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A public lecture delivered at the Agip Recital Hall, Muson Centre, Onikan, Lagos on 18 February, 2006.

In a nutshell, my presentation today argues that:

1] The 20th century has been the most disastrous century, so far, for Black Africa. It was the century in which, under colonialism, Black Africa was subjected to culturecide at the hands of White Power. That culturecide destroyed our ability to resist the genocide that is now taking place. As a result, this 21st century is likely to see the physical extermination of Black Africans, unless those now under 30 organize and defeat the extermination campaign that white power has already unleashed on Black Africa. Therefore,

2] The problem of the 21st century is the problem of African Power – how to build it, and enough of it, to end the long era of our defeats and disasters in the race war, to prevent our extermination, and to ensure our dignity.

3] We should particularly note that Lugardism is a false framework, and these Lugardist states, Nigeria included, are the wrong foundation for building African Power

INTRODUCTION:

I just want to get us started on an examination of the awful situation in which we find ourselves in Nigeria, and in Africa, at the start of the 21st century, after some 50 years of fake independence, and more than 500 years of race war. We, Nigerians and Black Africans as a whole, have been in a race war for 500 years or more, and we have no chance of surviving it if we refuse to recognize that fact and act on it.

Since 1960, many attempts have been made to diagnose the trouble with Nigeria. Chief among the usual suspects have been, “tribalism,” corruption, and bad leadership. May I submit that these are symptoms, not the underlying causes; the fevers, not the malaria or typhoid parasites. Our problems are much more serious than corruption & co. They include identity
crises of various kinds, a lunatic elite, cultural schizophrenia, Eurotoxification and the fact that Nigeria is not a nation but a noyau—i.e., a society of inward antagonism, one held together by mutual internal antagonism, one which could not carry on if its members had no fellow members to hate. And if we want to end the troubles of the Nigerians, we must dig deeper to find the fundamental causes. And I would like, today, to draw your attention to some of the systemic causes that do not usually appear on our radar.

1] First of all is Nigeria itself: **The fundamental trouble with Nigeria is Nigeria itself—the Nigerian state.** This Lugardist state, by which Nigeria was invented and is maintained, has been a disaster for the Nigerian peoples/nationalities and their society.

2] Second, is the refusal by Nigerians to recognize the race war in which Lugardism is a key weapon that white power is using against Black Africans.

3] Third is our failure, in Nigeria and in Black Africa as a whole, to study the Haitian experience and learn from it.

I, now, invite you to examine the following theses:

1] The Lugardist state is an enemy to the Nigerian population;
2] Black Africans, including Nigerians, are in the semi-final phase of a race war with the European and the Arab branches of White Power.
3] Nigeria has been Haitified--Turning Nigeria into a Haiti has been a way to totally defeat its people and all of Black Africa in this semi-final phase of the race war. For, just as Haiti in 1804 was the hope of the Black race, even so, in 1960, was Nigeria the hope of Black Africa. And, for your information, the Haitification of Nigeria is almost completed by now.
4] The key enemy weapons in the race war today include the AU, NEPAD, and the organs of the New World Order, especially the UN and its agencies.
5] If Africans do not build African Power now, and use it to prevent their final defeat in the race war, Africans will be exterminated in this 21st century. This, therefore, is the do-or-die century for Africans.

Recognition of these facts is the first step on the road to liberation and survival for the Nigerian peoples/nationalities. I shall say a little to introduce each thesis, and we can then together explore and illuminate them through questions and answers that, I hope, will continue long after we leave this hall.
THESIS #1: LUGARDISM AND THE LUGARDIST STATE

In a broadcast on January 15, 1970, General Yakubu Gowon, the then Head of the Lugardist state of Nigeria, proclaimed the Lugardist doctrine that justifies the continued existence of the Nigerian state. He said:

“Our objectives in fighting the war to crush Ojukwu’s rebellion were always clear. We desired to preserve the territorial integrity and unity of Nigeria. For, as one country, we would be able to maintain lasting peace amongst our various communities; achieve rapid economic development to improve the lot of our people; guarantee a dignified future and respect in the world, for our posterity and contribute to African unity and modernization. On the other hand, the small successor states in a disintegrated Nigeria would be victims of perpetual war and misery and neocolonialism. Our duty was clear, and we are today vindicated.”


Source: Insider Weekly, August 8, 2005

This doctrine states the reasons for the continued existence and public toleration of this Lugardist contraption called the Federal Republic of Nigeria. I think we are all living witnesses to the fact, which our newspapers daily confirm, that none of these claims is true and that none has been vindicated.

Has the Lugardist state preserved the territorial integrity and unity of Nigeria? No! Just think of Bakassi. Has it maintained lasting peace amongst our various communities? No! Just think of the inter-communal clashes reported periodically from Plateau, Kano, Taraba, Benue, Delta states and elsewhere. Has it achieved economic development, let alone ‘rapid economic development’ or improved the lot of our people? No! Just think of the daily deterioration in the condition of life of our people, and recall the coup-day rhetoric we heard regularly for the past 40 years, denouncing each ousted regime for its failures in this regard. Has it guaranteed a dignified future and respect in the world for our posterity? No! Unless it counts as earning the respect of the world Nigeria’s appearing, year after year, on the list of the poorest and most corrupt countries in the world? Have we escaped neo-colonialism? If so, why are we still in the debt trap where we are being robbed by the Paris Club and the transnational corporations? And what are the agents of the IMF, the World Bank and other imperialist organs doing in the offices and corridors of power in Nigeria?
What has the Lugardist state actually accomplished in its century of existence? It has destroyed our sense of community and atomized us into the Hobbesian condition of a ‘war of everyone against everyone’ in the ruthless struggle for money to buy what it has brainwashed us to consider ‘the good life’; a condition of chronic insecurity, of ‘continual fear and danger of violent death’—as from ‘accidental discharge’ from the guns of its policemen; or from its rampaging soldiers, like at Odi, or Zaki-Biam and other places, or from assassin’s bullets targeted even at such big winners in its system as Kudirat Abiola, Alfred Rewane, Alex Ibru, Bola Ige, Harry Marshall, A.K. Dikibo, etc in the last decade; a condition where life has been ‘solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short’ for everyone—even for Generals like Bisalla, Vatsa, Shehu Musa Yar Adua, and Chief MKO Abiola, let alone for the APO Six and countless ordinary victims of the police and armed robbers. Thus, even without Nigeria’s disintegration, we have been victims of misery, neocolonialism and perpetual war inflicted on us by the Lugardist state itself.

From the foregoing, we can see that each and every one of the itemized claims of Lugardist doctrine is demonstrably false. The Nigerian state has failed to satisfy any of its own advertised justifications for its continued existence. This goes to show that Lugardism is a hoax, and Nigeria is a failed state even by its own criteria.

In 45 years, under local comprador management, this Lugardist state has reduced Nigeria to a shanty country, a refugee camp where there is no order or authority; where social anarchy reigns, since government has abdicated its responsibilities and anyone can, with impunity, disturb the peace and, with noisy loudspeakers blaring songs and drums and prayers all night long, keep others from sleeping.

“Development” has been so successful that we now have industries everywhere: the 419 industry; the ‘wetin-you-carry’ industry that recently yielded N17billion to its Chairman of the Board; the lootocrat or Authority-stealing industry that has piled up billions of dollars in the foreign bank accounts of high state officials; and the gospel and miracles industry on every street; the thugs and ethnic militia industry that provide “jobs” for the tens of millions of the unemployed and lets them extort their livelihood from people on the roads. We have all these strange industries, but no iron-and-steel or machine tools or aerospace industries. It seems that the comprador managers of the Nigerian state overheard that a STEEL industry was vital for development and have built a STEAL industry instead. That’s probably their best understanding of what a steel industry means!
This Lugardist state has, within a century, destroyed every society and killed every culture it trapped in its prison, and has reduced its traumatized captives to a 100 million mob of Hobbesian idiots who have lost all sense of community and solidarity with one another. Nigeria is now a place where the unspeakable is routine news. With the decay of both the state and social authority structures for arbitrating disputes, neighbours resort to do-it-yourself justice using privatized violence—hence the spate of acid and machete attacks by people on their neighbours. Nigeria has been reduced to an amoral land where greedy people think nothing of kidnapping their neighbour’s children and selling them to be killed for fresh body parts to be sold abroad for organ transplants. That’s the racket being covered up by the epidemic of so-called ritual murder we read about these days. It used to be that, in Lagos, if you were attacked by robbers and you shouted Ole! Ole! (i.e. ‘Thief! Thief!’) your neighbours would assemble and lynch the thief in solidarity with you. Not anymore! Now, the people around will run away and leave you to the mercy of your attackers. Fear, acute individualism and deep insecurity have killed the community spirit.

