa and the world. This was to be assisted by diversifying the student body so that it was Pan-African in makeup and to host sessions open to off-campus populations. Presentations were to also be made in forums provided by the Encyclopaedia Africana.

The Encyclopaedia Africana was a major project that was initially guided by W.E.B.DuBois and W.A.Hunton. When this project held its first Editorial Board meeting DuBois had already passed on to the ancestors. Nkrumah addressed that meeting which took place on 24 September 1964. At that meeting he reiterated much that he had said to the First Africanists Conference and to the Institute of African Studies. He added, however, a few comments of particular interest for this study.

First, he claimed that the project “must be frankly Afro-centric in its interpretation of African history and of the social and cultural institutions of the African and people of African descent” (emphasis mine) (Nkrumah, 24 September 1964, University of Ghana, Accra). In describing this interpretation he stated that it must be derived from the point of view of African interests, assumptions and concepts which tended to differ from European ones. Nkrumah was anxious to be understood in his emphasis on the Afrocentric viewpoint for he anticipated the ‘reverse racism’ taunts that would come. He assured all that his call meant an approach that asserted a scientific historiography with first-class scholarship based on a referential that was independently African.

A second issue of prime importance was Nkrumah’s acknowledgment of the anteriority of African people. In this presentation Nkrumah acknowledged Africa as both the cradle of biological humans and civilized humanity. Discussing the former by recognizing the discoveries of Leakey in what was then Tanganyika and asserting the latter by referring to Egypt. He said, “evidence from language, religion, astronomy, folklore and divine kinship, as well as geographical and physical proximity, confirms the basic African origin of this Egyptian cultural eminence” (Nkrumah, 24 September 1964, University of Ghana, Accra).

Third, an issue that highlighted Nkrumah’s concern with psycho-linguistic location, he requested the rejection of ‘Negro’ as an identifier of African people.

I hope that in the record of the Encyclopaedia Africana the term “Negro”, whatever meaning or connotation has been given to it, will not find a place, except perhaps in a specific article proving its opprobrious origin and redundancy. I would like that people of African descent and Africans
in general should be described as Black men, or Africans. I personally would like to be referred to as a Black man, African or Ghanaian, not referred to as a “Negro”. (Nkrumah, 24 September 1964, University of Ghana, Accra)

Nkrumah stressed that the success of the project required Pan-African cooperation. He closed his presentation with his familiar pattern of reminding the educators that their work would take them one step closer to the greater objective to which they were all dedicated: Continental Union Government for Africa.

In summation of this chapter’s section, concerning education in its general sense and the African Revolution, Nkrumah said,

It should be an honour and responsibility of those of us who have had the privilege of the best education our country can afford to strive in every way possible to make our generation better than we found it. We must not only feel the pulse and intensity of the great African revolution taking place in our time, but we must also make a contribution of its realisation, progress and development. (Nkrumah 1997e, 11)

Addressing the National Assembly on ratifying the charter of the OAU (21 June 1963) Nkrumah informed it of his immediate plans to set in motion a student exchange program for the University of Ghana. Within the year, Nkrumah was able to report that almost 200 students from Nigeria, Nyasaland, Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda, as well as from the USA and Europe were enrolled in Ghana’s universities (1997e).

Nkrumah also announced his intention for the provision of a course of studies in African Affairs and in History, Economics and Politics generally which might be of value to independent African States without universities of their own to train their administrators. He stated, “educational and cultural co-operation in general demands co-ordination at the inter-State level. A guide to the history of Africa should be produced to destroy once and for all the colonial myth that Africa has no past” (Nkrumah 1973c, 269).

Nkrumah’s direct intervention in the administration of higher education in Ghana brought criticism from the opposition. Some complained that his intervention was a violation of ‘academic freedom.’ Nkrumah gave a dialectical response:

Scholars must be free to pursue the truth and to publish the results of their researches without fear, for true scholarship fears nothing. It can even challenge the dead learning which has come to us from the cloistral and monastic schools of the middle ages. We know that without academic freedom in this sense there can be no higher education worthy of the name, and, therefore, no intellectual progress, no flowering of the nation’s mind. The genius of the people is stultified. We therefore cherish and shall continue to cherish academic freedom at our universities….
There is, however, sometimes a tendency to use the words “academic freedom” in another sense and to assert the claim that a university is more or less an institution of learning having no respect or allegiance to the community or to the country in which it exists and purports to serve. This assertion is unsound in principle and objectionable in practice. The university has a clear duty to the community which maintains it and which has the right to express concern for its pressing needs. (Nkrumah 1997e, 12–13)

The focus in this section has been deliberately on curriculum development that sought to enhance Pan-African agency. One should not get the impression that this was the only concern of Nkrumah’s approach to education. It was not.

This chapter has highlighted Kwame Nkrumah’s influence and impact on three key organized segments of the Ghanaian liberated zone. It revealed his effort to center them Afrocentrically to enhance their potential for Pan-African Agency. The next chapter will focus on developments in the theoretical area of ideology and philosophy.
CHAPTER 8
Nkrumahism: An Ideology to Enhance Pan-African Agency

Our pattern of education...was formulated and administered by an alien administration desirous of extending its dominant ideas and thought processes to us. We were trained to be inferior copies of Englishmen, caricatures to be laughed at with our pretensions to British bourgeois gentility, our grammatical faultiness and distorted standards betraying us at every turn. We were neither fish nor fowl. We were denied the knowledge of our African past and informed that we had no present. What future could there be for us? We were taught to regard our culture and traditions as barbarous and primitive. Our text-books were English text-books, telling us about English history, English geography, English ways of living, English customs, English ideas, English weather.... All this has to be changed. (Nkrumah 1970b, 49)

“Everywhere, the more or less covert implication is, Africa needs to be recolonised” (Nkrumah 1969b, 19)
The ideology of Nkrumahism, reflected in the writings, speeches and policies of Nkrumah, provides a coherent body of ideas that can be explored using the existing Africalogical paradigm. It addresses the concerns of African centeredness, empowerment, economic independence, cultural liberation and vitality.

The dialectical relationship between culture and time requires abandoning the earlier anthropological notion that African culture views social change as undesirable. The flippant classification of pre-colonial experience as uniformly communal may be at the root of this error. Before the existence of European imperialism and Islamic influence, Africa had experienced internal organizations controlling expansive geographical areas and populations. Centralized societies existed along with relatively decentralized societies, sometimes sharing symbiotic relationships. Afrocentricity, through its classical reference link, KMT (ancient Egypt), shows that Africa’s cultural diversity includes diversity in the social and political economic areas. The awareness of this diversity adds depth to the concept of Pan-African nationalism as an agential concept.
Nkrumahism was unequivocal in its call for the development of self-reliant organization throughout the African populace. To Nkrumah, only organization would secure the gains made by the masses and safeguard them particularly from the corruption of leadership. Finally, Nkrumah saw mass organization as a tool to reduce the ills of uneven development and imbalanced bounty.

Nkrumah offered models and rationales for strategy and tactics for initiating a viable African nation. Between 1945 and 1966 he led a small cadre of African revolutionaries in their thrust to initiate an African nation-state by donating the resources of the nation-state of Ghana. Besides establishing bases on Ghanaian soil to support freedom fighters throughout the African continent, Nkrumah’s government gave significant support to Mali and Guinea, Conakry. He also sponsored the Algerian embassy in Accra while the Algerians struggled to achieve independence. Batsa (1985) discussed the crucial support given Uganda in its quest for independence.

The strategic trajectories that Nkrumah came to reject were sometimes ones that he had earlier held high. Regional nationalism was one such suggested solution that Nkrumah had championed prior to his role in bringing Ghana to independence. He later came out forcefully against this position and stated so in his revised introduction to *Towards Colonial Freedom* (1973d).

Nkrumah’s experiences as a Pan-African ideologue and activist can provide information about the philosophy and strategy of the movement to liberate and qualify African agency. Nkrumah’s significance is assessed best through his premiere contributions to the development of Pan-African nationalism.