In the 35 years since Gowon propounded his doctrine, this Lugardist state has been unable to do those things that it claimed it exists to do; and it has done terrible things that it ought not to do to the society. It has inflicted cultural schizophrenia and social decay; it has fostered an ethos of greedy incompetence; it has replaced the work ethic with a criminal instant-riches mentality, and it has turned governance into brazen gangsterism and enthroned Al Capone on Aso Rock [the Presidential palace in Abuja]. It has thereby been an instrument of large scale culturecide.

How did this Lugardist state achieve this feat of social destruction and culturecide? The chief instruments were economic: principally, [1] the commoditization of land and the introduction of individualist land tenure a century ago, which slowly dissolved the communal holdings; [2] the emergence, with the discovery of oil, of a rentier state which dominates the economy with its huge rent revenues derived from foreign concessionaries—this has turned the economy upside down, and made everyone dependent on state favours instead of keeping the state dependent on taxing the economically active population for its revenues; [3] the Land Thief Decree, a.k.a. Land Use Decree, which robbed communities of their ancestral land, thereby quietly turning the population into a vast rootless proletariat with no landed communal interest to sustain their local structure and cohesion; [4] the ravages of SAP and other economic policies which have impoverished most people and left them without financial stamina; [5] a culturally alienating, white supremacist education system that inculcates possessive individualism and trains people for non-existent bureaucratic jobs, which makes its products unfit for self-employment in productive activities. By
such measures, imposed in the course of a century, this Lugardist state destroyed the communitarian foundations of the African societies it trapped in its cage.

This Lugardist state nowadays parades itself as a federal republic and a democracy. But it is neither federal nor republic. And its democracy is all fake. So, what is Nigeria actually?

Nigeria is a prison camp into which British soldiers, merchants, missionaries and political agents herded the peoples of the assorted villages, towns, statelets, kingdoms and empires they had, between 1850 and 1914, conquered by force or fraudulently dispossessed of sovereignty. The herding process was begun by Sir George Goldie, and was finalized by Sir Frederick Lugard in 1914 when he set up this Lugardist state apparatus to control the prisoner-of-war camp which he named Nigger Area, or Nigeria. What Lugard, the founding father of Nigeria, set up was a despotism to serve British interests, an instrument of the British monarch, for the subjugation, exploitation and control by terrorism of the captive population, for the profit of the British. This despotism of the British monarch was handed over, in 1960, to comprador agents recruited from among the black inmates of the prison camp. The original state imposed by Lugard has never been disbanded and reconstituted by the population. It lives on under black management, and has continued to behave despotically towards the population it got into its absolute power long ago. After all, none of its so-called constitutions has been submitted to the population for approval. As John Locke stated in his “Second Treatise of Government” (1690):

He who attempts to get another man into his absolute power does thereby put himself into a state of war with him: it being to be understood as a declaration of a design upon his life.

We can, therefore, see that this Lugardist state contraption has been making war on us, the victim population which it got into its absolute power a century ago.

It should not, therefore, surprise us that, since its agents see us as prisoners of war, they extort from us and plunder us at every opportunity. And they kill us with impunity whenever they feel the itch to shoot. And to keep us cowed and discourage rebellion they go on pacification sprees in which they massacre whole towns and villages. So, you see, there is a method to the madness of the ‘mad dogs’ at Odi and Zaki-Biam, and to the accidental discharges at Apo and countless checkpoints. These are random acts of state terrorism that are calculated to instil fear in the population and keep us insecure and passive.
This despotic, Lugardist state apparatus has never been reconstituted as a republic by the people. The Nigerian state is not an instrument or agent of the Nigerian people. It is not under their control, or answerable to them, and never has been. For the first half of its existence, i.e., 1914-1960, that was clearly the case. Since then, it has remained the case, the so-called independence notwithstanding. Whenever the Nigerian people have tried to actualise their nominal sovereign control, tried to become the masters of what claims to be their state, the state has rebuffed them. It has been a case of a novice horseman trying to mount his new and wild horse, and getting thrown off each time. The coups of 1966 aborted the initial attempts by the people’s elected representatives to sit securely in the saddle into which the departing British had lifted them. The coup of 1983 ended the second attempt. The June 12 annulment in 1993 aborted the third attempt. The emasculation of the National Assembly by the executive branch since 1999, together with the flagrant rigging of the 2003 elections has killed off the fourth attempt. The claim that Nigeria is now a democracy, or, as some prefer, a “nascent democracy,” is false. Nigeria is no democracy at all! Never has been. And is not likely ever to be. The Lugardist state will not permit it. It continues to do as it pleases, regardless of what the people say or wish. And the Nigerian people have yet to find enough courage and skill to make and enforce demands on the untameable state apparatus.

Nigerians have not awoken to the fact that, as Frederick Douglass said “power concedes nothing without a demand.” We resignedly think that some day God— that imaginary big-man-in-the-sky who is part Santa Claus and part Ojuju Calabar— will intervene and solve our socio-economic problems and rescue us from the despotism of the VIPs—the Vampires In Power. We forget or haven’t heard Martin Luther King’s remark that, “To accept passively an unjust system is to cooperate with that system.” “Shuffering and shmiling”, we wait and hope that things cannot get worse, yet they get worse with each regime. We forget or haven’t heard that there is no limit to which tyranny will not go if unopposed. We haven’t heard what Frederick Douglass said: “If you want to know how much a tyrant will impose on a people, find out how much they will take.”

And the Lugardists keep proclaiming that we should accept this prisoner-of-war camp as a blessing, as a gift from those British who said they came to civilize us by enslaving, terrorizing and robbing us. Well, that’s like the guards at the Nazi concentration camps claiming that the camps were a blessing and should be preserved at whatever cost; that remaining obediently in it is the duty of the prisoners. But the guards would say that, wouldn’t they? But do the inmates have to accept the guards’ doctrine? Nigerians have not awoken to the fact that Nigeria is going nowhere
because, Nigeria is like an elephant with two heads, one in front and one behind, with each head pulling in the opposite direction from the other. Clearly, for any two-headed elephant to move properly, one of its two heads must vanish. In Nigeria's case, one head is incorrigibly nostalgic for the ways of seventh-century Arabia; the other head lusts for the conspicuous capitalist consumerism of the European world. Note that I have not accused it of lusting after capitalist producerism -- which it passionately abhors. Now, since neither of these two heads on the Nigerian elephant is appropriate for national survival, there is a need to chop off, not one, but both heads, and to graft on a new head -- a single head that is passionate for production, that is indoctrinated with producer values and nationalism.

By the way, I must stress that Lugardism is not peculiar to Nigeria. All the states now in Africa are Lugardist. They were founded by white imperialist invaders from Europe for the exploitation of Africans to the benefit of Europe; every one of them in the AU is Lugardist. Lugardism is the doctrine that they are sacrosanct and should be preserved, that they should continue to exist even if they destroy the societies they hold prisoner.

**THESIS #2: RACE WAR**

Mention race war to Africans and they react as if it is some future danger that must be avoided at any price, even at the price of voluntary enslavement. They refuse to realize that we already are in it, and have been in it for at least five centuries. I shall try to show, as briefly as possible, that such is, indeed, our situation.

Two initial points of clarification: first of all, just because bullets are not flying about and swords are not flashing around us does not mean there is no war going on; there are other modes of warfare, including economic, political, psychological and intellectual warfare. For example, the Cold War, in the 20th century, between the capitalist and communist power blocs was mostly a non-military affair. It was mostly a propaganda and economic war, with occasional military flashpoints. Secondly, when the aggressor identifies the target of its attack on the basis of skin colour, the war is a race war. Black Africa is in the throes of two simultaneous race wars. It is being attacked from two fronts: The European front and the Arab front. Lets consider them one by one. First,
THE EURO-AFRICAN RACE WAR

When did it start and why?

Europe’s race war on sub-Sahara Africans may be said to have begun when
The captains of two of Prince Henry [of Portugal’s] exploring
caravels brought back with them to Lisbon in 1442 a dozen
Africans, whom they had captured on the West Coast in the
course of a wholly unprovoked attack upon an African village.
Further exploits of a similar kind followed.[2]

Not long after that, Pope Nicholas V (1447-55) spelt out and blessed a war,
in the name of Christ, on the world’s non-Christian peoples:

We, after scrupulous reflection, are granting by our Bull full and
entire freedom to King Alphonso [of Spain] to conquer, to
besiege, to fight, and to submit all the Saracens, Pagans, and
other enemies of Christ, wherever they may be; and to seize the
kingdoms, the dukedoms, the princedoms, the lordships,
personal properties, landed properties, and all the wealth they
withhold and possess; and to submit these persons to a
perpetual slavery; to appropriate these kingdoms, duchies,
principalities, counties, lordships, properties and wealth; to
transmit them to their successors; to take advantage and make
use of them personally and with their offspring.
--quoted in Jordan K. Ngubane, Conflict of Minds: Changing
Power Dispositions in South Africa, Books in Focus, Inc. 1979

As Jordan Ngubane pointed out “The Pope thus authorized the
commitment of crimes and sins against all and linked the division of the
world into Portuguese and Spanish spheres with slavery, colonialism, racism
and apartheid....”

Pope Alexander’s Bull Inter Caetera of 1493 divided all the “heathens”
of the world with their resources between Portugal and Spain. And then,
Pope Clement VI in Intra Arcana, the Bull he issued on May 8, 1529, and
addressed to Charles V [of Spain] urged him on to the war:

We trust that, as long as you are on earth, you will compel and
with all zeal cause the barbarian nations to come to the
knowledge of God, the maker and founder of all things, not only
by edicts and admonitions, but also by force and arms, if
needful, in order that their souls may partake of the heavenly kingdom.

That global war, declared by Europe in the 15th century in religious terms, is still going on, in different transformations. The most prominent version today is Bush’s “War on Terror”, which was initially announced as a Christian “crusade” against the Jihadeers of Islamic Fundamentalism. Another version is imperialism. We particularly must note that **imperialism is war, and the imperialism of whites over blacks is race war.**

**WHAT HAVE BEEN THE SIGNS OF THIS EURO-AFRICAN RACE WAR?**

The branch of this European war upon the world that most concerns us, has been waged on the African race mainly in the guises of what Europeans call the Slave Trade, The Scramble for Africa, Colonialism, Neo-colonialism and Racism. If we examine each of them, we will uncover its race war character.

**1. Slave Trade**. When the era of the so-called Slave Trade is examined, what do we find? Its main features were interminable wars, forced labour and terrorism; and the targets of all were the Black/African Race; and the entire thing was organized by Whites of European stock, and they were its prime beneficiaries. It was a system of war and violence on four continents and on their interconnecting seas. This war system operated in three zones:

(1) **Zone A:** Africa, the war front, the zone of daily battles, skirmishes, raids, kidnappings and ambushes, which yielded war prisoners for carrying off into slavery.

(2) **Zone B:** the Diaspora zone, the rear area of the Europeans, made up of the transit waters (the Atlantic and Indian Oceans), together with the territories of the Americas as well as the plantation islands in the Indian Ocean, off shore from East Africa (Mauritius, Seychelles, Reunion, Zanzibar, etc). For the Black war captives, this was the zone of permanent martial law and terrorism (especially on the plantations, mines and slave-holding towns); the zone of deadly forced labour (the super-Gulags and Siberias of their time. For example, “In French Saint Domingue, now called Haiti, slaves were literally worked to death. The average life span after being sold into slavery was about seven years”—*The Irritated Genie*, p. 24); This was the zone of daily resistance by the captives, and of their periodic escapes, mutinies and revolts, and of the brutal suppression thereof (there were some 250 recorded revolts in the USA alone, an average of one a year for the era
before Emancipation); This was the zone of guerrilla wars between the Maroon communities (hundreds of which existed at any one time all over the Americas) and the slave-owner communities around them which sought to re-enslave them; and the zone of full-scale wars between the slave-owner states and the liberation movements, as between France and its slaves in Haiti, or between the USA and the Black Seminoles. And then there was

(3) **Zone C**: Europe, the headquarters from where the entire far-flung system of daily warfare was masterminded, stimulated, coordinated, armed and financed, and to which the bulk of the resulting riches was taken.

Seen in its totality, this was a vast war on the Black/African Race that was most cunning in its grand strategy. In Africa, the first zone, Europeans made war on Blacks by inducing Blacks to make war on one another. It was “divide and conquer” at its devilish worst, applied to an entire Black race on the vast African continent, by a well-disguised white European hand manipulating from afar. For the kidnap victims and the war prisoners who were carried off into captivity, there was a second zone, a zone of total war -- military, cultural, economic, psychological, ideological; a total war waged against them by whites, clearly and visibly by whites, and designed to break each of them into an obedient workhorse for the rest of life. When taken altogether, this was the most devious and satanic of war systems ever contrived: Europe was the headquarters, Africa was the war front, the Americas were the prisoners-of-war camp, chattel-slavery was the kind of forced labour to which the prisoners-of-war were subjected in that camp, the produce and profits which went to Europe were the peculiar booty from this most peculiar of wars. As for all the Blacks caught up in it, the overwhelming majority, probably as much as 99.9%, were victims of different kinds and to different degrees: the war captives shipped abroad, the war dead and the war survivors left back in Africa, all those who resisted the pressure to collaborate, and even those among the Black procurers, far from the coast, who never made contact with the Whites but unwittingly served the interest of the European war fomenters. All were caught in the toils of a devilish system whose totality they were in no position to see or guess; all were driven by overpowering forces beamed and controlled from outside their societies, forces which crushed all resistance, even those put up by African kings and queens, such as Affonso of the BaKongo and Nzinga of the N’gola. They were, one and all, victims of a satanic European bourgeoisie, which devised the entire thing and kept it going for its own profit.
CONQUEST AND COLONIALISM

That centuries-long slaving phase of this race war was followed by the phase of undisguised military conquest and colonization, i.e. a phase of conquest of black Africans by white Europeans and of foreign white rule over blacks. The conquest phase, principally between 1884 and 1914, is Eurocentrically called “The scramble for Africa”. In this phase, Blacks would now be conquered, Christianized (See Appendix 8 at pp.57-60) and prepared for civilization [i.e. Europeanization] in Africa itself, and the job of doing that was dubbed the “White Man’s Burden”.

In furtherance of the project of Christianizing and Europeanizing Africans, (i.e. of treating them to culturecide), Black Africans were subjected to genocide, terrorism, land expropriation, property confiscation, forced labour, and taxation by the implanted Lugardist states. The starkest and best-documented varieties of this were in King Leopold’s Congo Free State (formerly Zaire and now the Democratic Republic of Congo), France’s Congo (now Congo-Brazzaville), Portugal’s Angola, Germany’s South-West Africa (now Namibia), Britain’s Southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) and the British-Boer Republic of South Africa. In the Belgian example, a “System” was devised to terrorize and exploit the Blacks to the point of utter ruin. (The book to read is The Black Man’s Burden by E.D. Morel) Colonialism, thereby, was the worst disaster to have ever struck Black Africa thus far. The culturecide it accomplished has left Africa so demented that it still can’t get its act together even today.

NEOCOLONIALISM OR THE RACE WAR TODAY

Since the mid-20th century, following the withdrawal of European expatriates from formal and visible political control of their African colonies, Europeans have prosecuted the race war using Black Africans as their agents, much like during the slaving phase of the Euro-African race war. This current phase is what is called Neocolonialism, in its various forms-- economic, political, ideological, cultural etc.

Let me briefly indicate a few of its features.

When the IMF, World Bank etc lure African countries into their Debt Trap and saddle them with the debt burden -- that is economic warfare. When the WTO enforces “free trade” rules that prevent fair trade, and ensure that trade results in resource and financial drain from Africa to Europe and America -- that’s economic warfare. And when the WTO insists that Africa must accept genetically modified (GM) crops that are engineered to be infertile and so destroy our food independence and food security, that’s
economic warfare. It is warfare by induced and premeditated starvation.  
[see Appendix 7 on GMO crops at p. 55]
When African governments are conned into implementing NEPAD policies  
that block the industrialization of Africa -- that’s an economic side of the  
race war. The net effect of such measures is to keep the African race poor  
and weak, so it cannot defend itself from white power.

When the US Government invents AIDS for the declared purpose of  
global depopulation (through its Special Virus Cancer Program that spent  
15 years, 1962-1977, and $550 million, and on which Dr Robert Gallo was a  
Project Officer); and when the World Health Organization (WHO) vaccinates  
97 million Africans with smallpox vaccines that were secretly infected with  
the AIDS virus, that’s biological warfare on the African race. And when there  
is a US Patented cure for AIDS (US Patent #5676977 granted on Oct. 14,  
1997), and the Government of the USA still does not publicise it, but instead  
allows ineffective remedies to continue to be deployed in Africa, that act of  
malign neglect is an act of war, and a part of the race war on Africans. AIDS  
is a New World Order bioweapon for global genocide.

[On the origin of AIDS, the book to read is State Origin: The Evidence  
of the Laboratory Birth of AIDS, by Boyd E. Graves, J.D.; see also  
AIDS: 'The Manufactured Virus'  
American Masses Hoodwinked  
http://www.apfn.org/apfn/aids2.pdf  
Proof: Department of Defense Appropriations for 1970  
H.B. 15090  
http://www.apfn.org/apfn/aids.pdf ]

On the World Health Organization (WHO) role in bombing Africa with AIDS  
through vaccines [See “Smallpox Vaccine ‘triggered AIDS virus’ ” by Pearce  
William Campbell Douglas]
On the US Patented cure for AIDS [To see the patent, go to :  
www.google.com , type in US patent 5676977 to read all about it.]  
-----------------------------------------------

For more on all aspects of AIDS visit www.boydgraves.com  
Or contact Boyd Graves thru zygote@sunflower.com or  
yzgotemedia@boydgraves.com

or contact Dr. Len Horowitz for his "Emerging Viruses: AIDS & Ebola -  
Nature, Accident or Intentional?" (Tetrahedron, LLC., 1997;  
ISBN:092355012-7;$29.95) It may be ordered toll free by calling 1-888-
To invite Dr. Horowitz to speak to your group, please contact:

Tetrahedron, LLC
PO Box 2033
Sandpoint, ID 83864
Toll free order line: 888-508-4787
e-mail: tetra@tetrahedron.org.