Addressing the First Seminar at the Winneba Ideological School on February 3, 1962, Nkrumah said:

I take it to mean that when you talk of Nkrumaism, you mean the name or term given to the consistent ideological policies followed and taught by Kwame Nkrumah. These are contained in his speeches, in his theoretical writings and stated ideas and principles. You also mean that Nkrumaism, in order to be Nkruma-istic, must be related to scientific socialism. To be successful, however, this ideology must:

(a) Be all-pervading, and while its theories in full can only be developed in and around the Party leadership, it must influence in some form all education and, indeed, all thinking and action;

(b) Be not only a statement of aims and principles, but must also provide the intellectual tools by which these aims are achieved, and must concentrate on all constructive thinking around achieving those aims; and,

(c) Offer the ordinary man and woman some concrete tangible and realizable hope of better life within his or her lifetime. (Nkrumah 1973c, 172)
Nkrumahism asserted the double crown of redemption and liberty for Africa. It’s strategic theory advocated a two prong approach: 1) achievement of a liberated African nation under scientific socialism; and 2) support for worldwide socialist revolution. Nkrumah was consistent in advocating the complimentarity of Africa’s rehabilitation and socialist construction. For Nkrumah, scientific socialism was better suited than capitalism to enhance Africa’s standard of life. Nkrumah helped advance the declaration of socialism among African agencies.

Nkrumahism contains ontological, epistemological, and ethical theories. These theories are well documented and explicated in his published works. **Consciencism**, Nkrumah’s principal philosophical text, serves as a primary source of these theories. Nkrumah’s addresses to the Convention People’s Party, All-African People’s Conferences, and Higher Educational functions provided material to contextualize the theories.

The Nkrumahist organs responsible for disseminating these theories throughout the Pan-African affiliates included: (1) *The African Interpreter*; (2) *The Spark*; (3) *Voice of Africa*; (4) *Freedom Fighters Weekly*; (5) *Pan-Africanist Review*; (6) *Bulletin on African Affairs*; and (7) *Accra Evening News*. Nkrumah’s books and speeches addressed various themes of Pan-Africanism. These publications and presentations played heavily in the Nkrumahist strategy to organize the Pan-African movement.

Major agencies influenced by incipient or full-blown Nkrumahism, from 1945–1966, included the African Students Association in the USA (ASA-USA), West African National Secretariat (WANS), the Council on African Affairs (CAA), the Circle, the Pan-African Federation, the 1945 Pan-African Congress in Manchester, the All-African People’s Conferences (A-APC), the Conference of Independent African States (CIAS), the Casablanca group, the All-African Trade Union Federation (A-ATUF), the Young Farmer’s League (YFL), the Ghana National Women’s Association (GNWA), the Young Pioneers Movement (YP), and the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

Nkrumah consistently distinguished Pan-African nationalism from that of the micro-national entities. His strategic edicts in his *Handbook of Revolutionary Warfare* and *Africa must unite* attacked what he saw as “the Balkanization” of Africa. Nkrumah worked tirelessly with all the resources available to him to institutionalize African continental unity. He advocated a strong, continent-wide, central government charged with launching and executing an “over-all economic planning on a continental basis” (1970b, 218). Secondly, it would “aim at the establishment of a unified military and defense strategy” (ibid., 219). Finally, the united African nation would have a foreign policy and diplomacy (ibid.) that reflected a monolithic nation.

Variations of the above themes were echoed by various African thinkers. Works by C.A.Diop (1987) and S.Touré (1980) show the impact of Nkrumah’s thought on them. Nkrumah’s position on these matters was further clarified through his famous debate with Julius Nyerere over regionalism and continental nationalism.
Nyerere, who was present at the First CIAS and the A-APC’s first meeting, was instrumental in constructing the Pan-African Freedom Movement for East, Central and Southern Africa (PAFMECSA). Nkrumah by this time had moved past regionalism and recognized it as dangerous to African unity. Nyerere disagreed at the time but in hindsight had the following to say at a presentation in Zambia on 13 July 1966:

We have achieved many things in Africa in recent years, and can look back with some pride at the distance we have travelled. But we are a long way from achieving the thing we originally set out to achieve, and I believe there is a danger that we might now voluntarily surrender our greatest dream of all.

For it was as Africans that we dreamed of freedom; and we thought of it for Africa. Our real ambition was African freedom and African government. The fact that we fought area by area was merely a tactical necessity. We organized ourselves into the Convention People’s Party, the Tanganyika African National Union, the United National Independence Party, and so on simply because each local colonial government had to be dealt with separately.

The question we now have to answer is whether Africa shall maintain this internal separation as we defeat colonialism, or whether our earlier proud boast—‘I am an African’—shall become a reality. It is not a reality now. For the truth is that there are now 36 different nationalities in free Africa, one for each of the 36 independent states—to say nothing of the areas still under colonial or alien domination. Each state is separate from the others; each is a sovereign entity. And this means that each state has a government which is responsible to the people of its own area—and to them only; it must work for their particular well-being or invite chaos within its territory.

Can the vision of Pan-Africanism survive these realities? Can African unity be built on this foundation of existing and growing nationalism? I do not believe the answer is easy. Indeed I believe that a real dilemma faces the Pan-Africanist. On the one hand is the fact that Pan-Africanism demands an African consciousness and an African loyalty; on the other hand is the fact that each Pan-Africanist must also concern himself with the freedom and development of one of the nations of Africa. These things can conflict. Let us be honest and admit that they have already conflicted.

...None of the nation states of Africa are ‘natural’ units. Our present boundaries are—as has been said many times—the result of European decisions at the time of the Scramble for Africa. They are senseless; they cut across ethnic groups, often disregard natural physical divisions, and result in many different language groups being encompassed within a state. (Nyerere 1968, 207–9)
Many points in Diop’s interview with Carlos Moore show an approach toward the primacy of politics and African unity that is reminiscent of Kwame Nkrumah’s thought. The same could be said of the Republic of Guinea’s first president, Sékou Touré. Touré authored two books in which Nkrumah is paid special homage. The titles of those text were: (1) *United States of Africa* and (2) *Culture, Revolution, and Pan-Africanism*. These texts, as well as Diop’s text, *Black Africa*, provided detailed recommendations for achieving African unity.

Diop, Touré, and Nyerere, each a part of the African Unity Movement, were not opposed to an intermediary step of regional unity on the way to continental unity. Here, Nkrumah vigorously disagreed with the others. While originally a supporter of West African regional unity as a step toward African unity, Nkrumah’s experiences altered his thoughts on this matter. Nkrumah saw the danger of regional ossification and its drag on the process of continental unity.

As a Pan-African Nationalist, Nkrumah saw the economic revolution as an indispensable part of the total emancipation of the African masses from disease and poverty resulting from imperialism. The success of the political revolution, however, was seen as a prerequisite for the economic revolution. Only then could a people decide on the development options that would be in its interest. While not asserting the sole realm of politics, Nkrumah prioritized politics as the first concern for the organization of unity amongst Africans. In his book, *Africa Must Unite*, (1970) Nkrumah says,

> It is my deep conviction that all peoples wish to be free, and that the desire for freedom is rooted in the soul of every one of us. A people long subjected to foreign domination, however, does not always find it easy to translate that wish into action. Under arbitrary rule, people are apt to become lethargic; their senses are dulled. Fear becomes the dominant force in their lives; fear of breaking the law, fear of the punitive measures which might result from an unsuccessful attempt to break loose from their shackles. Those who lead the struggle for freedom must break through this apathy and fear. They must give active expression to the universal longing to be free. They must strengthen the peoples’ faith in themselves, and encourage them to take part in the freedom struggle. Above all, they must declare their aims openly and unmistakably, and organize the people towards the achievement of their goal of self-government.

> The essential forger of the political revolution is a strong, well-organized, broadly based political party, knit together by a program that is accepted by all the members, who also submit themselves to the party’s discipline. Its program should aim for ‘Freedom first’. ‘Seek ye first the political kingdom,’ became the political slogan of the Convention People’s Party, for with out political independence none of our plans for social and economic development could be put into effect.” (50)
Ideological Base to Achieve Pan-Africanism

Ideology n [fr idéologie, fr. idéo-ideo-+-logie -logy] 1: visionary theorizing 2 a: a systematic body of concepts esp. about human life or culture b: a manner or content of thinking characteristic of an individual group, or culture c: the integrated assertions, theories, and aims that constitute a sociopolitical program. (Webster’s Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary, G. & C. Merriam Company, Springfield, Massachusetts, p. 413)

Ideologies lead to social objectives or goals even if the ideologues are not self-conscious. Disciplines that focus on agency inevitably pose the questions as to what factors cause and condition agency. Marxist and Maoist guided discussions on ideology within the Pan-African movement prior to the launching of Nkrumahism. Though not declared, Garveyism qualified as an ideology complete with the necessary component parts. In each situation, an ideology is designed to foster a certain range of acceptable behavior and to discourage behavior that falls outside of that range. Ideologies also profess a preferred social order that they seek to bring into existence.