For a brief introduction to the data on AIDS, see the Appendices attached at the end of this essay at pp. 40-51

Thus, through measures like the Debt Trap, unfair WTO rules, genetically modified/ GM-crops and the AIDS bomb, white European powers continue to wage race war on Africans even as we speak today.

There is one last aspect that needs to be touched on, the aspect which has featured in every phase, that widely-misunderstood thing called racism. So,

**WHAT EXACTLY IS RACISM?**

Nowadays, it has become fashionable to reduce racism to color discrimination; to say, as was done at FESTAC 77, that:

By racism we mean ethnocentric pride in one’s own racial group and preference for the distinctive characteristics of that group; belief that these characteristics are fundamentally biological in nature and are thus transmitted to succeeding generations; strong negative feeling towards other groups who do not share these characteristics coupled with the thrust to discriminate against and exclude the outgroup from full participation in the life of the community.


Contrary to such fashionable and ‘politically correct’ misdefinitions, racism is far more than mere ethnocentrism or mindless color prejudice or color discrimination. It is, in fact, the white supremacist color-caste mechanism of the Eurocentric Global System wherein status is assigned, and functions, opportunities and privileges are apportioned on the basis of skin color. It might, alternatively, be called colorism. The system is justified, legitimized and defended by the superstition of racial hierarchy and by the dogma which posits, contrary to evidence, that the white skinned are thereby inherently superior to all others and that the black skinned are thereby inherently
inferior to all others. Though unsupported by scientific or historical evidence, that is the status ranking which European power self-servingly chose, back in the 15th century, to impose on humanity, by force and fraud.

For those who have forgotten, or who are confused, let me here define racism clearly and firmly:

**RACISM is a system of domination, of one race by another,** which combines a superstition of racial hierarchy with a structure of domination and exploitation, and which is instituted and maintained by the violent practices of conquest and suppression, including torture, lynching and mass murder. And, it must be stressed, the only case of racism on the historical record is that instituted by white supremacists.

There are many other aspects of this war today, but these, I hope, are enough to help you recognize it. “Slave Trade” was race war; Colonialism was race war; Neo-colonialism is race war; Racism is race war; AIDS in Africa is Race war; GM crops for Africa is race war! Yes, European white power has for centuries been waging race war on the Black race as part of its global war on all non-Europeans. And this race war is still going on, even though most Africans foolishly refuse to recognize it for what it is.

**THE ARAB-AFRICAN RACE WAR**

The Arab-African Race War began with the invasion which led to the Arab conquest of Egypt in 642 AD. By 700 AD, the Arab invaders had seized all the lands as far west as the Atlantic coast of North Africa. But well before that, indeed soon after taking Egypt, they turned their aggression southward to Nubia and the rest of the Nile Valley. Here are some highlights of this other race war on the Blacks of sub-Saharan Africa:

**Nubia 7th to 14th centuries AD**

In 652 AD, Arabs invaded from Egypt into Nubia but got no further south than Dongola. The Egypt-Dongola treaty of 652 AD required 400 slaves to be sent to Egypt each year. It lasted till 1315AD, when a muslim was installed King of Dongola. With that, the tribute was abolished but the Arabs resumed their penetration up the Nile. By the end of the 14th century, Arab tribes were pouring into the Sudan to settle. [“Dongola” in Encyclopedia Britannica (EB) 1965, Vol. 7, p.585]
Ancient Ghana, 11th century AD

In 1076, the Almoravids, a group of Arabs and Arabized Berbers from Morocco, attacked and overran Koumbi Saleh, the capital of Ancient Ghana, in present day Mauritania, and broke its power and converted its people to Islam. Ghana regained its independence sometime after 1087, but never recovered its power or its empire.

Ethiopia, 14th -16th century AD

From the 13th century, immigrant Arabs established various sultanates on the Red Sea coast of eastern and southern Ethiopia. These recognized the leadership of a dynasty at Shoa, which traced its genealogy to the Arab tribe of the Makhzumi. In 1332, the Sultan of Ifat, Sabr al-din attacked the Ethiopian King Amda Seyon but was defeated. Other muslim princes renewed the war on Christian Ethiopia for the next two centuries. But not until 1530, under their leader Mohammed ibn Ibrahim, nicknamed Gran by the Ethiopians, did these invaders conquer a great part of the Ethiopian plateau and convert the people to Islam.

Bornu, 14th century AD

In 1391, the muslim King of the black African kingdom of Bornu, Uthman Biri ibn Idris sent a protest letter to the King of Egypt asking for the return of those already captured, including his own brother. He wrote:
The Arabs who are called Judham and others have taken captive our free subjects—women and children and old people, and our relatives, and other muslims. Among these Arabs are polytheists and apostates: they have raided the Muslims and killed a great many of them in a war which broke out between us and our enemies. . . . These Arabs have harmed our land, the land of Bornu, continually up to the present, and have captured our free subjects and relatives, who are Muslims, and are selling them to the slave-dealers in Egypt and Syria and elsewhere, and some they keep for themselves.

--“Diplomatic Note from Bornu to Egypt,” in Thomas Hodgkin, Nigerian Perspectives, 1960/1975:104

Thus, being Muslim did not protect Blacks from enslavement by the Arabs, for when it comes to enslaving blacks, Arabs are quick to disregard their own Islamic law.
**Songhay, 16th century AD**

In 1591, a Moroccan expedition crossed the Sahara and attacked the Black African Empire of Songhay. It defeated the Songhay army at the battle of Tondibi, seized Gao, Timbuktu and Jenne and looted them; many of Songhay's scholars were taken in chains to Morocco. The empire and people of Songhay were ruined by the wars, famine and pestilence which the Moroccans unleashed on them.

**Zanzibar, 17th century AD**

In 1698, Omani Arabs captured Mombasa and extended their rule to Zanzibar. Their white-minority Sultanate of Zanzibar lasted till 1964 when it was ended by an African rebellion, led by John Okello.

**Sudan 19th century**

In 1820, Muhammed Ali Pasha, ruler of Egypt, decided to conquer Sudan, primarily to recruit black slaves and to bring the sources of the Nile under Arab control. In the subsequent raids on the hinterlands of the White Nile and the Nuba Mountains, some 10,000 Negro slaves were annually exported to Egypt, where the able-bodied males were pressed into the army and the rest were taken into domestic slavery. These slave raids went on for decades, in the course of which an estimated one million blacks were enslaved or destroyed.

**20th century:**

The Arab-African race war continued in the Afro-Arab borderlands—in such places as Sudan, Mauritania, and Chad, flashing into bloody battles when it met African resistance, like the Anya Nya War (1956-1972) and the SPLA War (since 1983) in Sudan. The only clear African victory against the Arabs was in Zanzibar where, in 1964, the Africans overthrew the Arab white-settler minority rule and ended its regimen of black slavery.

In Chad, Libya’s Gaddafi annexed the uranium rich Auzou strip and tried to install his Chadian puppets in power.

Somalia and Djibouti were induced to join the Arab League and to Arabize themselves culturally, despite their non-Arab populations. Joining the Arab League requires that Arabic be made the official language of a country, so that Arabic becomes the mother tongue of its citizens, thus converting them into Arabs.
In Ethiopia, the Islamized province of Eritrea was given substantial Arab support in its war of secession from Black, Christian Ethiopia.

Beyond the borderlands, in Uganda, Central African Republic, etc, Arabs made proxy war on Africans through their local black agents.

In the Central African Republic, Gaddafi propped President Patasse in power in exchange for a concession to exploit the country’s diamonds and oil for 99 years. [See Lucy Jones, “Ceaucescu’s legacy in the heart of Africa,” Guardian Weekly, October 3-9, 2002, p.3]

In Uganda in the 1970s, using Idi Amin as his local agent, Gaddafi pursued a project of bloody Islamization and Arabization until Tanzania intervened militarily and drove out Idi Amin in 1979. Idi Amin then went into luxuried exile in the land of his Arab masters, first in Libya, then in Saudi Arabia where he died in 2003.

THE OAU/AU IN THE ARAB-AFRICAN RACE WAR

From its formation in 1963 until its demise, the OAU [Organization of African Unseriousness], was consciously used by its Arab members as an instrument for their race war on the Africans. They used it primarily to inhibit the Black African countries from giving organized support to those Africans who were being attacked by local Arab settlers, such as in Sudan and Mauritania. In the OAU, the Black African leaders conspicuously failed to define and defend the Pan-African interest. They, in effect, served as sell-outs, fifth columnists and fellow-travellers of the Arab expansionists. The switch from OAU to AU has merely been an anti-African switch from a smothering alliance, the OAU, to a suicidal union the AU [Africa Unmanned, i.e. castrated].