Nkrumah was attempting to develop Africa toward Pan-Africanism, which he defined as the total liberation and unification of Africa under a Socialist Union Government. Nkrumahist ideology employed the positive synthesis of the traditional African experience as basis, with the Islamic and European-Christian impacts. (Nkrumah 1970d)

Nkrumah saw this synthesis as one of the first steps in resolving the ‘crisis in the African conscience.’ Before Africans can practice a healthy culture an ideological path must clear the weeds of confusion sown by the intrigue of colonialism and enslavement. Making revolution is a sequential process.

What is called for as a first step is a body of connected thought which will determine the general nature of our action in unifying the society which we have inherited, this unification is to take into account, at all times, the elevated ideals underlying the traditional African society. Social revolution must therefore have, standing firmly behind it, an intellectual revolution, a revolution in which our thinking and philosophy are directed towards the redemption of our society. Our philosophy must find its weapons in the environment and living conditions of the African people. (Nkrumah 1970d, 78)

In the text *Consciencism in African Political Philosophy*, by Chuba Okadigbo (1985), Nkrumah’s ideological stance was criticized as one that had capitulated to oppressive influences facing Africa. To Okadigbo, Marxism should be seen as a separate and equal “invasion” into Africa and Nkrumah was in error to not single
this impact out as such. Nkrumah included the analysis of Marxist, namely dialectical and historical materialism as useful aspects of the Euro-Christian impact (Nkrumah 1970d). Nkrumah did not dismiss, without investigation, any aspect of African people’s experience. His attempt to reconcile Marx with the African experience was a damaging exercise according to Okadigbo’s text. Okadigbo either did not understand or did not agree with Nkrumah’s declarations on the role of social milieu in regards to philosophy. Okadigbo missed the power of synthesis offered by Nkrumah’s formula.

Nkrumah was attracted to the basic ethics of Marxian ideology, its rejection of economic exploitation of man by man, and its analytical tool of dialectical materialism. Nkrumah’s economic policies reflected the formulas of scientific socialism as they were understood to be at the time. In the area of political philosophy, however, Nkrumah followed the models that were idiosyncratic to the Pan-African movement. His pronouncements for the development of an economically sound and politically valid continental union advocated a cultural fusion. It also earned him the title of “revisionist” by Marxist who felt that this approach was an abandonment of Marxist socialism.(Smertin 1987; Agyeman 1993)

The relationship between Nkrumahism and Marxism is revealing when described in political and economic terms. Nkrumah added socialism to the definition of Pan-Africanism. Yet he attributed it not to the inevitable march of the worker. Nkrumah saw the driving force for progress as the Revolutionary African Personality. It is important to mention that Nkrumah qualified the concept of African Personality. The following passage illustrates the qualification:

An important aspect of Pan-Africanism is the revival and development of the ‘African Personality’, temporarily submerged during the colonial period. It finds expression in a re-awakening consciousness among Africans and peoples of African descent of the bonds which unite us—our historical past, our culture, our common experience, and our aspirations.

The myth that Africa’s history began with the arrival of the European, and that Africans had achieved nothing and had no culture before then, serves the purpose of imperialists who find it necessary to fabricate some kind of justification for capitalist exploitation. It is a part of the more insidious myth of racial inferiority which seeks to provide an excuse for master-servant relationships, and the domination of one race by another.

…The African Personality would become a strong driving force within the African Revolution, and would at the same time become a factor to be reckoned with in international affairs…

The spirit of a people can only flourish in freedom. When the liberation and unification of Africa is completed, the African Personality will find full expression and be meaningfully projected in the international community. In the meantime, while Africa remains divided, oppressed and
exploited, the African Personality is merely a term expressing cultural and social bonds which unite Africans and people of African descent. It is a concept of the African nation, and is not associated with a particular state, language, religion, political system, or colour of the skin. For those who project it, it expresses identification not only with Africa’s historical past, but with the struggle of the African people in the African Revolution to liberate and unify the continent and to build a just society. (Nkrumah 1973c, 205–6)

For Nkrumah, political-economy fell within the realm of culture, theoretically establishing as valid a distinct African polity and collective identity based in a historically distinct culture.

**PHILOSOPHIC THOUGHT**

*phi•los•o•phy n [me philosphie, fr. of, fr. l philosophie, fr. Gk, fr. philosophos philosopher]…2 a: pursuit of wisdom b: a search for a general understanding of values and reality by chiefly speculative rather than observational means c: an analysis of the grounds of and concepts expressing fundamental beliefs 3 a: a system of philosophical concepts b: a theory underlying or regarding a sphere of activity or thought <the philosophy of war> <philosophy of science>…*

*(Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate® Dictionary, 2002)*

The critical study of the philosophies of the past should lead to the study of modern theories, for these latter, born of the fire of contemporary struggles, are militant and alive. It is not only the study of philosophy that can become perverted. The study of history too can become warped. The colonized African student, whose roots in his own society are systematically starved of sustenance, is introduced to Greek and Roman history, the cradle history of modern Europe, and he is encouraged to treat this portion of the story of man together with the subsequent history of Europe as the only worthwhile portion. This history is anointed with a universalist flavoring which titillates the palate of certain African intellectuals so agreeably that they become alienated from their own immediate society. (Nkrumah 1970d, 5)

The philosophical statement of Nkrumahism is *philosophical conscienticism*. Nkrumah defined and described the statement in the following manner:

Such a philosophical statement will be born out of the crisis of the African conscience confronted with the three strands of present African society.
Such a philosophical statement I propose to name *philosophical consciencism*, for it will give the theoretical basis for an ideology whose aim shall be to contain the African experience of Islamic and Euro-Christian presence as well as the experience of the traditional African society, and, by gestation, employ them for the harmonious growth and development of that society. (Nkrumah 1970d, 70)

This section of the chapter relies heavily on the text, *Consciencism—Philosophy and ideology for decolonization*, (1970) by Nkrumah. Nkrumah used philosophy as another tool of liberation. The approach that Marx and Engles used toward philosophy appealed to Nkrumah though he avoided dogmatism by using African culture as his ideological filter. He agreed with the perspective of seeking the *social contention* in phenomenon and applied that perspective to philosophical systems. For Nkrumah, this contention was a sign of the life within philosophy. He acknowledged that there were other ways to view philosophy—lifeless, abstract ways. “When philosophy is regarded in the light of a series of abstract systems, it can be said to concern itself with two fundamental questions: first, the question ‘what there is’; second, the question how ‘what there is’ may be explained” (Nkrumah 1970d, 6).

Nkrumah went on to explain this cataloguing of *cosmic raw material* and the search for its origin. He also pointed to the preoccupation of philosophers to explain the extent and parameters of this cosmic raw material. He went on to show the incipient tautology that results from philosophy in the abstract. Nkrumah explained that in order to understand the true intent of the philosopher one must see the social milieu in which they are trying to relate to. He did this by listing the societal impact on a number of philosophers and their resulting theories.

Nkrumah warned the ‘non-Western’ student to find their philosophic tools within their own culture and social milieu. This remained a consistent theme within Pan-African centered thought from Blyden through Asante. Nkrumah experienced the clash of cultures while in the United States. One particular situation took place when he administered an African funeral ritual in honor of his mentor, Aggrey.

At the funeral Nkrumah said sacred prayers in the Fanti language, poured libation to the gods and ancestors, and cut a piece of sod from the grave to be sent to Aggrey’s ancestral home for burial. Since he had recently graduated from Lincoln’s Theological Seminary and the event was widely publicized he was admonished by an administrator of the institution. One Dr. Johnson criticized him for praying to heathen gods and pouring libations, which was considered an animistic practice in contradiction of the Holy Scriptures. Nkrumah explained to the distraught scholar that he had decided to live in a manner that would symbolize a synthesis of the best that both Christianity and the beliefs of his people had to offer (Sherwood 1996). This was Nkrumah’s formulaic response.
Nkrumah advanced that same formula to explain how other cultures and their philosophic outlooks could be understood and possibly utilized. For Nkrumah the ideology of the African Revolution had to address those issues that would assist with African liberation, unity, and improve the life circumstances of the multitude.