(The work to read on the Arab use of the OAU to pursue their race war on Africans is “Pan-Africanism vs Pan-Arabism” by Opoku Agyeman, Black Renaissance 1 (1), January 1994, pp.30-72, See Appendix 9 at pp.60-101)

The 21st century

Today in Sudan, the Janjaweed Arab militias, sponsored by the white minority Arab government of Sudan, are still busy, looting, raping, destroying and enslaving the Black Africans in Sudan’s Darfur province in an ethnic cleansing campaign to seize lands from Africans and settle Arabs there. According to one report in THE GUARDIAN, NAIROBI, Wednesday, Jul 21, 2004, Page 6:

During an attack on the village of Disa in June last year, Arab women accompanied the attackers and sang in praise of the government and
scorning black villagers. According to an African chief quoted in the report, the singers said: "The blood of the blacks runs like water, we take their goods and we chase them from our area and our cattle will be in their land. "The power of [Sudanese president Omer Hassan] al-Bashir belongs to the Arabs and we will kill you until the end, you blacks, we have killed your God." The chief said that the Arab women also racially insulted women from the village, saying: "You are gorillas, you are black and you are badly dressed." The Janjaweed have abducted women for use as sex slaves, in some cases breaking their limbs to prevent them escaping, as well as carrying out rapes in their home villages, the report said. The militiamen "are happy when they rape. They sing when they rape and they tell that we are just slaves and that they can do with us how they wish," a 37-year-old victim, identified as A, is quoted as saying in the report, which was based on over 100 statements from women in the refugee camps in neighboring Chad.

For more on this story, see


As this story makes clear, the Janjaweed are quite explicit about the race war and genocidal character of their activities. Yes, the conflict in Sudan is race war!

Thus have Arab invaders, century after century, pressed their war of aggression on Africans, and seized more and more of African lands and killed or carried off millions of Africans into slavery in Arab countries and beyond. By now, they are not only in possession of all of supra-Sahara Africa, but also of much of the Sahelian borderlands, and are thrusting deeper up the Nile to take over the entire Nile Valley, all the way to Uganda on the equator. Despite that relentless aggression, the governments of Black Africa refuse to acknowledge what is happening, let alone that a race war demands effective and concerted opposition from them. It will be a disgrace to the entire African race if, having barely survived European aggression, we succumb to Arab aggression, especially through our own leaders collaborating with the Arab enemy.

THESIS #3: THE NEW WORLD ORDER, UN IMPERIALISM ETC

About 10 years ago, in the early 1990s, there was public discussion in the imperialist press about their need to recolonize Africa. Some of us protested against the idea and tried, with little success, to alert the African intelligentsia and governments on the need to prevent such a thing. You may be surprised and shocked to learn that that Recolonization has been accomplished and most Africans have failed to even notice. They even
welcome the instruments and institutions of their own recolonization. Chief among these are the **AU** [Gadafi’s **Arabist Underwear**], NEPAD [the New European Practical-joke for Africa’s Destruction], and the New World Order instruments of UN Imperialism, namely the IMF [Imperialist Ministry of Finance], World Bank/ officially the IBRD [Infrastructure Bank for Robbery and Destruction], WTO [Wealth Thieving Outfit], The World Court, the War Crimes Tribunals (for Rwanda, Sierra Leone etc), the UN Peace Keeping and Peace Enforcing Missions, and the ideological package of globalization, democratization, privatization, marketization etc.

Why do I say that Africa has been recolonized and that the New World Order’s UN, AU and NEPAD are all part of it? Is the UN an imperialist outfit? Yes, it is. This UN that is, allegedly, being reformed, and on whose Security Council Nigeria is campaigning to get a Veto seat? Yes, it is. And is the AU an imperialist outfit? And NEPAD too? Yes, they are. Let me indicate just how these organs and institutions are carrying on the imperialist project.

The AU is a joint instrument of the Arabs and Europeans for waging race war on Black Africa. Its NEPAD policies serve European power, while its use as a political/diplomatic inhibitor of organized African resistance to Arab aggression serves Arab power.

The AU was formed at the initiative of Libya’s Gaddafi. It was part of his offering to appease the West so it would end its sanctions against Libya and resume non-hostile relations. Another item in that package of offerings was his surrender of two Libyans to be tried for the Lockerbee bombing. He roped the African countries into his **AU [Arabist Underwear]** for easier imperialist control. And the West proceeded to con them to implement its NEPAD recipe for Africa’s economic destruction.

As for the New World Order, it is actually not as new as it is made to appear. It is simply the UN Global Order of 1945 as it enters the final stages of its construction. What was made possible in the 1990s, by the collapse of the Soviet Bloc and the ending of the Cold War, is the final plastering and painting and furnishing of what was organized in Bretton Woods in 1944 and in San Francisco in 1945. Among these final steps is the creating of the World Trade Organization (WTO) to replace the stop-gap institution GATT; the establishment of an International War Crimes Tribunal with headquarters at The Hague; the move of the UN from peace-keeping to peace-enforcement, as attempted in Somalia and Bosnia; and the clear emergence of NATO as the enforcer of last resort for the UN Security Council – as in the former Yugoslavia.
This so-called New World Order is simply the collective phase of capitalist imperialism; the institutional arrangement for the collaborative imperialism of those great powers, now known as the G-8, whose rivalries inflicted the carnage of two World Wars on all of humanity during the first half of the 20th century. Their paramount objective now is to ensure that, after five centuries of unrestrained rivalries and warfare, these great winners shall no longer make war on one another as they compete for the labor and resources of the rest of the members of the UN. Their second objective is to ensure that rebellion against their collective imperialism, by any of its victim peoples, shall be collectively crushed. This collective imperialism, whose slogan is “World Order”, is upheld, not, as in the 15th century, by the fiat of the Pope, but by the economic, diplomatic, military, cultural and propaganda might of the G-8 imperialist alliance against the rest of humanity. The only thing new about this 1945 edition of the Eurocentric Global System is this: after fifty years of delays in its construction, it is at last emerging fully in the form designed originally by the U.S. and U.K. --its main planners and beneficiaries.

As the UN Charter is the blueprint for this current edition of the Eurocentric Global System, it is imperative to ask: What really is the UN and what manner of imperialist beast is this UN Global Order? At the level of the utopian chatter of the UN Charter, and of the sales rhetoric of its propagandists, the UN is a dream scheme that shall save humanity from the scourge of war, promote social progress and better standards of life, develop respect for the equal rights and self-determination of peoples, reaffirm faith in the dignity and worth of the human person, blah-blah-blah, blah-blah-blah! So claims the UN Charter. As for the New World Order, it is “a new just order that permits fair competition and protection of the weak from the strong . . . a joint undertaking of realizing the common aspirations of mankind: peace and security, freedom and the rule of law . . . an era in which the nations of the world, East and West, North and South, can prosper and live in harmony” (so said George H. W. Bush[3]). It is “a world of thriving democracies that cooperate with each other and live in peace . . . under . . . free institutions” (Bill Clinton[4]); with the UN there “to protect human rights, maintain peace and security for all and to deter aggression” (George H. W. Bush[5]). What glorious and inspiring images these are: peace, prosperity, just order, security, freedom, democracy, cooperation, social progress, equal rights, self-determination, fair competition, harmony, human dignity, world without war, protection of the weak from the strong, etc., etc.!

All this New World Order rhetoric touting Freedom, Democracy, Peace, Development, etc is quite attractive. But is what is preached anything like what is meant, let alone what is practiced? Let us go, for illumination, to
those who have closely studied the details of the matter. And let’s consider just three revealing examples: Freedom, Democracy and Development Aid.

In 1941, US President Franklin Roosevelt declared that the Allies were fighting for Four Freedoms—Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Worship, Freedom from Want, and Freedom from Fear. But Noam Chomsky has pointed out:

Roosevelt spoke of Four Freedoms, but not of the Fifth and most important: the freedom to rob and to exploit. Infringement of the four official freedoms in enemy territory always evokes much agonized concern. Not, however, in our own ample domains. Here, as the historical record demonstrates with great clarity, it is only when the fifth and fundamental freedom is threatened that a sudden and short-lived concern for other forms of freedom manifests itself, to be sustained for as long as it is needed to justify the righteous use of force and violence to restore the Fifth Freedom, the only one that really counts. A careful look at history and the internal record of planning reveals a guiding geopolitical conception: preservation of the Fifth Freedom, by whatever means are feasible. Much of what US governments do in the world can be readily understood in terms of this principle, while if it remains obscured, acts and events will appear incomprehensible, a maze of confusion, random error and accident.

—Noam Chomsky, *Turning The Tide*, p.47

So much for their freedom rhetoric. By the way, contrary to official propaganda, America grew rich and powerful, not because of the four official freedoms, but because of the Fifth Freedom: its freedom to rob and exploit, starting with the land of the exterminated Native Americans and the forced and unpaid labor of the enslaved Black Africans.