This takes us to Nkrumah’s concept of “cosmic contrasts.” According to Nkrumah, African societies resolved some of the contradictions that continue to plague Western-oriented philosophers. Foremost among these contradictions was the relationship between “inside” and “outside” which bogged Western society down. The quagmire that faced the West was connected with their concern of “first-ness” and “universality” which faced their creation questions. Nkrumah’s approach to the question was balanced and based in the African experience as can be seen in the following:

Many African societies in fact forestalled this kind of perversion. Making the visible world continuous with the invisible world reduced the dialectical contradiction between ‘inside and outside’. For them heaven was not outside the world but inside it. These African societies did not accept transcendentalism, and may indeed be regarded as having attempted to synthesize the dialectical opposites ‘outside’ and ‘inside’ by making them continuous, that is, by abolishing them. (Nkrumah 1970d, 12)

Nkrumah removed the impetus to escapism and the lethargic avoidance of necessary struggle. Removing the notion of external deterministic control over social reality did this. In fact, Nkrumah showed how clergy within European societies used the assertion of an outside entity to shore up their social-political power among the populace. He warned that the African social revolution must remain secular but not anti-religious. For Nkrumah, cosmic raw material was “matter” which he defined as a plenum of forces in tension. While Nkrumah stated that the African notion of human beings is that they are essentially spiritual beings he also said, “Our universe is a natural universe. And its basis is matter with its objective laws.”

For Nkrumah, the answer to the cosmic raw material question required the synthesis of matter and its internal self-motion, nature and ideas, practice and theory. Matter in this formula is described as “a plenum of forces which are in antithesis to one another…matter is thus endowed with powers of self-motion” (Nkrumah 1970d, 9). While agreeing with Marx on the ‘ordinal primacy’ of matter, Nkrumah asserted the ‘exigency primacy’ of ideology.

Philosophy was said to either support an established ideology or to call for a new ideology. In an often-repeated theme, Nkrumah showed how history intervenes in that hypothesis.

The history of a nation is, unfortunately, too easily written as the history of its dominant class. But if the history of a nation, or a people, cannot be
found in the history of a class, how much less can the history of a continent be found in what is not even a part of it—Europe….

In the new African renaissance, we place great emphasis on the presentation of history. Our history needs to be written as the history of our society, not as the story of European adventures….

In this way, African history can come to guide and direct African action. African history can thus become a pointer at the ideology which should guide and direct African reconstruction.

This connection between an ideological standpoint and the writing of history is a perennial one. (Nkrumah 1970d, 62–63)

**A SUMMATION OF NKRUMAH’S PHILOSOPHIC AND ETHICAL STATEMENTS**

1. Beginning with traditional African values as a base, revolutionary African ideology requires the synthesis of this traditional base with the Islamic and Euro-Christian impact on African culture. These impacts should be thoroughly Africanized in terms of interests and cultural compatibility.

2. When a foreign philosophy is studied it should be seen in the context of the intellectual history to which it belongs, and the context of the milieu in which it was born. If studied in this manner it has a greater potential to contribute to African social development.

3. The “Principle of Sufficient Reason” cannot be applied to the existence of a cosmic raw material that is “self-caused,” which logically means it is “uncaused.” This logical fact implies a basic unity of matter. This concept, when converted into social behavior, provides a supportive environment for the principle of egalitarianism.

4. Many African traditional societies see humans as essentially spiritual beings. The cosmic raw material is “matter” which is a plenum of forces in tension and capable of self-motion. Spirit can be described (not defined) as a surrogate of critically organized matter. The connection between spirit and matter is explainable through “categorial conversion.” Traditional African societies accepted the vitality of matter.

5. ‘Positive action’ leads to liberated zones while ‘negative action’ supports various forms of foreign domination.

**The Cardinal Ethical Principles**

The cardinal principles: “humanism,” “egalitarianism” and “collectivism,” are related to the concept of “unity” through matter’s oneness. They are consistent with Africa’s communalist tradition that imbued matter with life. These are principles of a living conscience and therefore require constant “refinement and clarification.” They also represent core values within the Nkrumahist ideology.
Nkrumah explains in depth, the base and definition of these principles in his work *Consciencism*. Simply speaking their definitions are as follows:

- **Humanism**: recognize human beings as an end within themselves not merely as a means to an end.
- **Egalitarianism**: the equal and fair opportunity for all and each in society to develop to their fullest capacity.
- **Collectivism**: the assertion of the paramount interest of the collective over the alien individual. That is to say that the individual that chooses to serve the collective at the same time chooses him or her self. However those that remain self-absorbed have chosen themselves without the collective.

According to Nkrumah, these values could only be advanced with the organization of a continental-wide nation that supports this ideological exigency with material resources.

### Analytical Focus

Nkrumah had no problem using the analytical tools of dialectical and historical materialism but he felt that they had to be fine-tuned in order to assist with the liberation of colonial “subjects”. In fine-tuning these tools, he added the concepts *categorial conversion* and *cosmic contrast*. These concepts were crucial in explaining the vitality of the cosmic raw material matter. They were also necessary to resolve the outside-inside contradiction suffered mostly by the African intelligentsia.

By applying Philosophical Consciencism to historical materialism, Nkrumah preempted the social determining force of the mode of production and replaced it with the condition of the consciousness. Nkrumah did not allow these different positions to become logically “either-or” debates. He understood both concepts to be needed to secure the accomplishment of African liberty, unity and social revolution. Nkrumah advocated scientific socialism and understood the need for socialists that were ideologically convicted to its establishment. Ideological training, therefore, was seen as the only safeguard for the establishment of a socialist the mode of production. The ideology proposed by Nkrumah was defended by the philosophy of Philosophical Consciencism.

What Nkrumah added to the tool shed of African revolutionaries was Philosophical Consciencism: a materialist philosophy that explained the existence of immaterial phenomenon and the interconnection between it and matter.
CHAPTER 9
Afrocentric Summary of Nkrumah’s Major Contributions

This book reviewed the influences and profound impact that Kwame Nkrumah had on Pan-African agency from 1945–1966. To accomplish that task it first examined the canons of Afrocentric inquiry. It then explicated the concept of Pan-African agency by reviewing its definitions and offering a definition that reflected an awareness of African centeredness. The perennial omnipresence of an agential option to unite African peoples in the face of life-challenging situations was asserted. KMT was given as an example of the persistence of this option within African culture. Other elements of the Pan-African historiography demonstrated significant influences on Nkrumah’s agential development.

Two such elements included Ethiopia’s battles against European imperialism juxtaposed to the activity of West African nationalists in the Gold Coast colony. Those protracted wars to retain African agency influenced many Africans to organize at an optimal level. The debate, however, would remain as to what that optimal level was.

For Nkrumah, following in the path of those who educated him in West Africa, the immediate optimal level was that of West Africa. He would later amend his thought and advocate against a ‘regional first’ approach. His conclusion from his experience was that the optimal level of African agency was a continental socialist union government. The influence of Garvey as well as his educational experience in the USA and England helped to expand Nkrumah’s vision on a united Africa and its descended populations.

Nkrumah’s participation in the 1945 Manchester Congress elevated his stature to the inner-circle of Pan-African activists. It was from this point that Nkrumah vanguard the Pan-African nationalist movement. Two years after that famous congress Nkrumah was involved in liberating an African territory from which he could assist with the prosecution of the Pan-African Nationalist Movement. That movement, as Nkrumah was to become keenly aware of, eventually distinguished itself from nationalists concerned solely with liberation in their territory. This latter force opposed Nkrumah’s efforts.

For Nkrumah, Pan-African Nationalism required liberated territories organized along socialist lines with a population growing in the awareness of Pan-Africanism. To Nkrumah that awareness needed to be formatted with an ideology of the African revolution. Those who worked with Nkrumah would
later come to name that ideology ‘Nkrumahism.’ Nkrumah did not wait for the official naming of the ideology to begin his campaign of massive political education. From his return to the Gold Coast colony until his overthrow, Nkrumah used all media available to him to impress on all who would listen or read his messages, the need for a totally liberated and unified socialist Africa.