Chomsky also has cast light on the peculiar American usage of the term democracy. Commenting on the situation in the 1980s, he said:

Take the idea that the United States is supporting “democracy” all over the world. Well, there’s a sense in which that’s true. But what does it mean? When we support “democracy,” what do we support? I mean, is “democracy” something where the population takes part in running the country? Well, obviously not. For instance, why are El Salvador and Guatemala “democratic,” but Nicaragua [i.e. under the Sandinista Party] not “democratic”? Why? Is it because two of them had elections and the other one didn’t? No. In fact, Nicaragua’s election [in 1984] was a hundred times as good as any election in El Salvador. Is it because there’s a lack of popular political participation in Nicaragua? No. Is it because the political opposition can’t survive there? No, the political opposition is barely harassed in Nicaragua; in El Salvador and
Guatemala it’s just murdered. Is it that there can’t be an independent press in Nicaragua? No, the Nicaraguan press is one of the freest presses in the world, much more so than the American press has ever been—the United States has never tolerated a newspaper even remotely like La Prensa in Nicaragua [opposition paper supported by the U.S. during the contra war], not even close: in any time of crisis here, the American government has shut down even tiny dissident newspapers, forget a major newspaper funded by the foreign power that’s attacking the country and which is openly calling for the overthrow of the government. That degree of freedom of the press is absolutely inconceivable here. In El Salvador, there was an independent press at one time—it was wiped out by the U.S.-backed security forces, who just murdered the editor of one newspaper and blew up the premises of the other. Okay, that takes care of that independent press.

So you know, by what criteria are El Salvador and Guatemala “democratic” and Nicaragua not? Well, there is a criterion: in Nicaragua [under the Sandinistas] business elements are not represented in dominating the state much beyond their numbers, so it’s not a “democracy.” In El Salvador and Guatemala, the governments are run by the military for the benefit of the local oligarchies—the landowners, rich businessmen, and rising professionals—and those people are tied up with the United States, so therefore those countries are “democracies.” It doesn’t matter if they blow up the independent press, and kill off the political opposition, and slaughter tens of thousands of people, and never run anything remotely like a free election—all of that is totally irrelevant. They’re “democracies,” because the right people are running them; if the right people aren’t running them, then they’re not “democracies.”

--Chomsky, Understanding Power, p. 42

In Americanese, a government is “democratic” if it is run by people who serve U.S. interests, and “undemocratic” if it is not. American rhetoric gives the impression that the U.S. supports democracy around the globe whereas in fact it has a long record of blocking democracy and overthrowing democratically elected governments or assassinating their leaders. Here are just a few notorious examples: Guatemala 1954, Chile 1973, Ecuador 1981, Grenada 1983, Haiti 1991, Venezuela 2003. And an example happening right now is the case of Palestine, where the U.S. is unwilling to accept Hamas as the party democratically elected by the Palestinians to govern them. Because Hamas is committed to serving the Palestinians and protecting them from Israeli armed attacks, the U.S., Britain and Israel have threatened to not accept or work with it. It is as if Bush, Blair and Natanyahu are Palestinians and as if their three non-votes should veto the
votes of all the real Palestinian voters who overwhelmingly elected Hamas. So much for the rhetoric that America supports democracy around the world.

Now, let’s consider Development AID. The best guide on the rhetoric and practice of foreign AID is probably John Perkins. In the 1970s [1971-1980] he worked as one of America’s Economic Hit Men (EHM)—consultants who are paid, “well paid—to cheat countries around the globe out of billions of dollars” and to ensnare them “in a web of debt that ensures their loyalty.” In his recent (2004) book *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man*, John Perkins says:

Economic hit men (EHMs) are highly paid professionals who cheat countries around the globe out of trillions of dollars. They funnel money from the World Bank, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and other foreign “aid” organizations into the coffers of huge corporations and the pockets of a few wealthy families who control the planet’s natural resources. Their tools include fraudulent financial reports, rigged elections, payoffs. extortion, sex, and murder. I should know; I was an EHM,” he adds. [*Confessions*, p.ix]

He goes on to say:

Our schools and our press have taught us to perceive all of our actions as altruistic. Over the years, I’ve repeatedly heard comments like, “If they’re going to burn the U.S. flag and demonstrate against our embassy, why don’t we just get out of their damn country and let them wallow in their own poverty?” People who say such things often hold diplomas certifying that they are well educated. However, these people have no clue that the main reason we establish embassies around the world is to serve our own interests, which during the last half of the twentieth century meant turning the American republic into a global empire. Despite credentials, such people are as uneducated as those eighteenth-century colonists who believed that the [American] Indians fighting to defend their lands were servants of the devil.” —[*Confessions* p. 16]

He goes on to set the record straight:

Claudine [his clandestine NSA trainer for his undercover work as an EHM] told me there were two primary objectives of my work. First, I was to justify huge international loans that would funnel money back to . . . U.S. companies (such as Bechtel, Halliburton, Stone & Webster, and Brown & Root) through massive engineering and construction projects. Second, I would work to bankrupt the countries that received those loans . . . so that they would be forever beholden to their creditors, and so they would present easy targets when we needed favors, including military bases, UN votes, or access to oil and other
natural resources. . . . the unspoken aspect of every one of these projects was that they were intended to create large profits for the contractors, and to make a handful of wealthy and influential families in the receiving countries very happy, while assuring the long-term financial dependence and therefore the political loyalty of governments around the world. The larger the loan, the better. The fact that the debt burden placed on a country would deprive its poorest citizens of health, education, and other social services for decades to come was not taken into consideration. . . . The loans of foreign aid ensure that today’s children and their grandchildren will be held hostage. They will have to allow our corporations to ravage their natural resources and will have to forego education, health, and other social services merely to pay us back.

—[Confessions, pp. 15-16, 48]

So, that’s that, as it were, from the horse’s own mouth, from one who worked to lure countries into the debt trap. He further tells us that “we make loans to countries with the full knowledge that they will never repay them; in fact, we do not want them to honor their debt, since the non-payment is what gives us our leverage, our pound of flesh.” [Confessions, p.212]

Incidentally, you can now see why imperialism will not allow Nigeria to escape the debt trap, even after OBJ hands over your foreign reserves to the Paris Club.

With the advantage of such expert insights, we can better appreciate what the World Order, whether the Old or the New, is really all about: Plunder of the weak. Or as Chomsky says:

The basic rules of world order remain as they have always been: the rule of law for the weak, the rule of force for the strong; the principles of “economic rationality” for the weak, state power and intervention for the strong. As in the past, privilege and power do not willingly submit to popular control or market discipline, and therefore seek to undermine meaningful democracy and to bend market principles to their special needs.

—Noam Chomsky, World Orders Old and New, p.271

(The key books to read for basic education on Imperialism since 1492, the New World Order, American power etc are On Power and Ideology: the Managua Lectures, Year 501: The Conquest Continues, Turning the Tide, Understanding Power, World Orders Old and New, all by Noam Chomsky; Confessions of an Economic Hit Man, by John Perkins; Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace by Gore Vidal; Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee, by Dee Brown; How Europe Underdeveloped Africa, by Walter Rodney; The West
and the rest of Us, by Chinweizu; and The Black Man’s Burden, by E. D. Morel)

**Thesis #4: The Haitification of Nigeria**

Haiti, the first formal black republic, was founded with high hopes in 1804 by self freed ex-slaves who defeated the army that Napoleon had sent to re-enslave or, if necessary, exterminate them. What is the path whereby Haiti has arrived at its present condition of chaos where desperately poor Haitian boat people are fleeing the country as economic and political refugees?

Let us take a look, first at Haiti in 1803-04; then at Haiti in 2000-2005; and then see how the sad decline was inflicted.

**Haiti 1803-04**

In November 2005, the poets known as The Maroons had this to say in celebrating the birth of Haiti:

On this day [in Nov. 1803], 202 years ago, African slaves on the island of Haiti (then known as St. Domingue) defeated the one and only Napoleon Bonaparte. . . . On this day, 202 years ago, Maroons of the past, African soldiers (former slaves) ripped off the shackles of slavery and spit them into Napoleon's face. Under the command of men like Toussaint Louverture (hailed as the Black Spartacus), Jean-Jacques Dessalines, Alexandre Pétion, Boukman, Biassou, Hyacinthe and Makendal the chains of slavery cried out in pain as West African slaves and the newly rising mulattoes/Afranchi gave birth to an independent nation, the first black republic...Haiti.

202 years ago, Rochembeau bowed down to Dessalines power. He fled with his tail between his legs and returned to Napoleon a defeated general, defeated at the hands of a former slave. On this day, 202 years ago, African cultural continuity played a pivotal role in the outcome of the slave uprising. With their age-old beliefs, history and culture intact, the enslaved Africans were able to forcefully and relentlessly resist the oppression they encountered in St. Domingue. Though largely misunderstood and maligned by Westerners, the Vodun religion our ancestors carried across the Atlantic Ocean infused them with a fiery determination to free themselves from human bondage.