Nkrumah strategically set out to organize women and youth as key sectors in the battle to radically transform the African landscape. He also paid meticulous attention to reconstructing the institutions of higher learning within Ghana for it was these institutions that would ensure the methodical dissemination of Nkrumahism: the ideology of the African revolution.

Nkrumah was not the first to use the phrase, “African Personality” but he was the first in modern times to give that concept the resources of an official government. He completed some of the aspects of Garvey’s program and some of Garvey’s symbols became part of everyday Ghana. The most famous of these symbols was the Black Star, which Nkrumah attached to his shipping lines and a public square in Accra. His most important contribution to the memory of Garvey was his organization of millions of Africans toward the redemption of African glory. In this way Nkrumah became the conduit of Pan-African agency, which was apparent in Garvey and others like DuBois. The efforts of both, however, required synthesis and at that, Nkrumah was extraordinary.

Synthesis became a major theme in Nkrumah’s quest to enthrone the agents of Pan-African nationalism. Nkrumah used this approach to both remove the presence of the British Empire from Ghana and to unite African peoples with themselves and their cultural experiences. Nkrumah advocated a philosophy that sought to harmonize the materiality of the world and the spirituality of humanity. Nkrumah also sought to harmonize the Christian and Islamic impacts with the traditional African base. He also advocated certain ethical principals which he claimed were African at root and which urged African societies along the path of socialist development. Finally, Nkrumah demanded an Afrocentric approach to the study of African phenomenon. He saw knowledge as a conditioner of purposeful practice.

As mentioned earlier, others mentioned aspects of Nkrumah’s admonishments and admonitions at earlier times but this book has shown that only Nkrumah can claim to have had the opportunity to implement what to others remained dreams and declarations. In summarizing Nkrumah’s contribution to Pan-African agency from 1945–1966, the attempt here was not to prove uniqueness but to prove effectiveness.

In that light, six major points can be summarized:

2. Nkrumah initiated and developed the first Pan-African liberated state in modern history.
4. Nkrumah developed the concept of socialist African union as the optimal level for the African personality, genius, community, and agency.
5. Nkrumah offered a formal philosophy to defend the ideology of the African Revolution.
6. Nkrumah initiated the first African state sponsored effort for Afrocentric research.

LINKED TRADITIONS OF WEST AFRICAN NATIONALISM AND PAN-AFRICAN NATIONALISM

As previous chapters have shown, Nkrumah was impressed both by the events that preceded him and those of his day. Ethiopia, a beacon for the Pan-African movement since the Battle of Adowa, also became his beacon. He would later interact with its Emperor and encourage him to advance the state he ruled into an icon of African unity. Simultaneously, Nkrumah made Ghana the beacon of Pan-African nationalism.

The impact of Nkrumah’s earlier political educators gave him a base from which to operate as he explored and discovered the world of Africans outside of Africa. While he absorbed Harlem, London, Philadelphia and other places, Accra, Axim, and the memories of Nzimaland remained with him. He organized at every location that he found himself and pushed unity as a principle.

The power of synthesis was both Nkrumah’s opportunity and tool. He was the right person to be in the right place at the right time. He was in the USA and London when Pan-African stirrings were on the rise. He had the opportunity to participate in two conferences in which DuBois and Amy Ashwood Garvey were to participate. He had the opportunity to befriend and cooperate with the likes of George Padmore and Ras T.Makonnen. Finally, he was given the opportunity to return to the Gold Coast colony in a leadership position with an occupation as a mobilizer. It was there that the synthesis of his experiences was to strengthen his hand.

He used his voice and printer’s ink as weapons to etch an awareness of Pan-African agency on an already militant Ghanaian population. He used all of the oratory skills that he accumulated in New York, Philadelphia, London, Manchester, Washington DC, and Axim to propagate the cause of Pan-African nationalism. The overwhelming majority of Africans residing in the Gold Coast colony, for the time in which they accepted Nkrumah as their leader, merged their nationalist interest with that of Pan-African nationalism. Ghanaian nationalism was actually the progeny of Pan-African nationalism for the former without the latter was fragile and prone to attack from irredentist identities.
DEVELOPMENT OF THE FIRST PAN-AFRICAN LIBERATED STATE IN MODERN HISTORY

For a considerable amount of time Ethiopia, and to lesser extents Haiti and Liberia stood as the independent zones of Pan-African support. Liberia, which was approached by Garvey and DuBois, satisfied neither of them. The ideological baggage that accompanied the Americentric location of the Liberian ruling elite restricted its Pan-African agency. Haiti had its period of militancy but it was far from the motherland. Ethiopia was in the motherland but ruled by a monarch still in the tradition of an enlightened African feudalism. Ethiopia’s agency was in such disarray in 1935 that Garvey publicly commented on his disappointment with the emperor’s response to Italian aggression. Nkrumah was cut from a different cultural cloth than the emperor.

Even before independence, Nkrumah began to use the offices of the state to improve the lives of Ghanaian residents by qualifying their education and skill levels. Upon Ghana’s formal independence, Nkrumah began to use Ghana’s treasury to support the African Revolution throughout the world. Ghana became the ‘Mecca’ of African revolutionaries as well as to others committed to liberation from colonialism and neo-colonialism. Che Guevara, Fidel Castro, and Ho Chi Minh were affiliated with Nkrumah around this time. Ghana became known through the orature of Malcolm X as the “fountainhead of Pan-Africanism” (Breitman 1965, 62).

A liberated zone by definition is a zone from which to launch and support liberation. It is not merely a state being, it is a character or a state of doing. Nkrumah declared Ghana’s independence only meaningful if it was involved in liberating and uniting Africa. Some may have taken his statement as merely exciting rabble but Nkrumah showed his concrete support to the liberation movements and newly independent states. Ghana’s unflinching assistance saved Guinea’s independence. Many of the future heads of states were present at Ghana’s sponsored conference for All-African People. While there were states independent in Africa before Ghana, it had not dawned on them that they should come together. This was left to Nkrumah and his empowered circle of Pan-Africanists.

Under their charge Ghana organized conferences, sponsored scholarships and provided training to freedom fighters. As shown in this study many of the future leaders of Africa met each other in Ghana while training to liberate their territory from imperialism. Tanzania, whose president had attended Pan-African assemblies in Ghana, would later build a base for Africans to launch liberation struggles into the southern part of the continent. Egypt was a militant liberated zone but was not dedicated to Pan-Africanism at its outset. This came later as a result cooperation with Nkrumah’s Ghana and Touré’s Guinea.
ELEVATION OF PAN-AFRICAN AGENCY TO THE LEVEL OF NATION-STATES

Mindful of his first visit to Liberia and the cold shoulder shown him by those who only recognized state power, Nkrumah knew that state power was seen as a distinguishing point of agential reality. After becoming the Leader of Government, and being received with state honors to Liberia, Nkrumah recognized two things. First, his words were given more attention than previously and second, Liberia was able to marshal resources, meager as they were, which were not imaginable to organizations without state power.

Other states that were independent before Ghana rarely recognized themselves as part of an African reality. They were preoccupied with an identity from earlier eras and earlier empires. Egypt was the closest among them to being a Pan-African liberated zone during this time but a primary Arabic identity blurred its vision of a Pan-African nation. This was Nkrumah’s only criticism of Nasser and it was given in confidence to June Milne. Nevertheless, Nasser’s speeches (Nasser, n.d.) show his change in terminology and identification with his southern compatriots over time.

With Nasser, thus with Egypt, Nkrumah was a unifier. In Nasser’s earlier writings, he refers to the African continent as the ‘second circle,’ following the Arab circle. Nasser stated back then that Egypt could not “stand aloof for one important reason—we ourselves are in Africa” (Nasser n.d., 3). While in Africa, Nasser considered himself Arab before he was African. His synthesis in this area came a little later as he conflicted with the ‘lighter’ Northeastern Arabs and as his relationship with Africa heightened. Liberated Ghana reached out to the independent states and Nasser became an important friend and brother to Nkrumah. Nasser’s resulting ‘location shifts’ was reflected in his public pronouncements. As late as January 1958 Nasser was expressing condescending paternal comments on African people. In a press interview to American reporters that month Nasser told them that the Africans were changing a great deal from their past primitiveness because of modern communications. He said that they were learning about liberation and democracy. Nasser, like many others had seen Africans through eyes that could not recognize agency. On 21 June 1958 Nasser responded to an earlier address made by Nkrumah by saying, “Today, when we meet as two African countries, representing free Africa, we look to the future so that Africa may attain this strong independent personality” (ibid., 10).

Nkrumah’s Ghana significantly changed Nasser’s image of the African. By 28 July 1963 Nasser would say,

During long years, we were kept isolated from Africa; colonialism prevented us, separated us from unity with Africa; and today, we find our brothers extending their hands to us and we are increasing our knowledge about Africa…. The universities are our vanguard in this field; they can make the researches and give us the correct results, the sound solution for
an African solidarity, for tightening the relations between the United Arab Republic and African countries. We shall no long rely only on books written by foreigners which may contain distorted informations [sic] misleading dissertations. (ibid., 56)

Nasser deepened his relation with Nkrumah early after the First CIAS and Nkrumah married Fathia Rizk, a Coptic Egyptian, with Nasser’s blessings. Though metaphoric, future historians will point to the marriage of Nkrumah and Rizk as a merging of Ghana and Egypt as well as a linking of Africa across the Sahara, across the sands of time, and across periods of classical greatness.

Nkrumah’s impact on Sékou Touré and Guinea Conakry is mentioned throughout the literature on the subject of Pan-Africanism. These two statesmen reflected a unity that was unparalleled. The impact was bi-directional as Touré was a staunch fighter for African freedom though not as well versed on its unity as Nkrumah. Nkrumah befriended Touré early cementing their unity in concrete state-to-state activities.

Nkrumah found that approaching and supporting organizations and their leaders before obtaining state power was a more assured way of gaining their commitment to unity than if he waited until after independence. European and American imperialism also displayed a high aptitude toward this fact. They often countered state level Pan-Africanism by enticing new states to make bi-lateral pacts with former colonial powers. While Nkrumah was able to influence the older independent states and some novices, notably Guinea, Mali, Algeria, Uganda, and the Congo under Lumumba, his resources could not match those of the European Empire. That empire supported those in opposition to Nkrumah within the African Unity movement and inside Ghana.

When the Opposition overthrew Nkrumah, Touré publicly announced him as the head of the state of Guinea (Nkrumah 1990). Nkrumah was honored and moved. Neither Africa nor the world had seen that level of self-sacrificed sovereignty. Nkrumah negotiated the invitation downward and accepted the position of co-president (Ibid.). His position was not a token one but one of real authority (Ture Interview 1998). From Guinea, he continued to coordinate the efforts of various freedom fighter organizations.

THE CONCEPT OF SOCIALIST AFRICAN UNION AS THE OPTIMAL LEVEL FOR THE AFRICAN PERSONALITY, GENIUS, COMMUNITY, AND PAN-AFRICAN AGENCY

Nkrumah imagined collective African agency at the global level and was directly responsible for initiating the ‘African group’ at the United Nations. Nkrumah referred to the group of African states as the African community. He viewed this community as a potentially powerful reflection of the African Personality and genius in world affairs. To Nkrumah, however, the full fruition of African
agency would not be realized until it was organized into one organic political unit, which had one face of policy in relation to the rest of the world. Nkrumah approached the wealth of Africa in the same way that he approached the wealth of Ghana. In Ghana, he was able to direct the profits from cocoa sales to the development of other areas in the country. Nkrumah saw in a united Africa, human and natural resource potential to elevate Africa to the position of a superpower in the world.

Essentially, Nkrumah wanted global power for Africans and felt that the reorganization of Africa was necessary to achieve it. He sought the power to reduce the threat of human mutual destruction. He also sought it to improve the living standards of the average African. To Nkrumah, the creation of an African Socialist Union became a strategic principal though he did show flexibility in the proposals he put before successive OAU summits.

A PHILOSOPHY TO DEFEND THE IDEOLOGY OF THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION

Simply put, policies reflect basic philosophies. Often discussions of philosophies were held only by its doctors. Nkrumah saw philosophy as a discussion that had to be addressed since his intent was to harmoniously reconcile conflicting worldviews that shared African living spaces. His academic preparation in the area helped and his loyalty to traditional notions kept him grounded to the needs of the African population.

Nkrumah articulated a philosophy that explained the many lively forces that occupied a territory; their interrelationships; and the surrogates of their interrelationships. He effectively reconciled the atheistic notions of socialist intellectuals so as to prevent the alienation of the more religious and spiritually inclined African. Finally, Nkrumah advanced some basic cardinal principals that were to bring about the type of behavior conducive to building new men and women.

This philosophy for decolonization was ‘Consciencism’ while its tactical adjunct was known as ‘positive action.’ At the global level, the strategy called for a united socialist Africa as the power base of Pan-African agency.

THE FIRST AFRICAN STATE SPONSORED AFROCENTRIC RESEARCH

Occasionally, usually in a character attack, academic dissenters would claim that Nkrumah was not a scholar. These nay-sayers either overlooked or rejected Nkrumah’s academic degrees, corpus of written works, or professional titles. Most often, they disagreed with Nkrumah’s approach to education. As shown in this study, Nkrumah advocated education for a knowledge that led to human service. He also advocated a cultural grounding for education. His launching of the
Encyclopaedia Africana and the African Studies Institute at the University of Ghana were two examples of his contribution to such an education.

Much like Asante and other Afrocentric scholars, Nkrumah called for the historiography of Africans to be centered on African interest and experiences. The actors in this history and ultimate forces responsible for its development were to be found in Africa. Nkrumah had attempted to influence the African Studies Association in this direction but their scholars were too linked to colonial disciplines for the influence to stick.

The resources that Ghana committed to Afrocentric education was a boon that has yet to be matched. For Nkrumah this commitment was not to a mere color-coding of faculty but to a corrective hermeneutics. Afrocentric education was to serve the purpose of building an optimal power base for the African Revolution, which was in turn to improve the lives of Africans in particular and humanity in general.

Before closing this study it is necessary to acknowledge the critical remarks made by some authors who considered that Nkrumah failed in his mission because he did not tease out Marxism as a foreign and hostile creed. Champion among this argument was Okadigbo (1985) and his critique was visited in the chapter on Nkrumahism. Another critique of Nkrumah came from W.S. Thompson (1969), whose work charges that Nkrumah was a committed and persistent warrior but a mediocre judge of character and a poor statesman driven by a desire to be recognized. From Thompson’s view, Nkrumah was a meddler in the affairs of other African ‘nations.’ Davidson tended to think that Nkrumah’s error was in accepting the nation-state formula (1973, 1992).

Some of the criticism that Nkrumah received was in direct response to his formula of synthesis. Nkrumah’s global travels made his experiences vastly different from the bulk of persons that he would work within the CPP and other organizations in Africa. Thus, his efforts to organize African descendants from the Americas and in Europe; as well as his drafting and supporting African Freedom Fighters from other parts of Africa, were seen as misuses of Ghanaian funds and resources.

None of these criticisms, in part or combined, can negate the contributions that Nkrumah made to Pan-African agency from 1945 through 1966. It is this latter concern that this study has focused on.

Contemporary declarations of an African Union must take into account Nkrumah’s initiatives and experiences. The impact that Nkrumah had on Nasser should also be factored in when contemplating the key role of Libya’s Qaddafi, an African leader that was deeply inspired by Nasser. The differences between Qaddafi and Mbeki on the question of foreign policy and a unified military echo the times of Nkrumah during his earlier attempt to establish the African Union. There are, of course, distinct differences between the era described in this book and the early twenty-first century but the essential challenges facing the de facto
existence of an African Union remain unchanged. In that light it is hoped that this book serves as an important contribution to the literature informing such a noble endeavor.
CHAPTER ONE

1. In this work the term “Pan-African nationalist” is a person committed to the establishment of a continent-wide African nation.

2. The distinction between Black Nationalist and African nationalist is that the former believes that a nation is predominately determined by biological race while the latter believes that nations result predominately from group training and group interaction with the natural environment. Areas that experience a racist settler-colonialism are more prone to develop race nationalists.