Dessalines, at the head of the triumphant indigenous army, entered Cap on Nov. 30, 1803. On December 4, the French also surrendered the northwestern peninsula and Mole St. Nicolas to the
victors and the French occupation and control of Haiti ended forever."
(Heroes of Haiti, W.F. Burton Sellers)
27 days later, the first free black nation was born, the first black republic, the originator of freedom,
--Excerpt from “The Maroons Salute The Battle of Vertieres...on this day, 202 years ago” By The poets known as The Maroons

But now, two centuries later, this is Haiti:

Haiti 2000-2005

Let me quote from a news report datelined Nov. 17, 2005:

Haiti is one of the poorest nations in the world and getting poorer. Only parts of sub-Saharan Africa are worse off. The armed rebellion that ousted former President Jean-Bertrand Aristide early last year [2004] and the continuing insecurity ever since have steepened the decline. Prices rose 15 percent this year, while most incomes stand still at less than a dollar a day. And many Haitians fear that elections later this year will erupt in violence.

"We will never let the election find us in Haiti," said Jippy Hamilton, a 29-year-old mechanic.

For the past eight months, Hamilton and his childhood friend Ricardeau Felix have been scouring the city for scrap, building a 16-foot speedboat for a rare direct shot at Miami.

. . .

"I have no life here," he said. "Even if I die at sea, I have no choice. There is no life for me in Haiti."

--- . . .

In this old French colonial port, one sailor plans to smuggle his own family out. A journalist is fleeing political gangs. An unemployed mechanic hopes to be a better father from afar. A single mother prays that she can find a future for her children in Miami, even as she leaves them behind.

They are people whose wrenching personal stories are often lost under the category of "economic refugees." They drown, they get robbed, they climb into the most wretched of boat holds, packed body to body in steaming heat, hoping to go anywhere but here.

Haiti’s relentless poverty has bred a paralyzing sense of helplessness, with thousands of people concluding that the only way to take control of their lives is to leave - no matter what the risk.

They make news now and then, as in the televised landing of 220 Haitians on Miami’s Rickenbacker Causeway in 2002 and the
drownings of three women whose bodies washed up in Pompano Beach on Nov. 5. But mostly, they are invisible.

U.S. and Bahamian officials stopped about 3,200 migrants in the last fiscal year [i.e. 2004], fewer than in some years, more than in others. The Coast Guard has clamped down since the 2002 incident, dramatically reducing the number of migrant ships sailing straight into Miami. Smugglers have reacted accordingly. They carry fewer people at a time, charge more and take a circuitous route.

Migrants often make several attempts just to complete the first leg of the journey, to Providenciales in the British colony of Turks and Caicos, 150 miles north of Haiti. From there, they hope to move into the Bahamas and then try to slip into Florida on speedboats.

In the north coast port of Cap-Haitien, Haiti’s second-largest city, handmade boats with anywhere from 10 to 200 passengers sail into the pipeline every week. Many more leave from the northern town of Port-de-Paix and the offshore island of La Tortue.

Some make it to their destination. Others don't. Storms sink them or drive them far off course. Winds die and stall them for weeks as passengers run out of food and water. Coast Guard cutters intercept them, destroy their boats and send them home. Smugglers deceptively loop around and drop them back off in Haiti, or leave them to perish on uninhabited islands. Armed bandits attack them.

Ima Pyrrhon, 23, lost her husband on a trip that left here with 15 people in August. She was told that he and six others drowned when the boat capsized. She says she can barely speak since it happened.

``We had three children and another baby on the way. ... We made this decision. We had no choice. He was all I ever had.''

---Excerpt from “Sailing north only way to escape for some Haitians” by JOE MOZINGO, Knight Ridder Newspapers, KRT Wire, Nov. 17, 2005

How Haiti got there: the Haiti Highway

Now, how did Haiti get from the high achievement of defeating Napoleon, two centuries ago, to this desperate poverty and fleeing boat people of today? As Noam Chomsky put it:

Haiti, in fact, is a parable of Western savagery. That was one of the first places Columbus landed, and he thought it was a paradise—it was the richest place in the world, and also probably the most densely
populated place in the world. And in fact, it remained that way: France is a rich country in large measure because it stole Haiti’s resources, and even early in the twentieth century, before Woodrow Wilson sent the U.S. Marines to invade and wreck the country in 1915, American scholarship and government studies on Haiti were still describing it as a major resource center—it just happened to be an extremely rich place. Well, take a look if you fly into Haiti today. The island consists of Haiti and the Dominican Republic—the Dominican Republic we’ve [i.e. the U.S.] also brutalized, but Haiti much more so—and you can just see if you look down from the plane: on one side its brown, on the other side its sort of semi-green. The brown side is Haiti, the [once] richest place in the world. It may not last another couple decades—literally it may become uninhabitable.”
--Noam Chomsky, Understanding Power, pp. 400-401

A little chronology of events will help here.
1791-1804: The War of Independence. The Republic of Haiti was founded in 1804 by Dessalines the conqueror of Napoleon, with a constitution that forbade foreigners from owning land in Haiti.
1825: France exacted reparation of Fr.150m for the loss of its slaves; this was the condition for recognizing Haiti, and letting it into the global market. This reparations debt led to decades of French domination of Haiti’s finance, with catastrophic effects on the new nation’s economy. This debt was not liquidated till 1887.
1849-1913: In total disregard of Haitian sovereignty, U.S. Navy ships entered Haitian waters 24 times to “protect American lives and property”.
1915: U.S. Marines invade, occupy and begin administering Haiti on the excuse of humanitarianism and enforcing America’s Monroe Doctrine.
1916: A “treaty” turned Haiti into a political and financial protectorate of the U.S.A.
1918: A “plebiscite” conducted by the Marines “approved” a U.S. sponsored constitution that allowed foreigners to own land in Haiti. U.S. investors move in and take large tracts of land for plantations worked by extremely cheap labor. [23¢ per day compared to $3 per day in Panama, in 1926]
1922: the U.S. grants loans to fund Haiti’s national debt.
1934: U.S. Marine rule ends.
1947: Haiti liquidates the 1922 debt to the U.S. ending U.S. control of Haiti’s finance.
1934-1957: A succession of Haitian presidents attempt unsuccessfully to change the constitution to allow them extra terms in office. Some were blocked. One, Lescot, was overthrown by students and mobs.

1957: Dr Francois “Papa Doc” Duvalier elected President; rules Haiti with the help of the state-sponsored death squads—the Tonton Macoute.

1964: Papa Doc “elected” President-for-life.

1971: Papa Doc dies. His son Jean-Claude “Baby Doc” Duvalier inherits position of President-for-life. Under the Duvaliers, in the 1960s and 1970s, US-owned assembly plants move in to exploit labor kept extremely cheap by Tonton Macoute terror. In the early 1980s, Haiti is subjected to the dogmas of IMF Fundamentalism. Under USAID-World Bank programs, 30% of the cultivated land is shifted from food for local consumption to export crops. As tourism booms and poverty deepens, and terror blankets the land, boat people begin to leave in the 1970s. (For an example of USAID destructiveness see Appendix 6 at pp. 51-55)

1986: Baby Doc overthrown

1990: Aristide elected President; inaugurated in Feb. 1991; He tried, against USAID opposition, to raise the nominal minimum wage from 25¢ to 37¢ an hour; was overthrown seven months later by the Duvalierist military, plunging the country into a political crisis from which it has not fully emerged.

Haiti as a theatre of the race war

It is important to view Haiti properly in the context of the race war. Since Columbus first visited the island, the whites [first the Spanish, then the French, and then the Americans] have attacked and exterminated or enslaved the non-whites they found or brought there.

**PHASE ONE: THE SPANIARDS VS THE ABORIGINAL “INDIANS”**

Columbus described the people he found as “lovable, tractable, peaceable, gentle, decorous,” and their land as rich and bountiful. Hispaniola was “perhaps the most densely populated place in the world,” Las Casas wrote, “a beehive of people,” who “of all the infinite universe of humanity, . . . are the most guileless, the most devoid of wickedness and duplicity.” Driven by “insatiable greed and ambition,” the Spaniards fell upon them “like ravenous wild beasts, . . . killing, terrorizing, afflicting, torturing and destroying the native peoples” with “the strangest and most varied new methods of cruelty, never seen or
heard before, and to such a degree” that the population is barely 200 persons, he wrote in 1552, “from my own knowledge of the acts I witnessed.” “It was a general rule among Spaniards to be cruel,” he wrote: “not just cruel, but extraordinarily cruel so that harsh and bitter treatment would prevent Indians from daring to think of themselves as human beings.” “As they saw themselves each day perishing by the cruel and inhuman treatment of the Spaniards, crushed to the earth by the horses, cut in pieces by swords, eaten and torn by dogs, many buried alive and suffering all kinds of exquisite tortures, . . . [they] decided to abandon themselves to their unhappy fate with no further struggles, placing themselves in the hands of their enemies that they might do with them as they liked.” . . . The Spanish effort to plunder the island’s riches by enslaving its gentle people were unsuccessful; they died too quickly, if not killed by the “wild beasts” or in mass suicide. African slaves were sent for from the early 1500s, later in a flood as the plantation economy was established. --[Chomsky, Year 501, pp. 198-199]
That was the Spanish war of extermination on the native Indians.