3. This is the paradigm that supports the establishment of Pan-African nationalism and global African agency.

4. Nkrumah taught philosophy and “Negro History,” at Lincoln University and African languages at the University of Pennsylvania.

5. He was president of the African Students Association in the United States of America and vice-president of the West African Student Union.

6. Nkrumah pledged the Black fraternity, Phi Beta Sigma. He recounts this experience in his Autobiography.

7. Nkrumah wrote at least two philosophical papers on Marxist theory and the social sciences while at the University of Pennsylvania. His focus was on materialist dialectics. Though he wanted to write his master thesis on the Philosophy of Imperialism this request was refused and he ended writing on Ethno-philosophy.

8. Nkrumah was the editor for the African Student Association in the US and Canada’s organ titled, African Interpreter, which was distributed from 1941 through 1943.

9. Kemet (KMT) is one of the ancient names Egypt used for itself. The word Egypt is of Greek origin and derives from the word “Aegyptos.”

10. Ancient Egypt is interchanged with the term, “KMT,” probably pronounced with a Coptic vocalic style. KMT is one of the formal names that the ancient Egyptians gave to their nation.

11. Alternate spellings exist throughout this book for the Nzima, Asante, and Fante subculture groups as follows: Nzema, Ashanti, and Fanti.

12. The term ‘Odikro’ is occasionally used as is the term ‘chief.’ The first term is an indigenous one.
CHAPTER TWO

1. There is a variation in the spelling of “Nkmmahism” such that it may appear as “Nkrumaism.”
2. This is the sense that what is good for the collective is good for the individual.
3. Seku Ture offers a resolution to a seeming contradiction between Asante’s concern with obtaining subject status for the African and Nkrumah’s concern with obtaining the object status for the African. Ture claims that the human is the means and end, subject and object, of development.
4. Those values are (1) Divine truth and reality; (2) Cosmic order and harmony; (3) Social justice and law; (4) Consciousness and rightness; (5) Rules of human conduct; and (6) Hope for eternity in the afterlife (Icons of Maāt, by T. Obenga, The Source Editions, Philadelphia, PA, 1996, page 1).
5. Karenga’s Kawaida principles approximates these values and are as follows: Umoja-Unity; Kujichagulia-Self-determination; Ujima- collective work and responsibility; Ujamaa- cooperative economics; Nia-purpose; Kuumba- creativity; and Imani-faith. Though not word for word, the Kawaida “Nguzo Saba” are subsumed within the values of Maāt as identified in Obenga’s work.
6. The basis of the disagreement resides in the various ontologies of the disciplines within which scholars were trained. Since Asante, Keto, and Obenga accept Kemet as the African classical referent they tend to agree with the Maātic value system.
7. A sampling of demeaning terms that saturated early literature include, “native,” “kaffir,” “fellah,” “nigra,” “nigger,” “darkey,” “coon,” “monkey,” “slave,” “jigaboo,” and “buck.”
8. This ideology is explored in detail in chapter 8.
9. One can recall the rebirth of M.Lefkowitz denial of Egyptian contribution to Greek civilization.

CHAPTER THREE

1. It is so-called because a careful look at the etymological history of the term ‘Diaspora’ speaks to a history that does not adequately coincide with the experience of African descendants outside of Africa.
2. See chapter 2 of this work.
3. The Maātian principles are “truth, justice, integration, solidarity, community, harmony, good, beauty, and self-wisdom.” (Obenga 1995, 77)
4. One tape used was obtained in Accra during the celebration of Fortieth Anniversary of Ghana’s official independence from British Colonialism. Another tape was widely circulated in the mid-1980s and had a half an hour presentation of Nkrumah at the United Nations in 1960.
5. Other key speeches may have been published in languages other than English but this work is restricted to the ones appearing in English.
6. The word Negro fell into this category. Nkrumah detested its use.
7. Panaf Books Ltd., an offshoot from Panaf Publications Ltd., was the company to published the journal, Africa and the World. Panaf Books was to ensure the reprinting of Nkrumah’s books after the 1966 coup d’tat.
8. I took the opportunity to interview Wachman since he was the Provost at Temple during the writing of this book. Even he was amazed that he had been included in Milne’s book since his relationship with Nkrumah was so brief.

9. It should be noted that Nkrumah included the Belgian Congo in his category of West Africa.

10. The use of this term highlights the difficulty of using a culturally biased language that tends to denigrate the different cultural vantages. ‘Ethnic’ as a term addresses a group of people considered to be heathens or non-believers in the monotheistic view of ‘Western’ definers.

11. The following quote is found on page 5 of Kwame Nkrumah the Conakry Years: His life and letters (1990).

    Nkrumah’s son Gamal Gorkeh Nkrumah, then aged seven, remembered every detail of that traumatic day. Before the fighting at Flagstaff House began, he had been woken early by the roaring of unfed lions in the zoo a short distance from the house. Soon, the whole family was awake. Gunfire from the direction of the airport was heard, and the broadcast of the coup leader, Colonel E.T. Kotoka announcing the coup. Fathia at once phoned the Egyptian Embassy telling them to contact Nasser to ask him to send an aircraft at once to Accra to rescue them. Her call was just in time. Minutes later, the telephone was cut off. The family took refuge in the Egyptian Embassy until the afternoon when the aircraft sent by Nasser arrived. On the drive to Accra airport their car was stopped by tanks and troops at an army road block. Fathia and her three young children were ordered out of the car at gunpoint. Fathia showed no fear, declaring her anger at the treatment of her husband who had done so much for them and for Ghana. Clearly taken by surprise at being confronted with Nkrumah’s family, the officer in charge was at a loss to know what action to take. With loaded guns still pointed at them, Fathia and the children waited at the roadside while the officer radioed for instructions. Eventually, the family was allowed to continue to the airport, and finally make their escape to Cairo.

12. Limited resources and my inability to read German caused me to omit the text written by Hanna Reitsch titled Ich flog fur Kwame Nkrumah. (1968) Milne speaks of Flight Captain Reitsch’s correspondence with Nkrumah. Reitsch has unique pictures and information about the glider training school that existed in Ghana during Nkrumah’s presidency and is worth investigation. Nkrumah also mentions the important work that Reitsch had done for the Young Pioneers.

13. Though not an author, Botsio is included in this group because he was so frequently interviewed by those writing on this era and topic.

14. Milne is mentioned above but since she became so close to Nkrumah she is also mentioned here as a person that crossed categories.

15. A prolific and brilliant author in The Spark often penned under the name Julius Sago. W.S. Thompson (1968) claimed that Ikoku was the defacto editor of the ideological publication.

16. Adjei was associated with Nkrumah since his student days in the USA as they worked on the ASA’s organ, The African Interpreter together. They reconnected in
Europe (Nkrumah 1973a). Adjei was one of the participants in the Pan-African Congress in Manchester (1945) (Langley 1979). Adjei was an original member of the UGCC and the first to invite Nkrumah to become its General Secretary. With other members of the UGCC leadership, Adjei parted ways with Nkrumah when Nkrumah sought to radicalize the movement for independence. Adjei did not rejoin Nkrumah until he joined the CPP in 1953—four years after its founding (Ghana Yearbook 1959). He became the Minister of External Affairs from 1959 through 1961 at which time he became the Foreign Minister until 1962 (Thompson, W.S. 1968).

17. This was the self-ascribed name of ancient Egypt and serves as the classical reference point of Afrocentric works.

18. Natambo’s work still seems to only recognize the defensive posture nationalism and he leaves out Pan-African Nationalist movements in parts of Africa other than KMT.

CHAPTER FOUR

1. As a term, “Academy” (originally “Akademy”) goes back to third century AD Greece. It spoke to the earliest of European organized institutions of higher learning organized by Plato. The author is well aware of African (especially KMTic) antecedents to this time period but the intent of the term’s usage in this text requires the distinction of the European model. That model, while it traces its name to the Platonic period, is really rooted in twelfth century AD Europe. This is when some of Europe’s older universities were established. As Europe began to expand beyond its borders these Universities played important roles of informing expansionists and recording their experiences. For the purposes of this paper, the study will refer to institutions of Higher Learning and their professional associations that are guided by European cultures and customs.

2. This book recognizes the historical fact that the United States of America began as a settler-colony and has maintained a cultural posture that reflects that reality. References, implicit and explicit, to a European cultural base provide ample proof of this fact.

3. This reference is good for information background history of various Islamic sects formed in the USA but the reader should be aware of the ranting and raving apparent in the author’s clear bias.

4. MAÄT and NFR are two values present throughout African social evolution. See T.Obenga for a thorough treatise on this topic. Nkrumahists referred to the principles of ‘humanism’ and ‘egalitarianism’ as underlying principles driving the African Revolution.

5. Most published scholars agree with Nkrumah’s pronouncement that the ancient African belief is that we live in a material world. At the same time, without contradiction, Humanity is postulated as a spiritual entity. The apparent contradiction is resolved through the concept of continuity and connectedness. Thus, Humanity is in the world as a distinct entity not sole entity as some Greek philosophers, especially solipsists, have asserted.

6. The term “People” is capitalized purposely to introduce the paradigmatic power of collectivity in the Pan-African Centered Perspective (PACP). This designation is
self-conscious similar to the capitalization of the term T in individualist dominated English. Language, to be useful, serves those seeking to use it, otherwise it locks the user into self-defeating constructs of cultural confusion. Ideology screams out through language. Thus, festering individualism is reflected in the way that terms reflecting the Human species or collectivity, are referred to in lower case letters while individual actors of the 1st and 2nd person are capitalized. This preference toward individualism is also reflected in the default reference to the generic Human being as ‘3rd person singular.’ The author proposes the utilization of a “3rd person collective” present and active in Ebonics and in other living African languages.

7. M.O. West, “Pan-Africanism, capitalism and racial uplift: the rhetoric of African business formation in colonial Zimbabwe,” *African Affairs*, vol. 92, no. 367, (April, 1993): 263. This is an excellent article that does a review of the literature of those that advocate an economic Pan-Africanism over a politically led one.

8. The Pan-African Centered Perspective recognizes these cardinal values to be synonymous with Ma‘at, as mentioned above. In the language of Ideology these values are stated as the following principles: (a) Humanism, (b) Egalitarianism, and (c) Collectivism. *Humanism:* That principle that deals with minimum acceptable behavior between individuals and between the individual and the collective. This value postulates an indivisibility of humanity and human beings. To some in various Christian schools, humanism is equated with Satanism because of the elevated value it places on humanity. That is not the African perspective! *Egalitarianism:* Speaks to the even and fair opportunity offered to each member of the society to contribute and to develop through that contribution. *Collectivism:* The principle that asserts the collective’s interests over the individual’s. See Nkrumah’s *Consciencism*.

9. Ancient Egypt was originally known as KMT and spelled KMT.

**CHAPTER FIVE**

1. Fanti and Fante are used interchangeably as there is not consensus on its English spelling in the texts under review.

2. As in the case of the Fanti, Asante and Ashanti are used interchangeably in the texts under review.

3. The name, “Apollonia,” is often used in historical text to refer to Nzima, which is sometimes found spelled as Nzema.

4. The *Treaty of 1831*, signed by George Maclean on behalf of the King of England, Princess “Akianvah” and Chief “Quagua on behalf of the King of Ashanti, King Aggery of Cape Coast, King “Adookoo” of the Fanti, and a number of neighboring Kings, included the following passage:

   The King of Ashantee having deposited in Cape Coast Castle, in the presence of the above mentioned parties, the sum of 600 ounces of gold, and having delivered into the hands of the Governor two young men of the royal family of Ashantee, namely, ‘Ossoo Ansah,’ and ‘Ossoo In Quantamissah,’ as security that he will keep peace with the said parties in all time coming, peace is hereby declared be-twixt the said King of Ashantee and all and each of the parties aforesaid, to continue in all

5. The use of the term “educated elite” by Hadjor and other Ghanaian writers, as opposed to the term, “intelligentsia,” is aptly explained in the following quote:

   One result of Sir Ofori Atta’s opposition was to place him in direct conflict with what came to be called the intelligentsia of the Gold Coast…. Because of his eloquence, both in the Fanti language and in English, his high training in politics, law and in philosophy, both in this country [Gold Coast] and in England, together with his masterful control of a trenchant pen, Mr. Sekyi was eminently fitted by temperament to put the case of the intelligentsia against the Chiefs. Between 1920 and 1925 the Gold Coast had a foretaste of the promise of strife or peace we could expect from a continued maintenance of acrimonious “party politics.” While Sekyi wrote in the press, Sir Ofori Atta and Casely Hayford fought the wordy battle in the Legislative Council, …the one believed that the request for the grant of liberty could proceed from the intelligentsia, and the other that the request should proceed from the natural rulers…. In the past the Chiefs had submitted themselves to be led by the educated people into the new realm of co-operation with a “lettered race” of European rulers in the government of this country; now the Chiefs themselves having become educated, claimed that they should not merely be led, but should themselves be admitted into the front rank amongst the leaders, that they too should share in the labour to bring peace and happiness to the Gold Coast people....” quoted from: J.B.Danquah, *Introduction*, in M.J.Sampson, *Gold Coast Men of Affairs*, Dawsons of Pall Mall, London, 1936; 1969, pp. 33–34.

**CHAPTER SIX**

1. This meeting is usually referred to as the Manchester PAC in this book. This alternate reference is in recognition of the controversial enumeration of the conferences.

2. Esedebe, quoting Imanuel Gueiss, erroneously reports that this was the effort of Mrs. Amy Jacques Garvey—Marcus Garvey’s second wife. This mistaken identity was also adopted by UNESCO’s volume VIII of the *General History of Africa* (Mazrui 1983, 744–45).

3. According to Langley (1973) this session was on “North West Africa” (353).

4. ‘Other-location’: Afrocentrically, ‘dislocation’ speaks to a person’s or people’s actions which reflect a mode of operation or behavior which is not centered in their people’s cultural origin or interests. The term implies error on the part of the actor (s). ‘Other-location’ however, implies the conscious abandonment of a known center.

5. The UGCC was initially formed in August of 1947 according to Ako Adjei’s biography in the *Ghana Yearbook* (1959).

6. The conference never took place.

7. This indigenous word is used interchangeably with the term ‘chief’.
8. Nkrumah contradicts this date in his *Autobiography* in which he gives the date of his maiden presentation in Accra as 29 February 1948. In his *I Speak of Freedom*, however, he quotes on comments of his Accra presentation from *The African Morning Post*, January 21, 1948. This earlier date fits more logically in the sequence of events.

9. More on these organizations is discussed in the next chapter.

10. This an indigenous term for traditional rulers.

11. Kwame Ture would continue to urge organization in this exact declarative style. For those who did not know of the Nkrumah exhortation this link is revealing of Ture’s fidelity to Nkrumah’s strategic themes.

12. Nkrumah once called for an “African irredentism” himself but he intended it as a collection of traditional boundaries within the framework of an overriding African Union.

13. Some might consider Haiti as an earlier center of Pan-African revolutionary activity.

14. According to Langley (1973), Nkrumah called for a “Sixth Pan-African Congress at Kumasi” (366) to be held in December of 1953. It was sparsely attended but had notables present including Mrs. Ransome-Kuti, H.O.Davies and Azikiwe from Nigeria as well as the Liberian consul-general in Accra, representing Liberia.

15. Notables that came to reside in Ghana during Nkrumah’s leadership included Julian Mayfield, W.E.B. and Shirley DuBois, George and Dorothy Padmore, Maya Angelou, Dorothy and Aldaephus Hunton and others. Check Walter’s book as it is informative on this account.

16. See next chapter for a detailed account of Nkrumah’s action on this account.

17. The proposals included the “Casablanca Charter”; “Monrovia Charter”; a Ghanaian proposal authored by Nkrumah; and a proposal from Ethiopia.

**CHAPTER SEVEN**

1. See preceding chapter.

2. Adamafio called this group the Young Pioneers Movement in his text (1982) and occasionally by Nkrumah in his text (1970b). Nkrumah, however, has varied and referred to this group as the Ghana Youth Pioneers (1997b) and Young Pioneers organization (1997a). Unless directly quoted, they will be referred to as the Young Pioneers or YP(s).

3. It was formerly known as the University College.

4. Formerly known as the Kumasi College of Technology.

5. This term is the transliteration of the name that Ancient Egypt called itself.

**CHAPTER EIGHT**

* The term ‘categorial’ is a philosophical term that implies a moral category.
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