**PHASE TWO: THE FRENCH VS THE AFRICANS**

With African slave labor, Saint Domingue, as the French renamed the Island, became the greatest wealth-producing colony in the Americas. By 1789, it was producing three-quarters of the world’s sugar, and was also a leader in the production of coffee, cotton, indigo, and rum. In coercing the labor for this production from 450,000 African slaves, the French hung up men with heads downward, drowned them in sacks, crucified them on planks, buried them alive, crushed them in mortars . . ., forced them to eat shit, . . . cast them alive to be devoured by worms, or unto anthills, or lashed them to stakes in the swamp to be devoured by mosquitos, . . . threw them into boiling cauldrons of cane syrup” – when not “flaying them with the lash” to extract the wealth that helped give France its entry ticket to the rich men’s club. [Chomsky, Year 501, p. 201]

Against such horrors, African rebellions were frequent. These rebellions finally exploded into the liberation war that began in 1791 and that saw the defeat of Napoleon’s army in 1803. That was the first part of the French-African phase of the race war that the whites inflicted on the blacks, and the Africans won it in the end.

The second part of this French-African race war in Haiti began with the indemnity/reparations imposed on Haiti by France in 1825. It was a long economic war and the French won it.
PHASE THREE: THE AMERICANS VS THE AFRICANS

This American-African phase of the race war began in 1915 when Woodrow Wilson, --the man famous for his “idealism” [Wilsonian Idealism] who, in his oratory, defended the rights of small nations to self-determination; the apostle of world peace who won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1919—sent in the U.S. Marines to occupy Haiti. In their 20 years rule, “Wilson’s troops murdered, destroyed, reinstated virtual slavery” as Chomsky says. They indulged in “indiscriminate killing of natives” and some of them boasted that they “hunted the Cacos [i.e.Haitians] like pigs.” [Chomsky, Year 501, p. 202]

The economic side of this race war has continued till today and has produced the exodus of boat people since the 1970s. They are, indeed, refugees from an economic war orchestrated by the World Bank and USAID to produce a situation where “Haitian wages, expressed in U.S. dollars, had fallen 39% from 1983 to 1991; “where assembly workers spent as much as one-quarter of their daily wage, and two hours of time, just getting to and from work”; where, “in 1990, an estimated 70 per cent of the Haitian workforce was either unemployed or underemployed: and where each job in the assembly export sector in Haiti feeds an estimated five to seven people”. “How do seven people survive on a wage of 14 U.S. cents an hour?” Here are two reported examples of how:

1] “An extremely competent looking woman in her late thirties who had worked in the plant for four years as an inspector made H$4 a day. . . . the equivalent of US$1.48 a day. Travel cost her 52 U.S. cents a day and she spent 37 cents a day on food. That leaves 59 U.S. cents. To make H$4.00 she works a nine hour day. She has two sons, eight and ten. She told us, ‘The money goes very fast. Often there is nothing left for the weekend.’ . .

2] A young man had worked in the plant for four years. He was making H$3 a day. He had a wife and two children, aged one and four-and-half. It cost him 41 U.S. cents a day for transportation and he skipped lunch. This meant he could go home with 70 cents a day. He and his family can afford only one meal a day. His home is a one-room straw hut. . . When it rains, the house becomes flooded and everything is drenched. For such a house for his family, he pays US$115 a year rent. What else can you afford on wages of 14 cents an hour?”

--from “Sweatshop Development” in The Haiti File, pp.136, 137

When you reflect on these phases, it is clear that despite beating Napoleon in battle, the Africans of Haiti have come full circle in 200 years, from chattel
slavery and its physical brutalities back to wage slavery with its economic and physical brutalities today.

(The books to read on Haiti are *The Black Jacobins* by C.L.R. James; *The Irritated Genie* by Jacob Carruthers; *The Haiti Files* ed by James Ridgeway; “The tragedy of Haiti”, Chapter 8 of *Year 501: The Conquest Continues* by Noam Chomsky; *AIDS and Accusation: Haiti and the Geography of Blame* by Paul Farmer)

Now, let us inspect the key spots on the Haiti Highway on which Haiti has been forced to travel since 1804: Haiti was dragged into the Debt Trap in 1825; It was held in the Debt Trap, by trick or by force till 1947; The USA repeatedly violated its sovereignty in the second half of the 19th century and finally invaded it in 1915; occupied it till 1934 and re-organized it for American economic control and exploitation; Haiti has never recovered from the damage inflicted by the American occupation and by IMF fundamentalism with its dogma of a foreignized and export-oriented, open-door economy. In Haiti’s case this means that foreign companies pay no taxes, and can get virtually free labor at less than $2 a day. Hence the exodus of Haiti’s boat people. This journey has taken Haiti 200 years to accomplish.

**HOW NIGERIA IS ALMOST THERE TOO**

Nigeria has already gotten itself into imperialist economic and political control through the debt trap and the dogmas of IMF fundamentalism; the U.S. Navy is already in physical possession of Nigeria’s off-shore oilfields in the Gulf of Guinea; its economy, through the OBJ foreignization program, is largely in foreign hands; and the number of political assassinations suggests that Nigeria’s equivalent of Haiti’s Tonton Macoute already is active. OBJ is already taking land from Nigerians and settling on it white, racist Rhodesian farmers expelled from Zimbabwe. Blacks who welcome and give land to white refugees to settle ought to note what happened to Lobengula in the 19th century:

**On Welcoming Predators**

(In memory of Lobengula who welcomed in Cecil Rhodes)

With open arms

He welcomed a smiling tiger into his home;

With open jaws

The tiger welcomed him into his belly.

After all, smiled the beast,

One good welcome deserves another.

--Chinweizu, from *Energy Crisis and other Poems*, 1978, p. 34
OBJ has already instigated a shift of farmland from cassava for local consumption to cassava for export. Predictably, this short-sighted policy will lead to mass starvation like the Irish Potato Famine in the 19th century. But what country today can welcome 100 million starving refugees from Nigeria? The economy is already in ruins. All in all, the Haitification of Nigeria is almost completed. The large oil revenue is all that masks the full extent of the economic and social disaster. As for the exodus of desperate Nigerians, it has been on for sometime now: the members of the economically destroyed middle class have been “checking out” to seek employment elsewhere; young women have been escaping to Europe to engage in prostitution; able-bodied young men have been stowing away or paying human trafficking syndicates to smuggle them into Europe. Thus, Nigeria has managed to go very far on the same road, almost reaching, in just 45 years, where it took Haiti 200 years to reach. If OBJnomics persists and gets entrenched, it can’t be long before the exodus of desperate Nigerians reaches Haitian proportions.

So long as we remain trapped on the Haiti Highway, if you want to see Nigeria’s future, just look at Haiti today. The longer Nigeria continues to exist, the greater the disaster it will bring upon the Nigerian population.

**THESIS #5: AFRICAN POWER**

I have presented a brief picture of where we have arrived after a century in the prisoner-of-war camp that is Nigeria, and of what our prospects are if we stay in it.

I have tried to clarify that

“Slave Trade” was race war;
Colonialism was race war;
Neo-colonialism is race war;
Racism is race war;
AIDS in Africa is Race war;
Pressing GM crops on starving Africa is race war;
Imperialism in Africa is race war;
Arabism in Africa is race war;
the conflict in Sudan is race war;
the chaos in Haiti is race war;
Africa in debt trap is race war!

It should be clear that our disasters over the centuries have been caused by African powerlessness. (See *The Destruction of Black Civilization* by Chancellor Williams; and *Two Thousand Seasons* by Ayi Kwei Armah)
Therefore, if we want our disasters to end, we need to build African power. Like Marcus Garvey said: “The only protection against INJUSTICE in man is POWER—physical, financial and scientific.” If we want to survive the race war, we must, like Garvey also told us, “create for ourselves a political superstate, . . . [one] strong enough to lend protection to the members of our race scattered all over the world, and to compel the respect of the nations and races of the earth.” But where do we start, where do we start? I would say, lets start with awareness of the essentials. (The principal book to read on African Power is Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey).

For a millennium or more, the ultimate source of all our disasters has been the abject and chronic powerlessness of Africa. We must therefore pose the problem of African power, and do so starkly and sharply, without evasions. We must solve the problem of African power with rigor and vigour or we shall be exterminated in this 21st century. We must face up to the fact that the AU, NEPAD, the UN, Liberalism, Humanism, Marxology, Christianity, Islam, etc are antithetical to African Power. We must realize that the development we need is not the development of African consumerism or contractorism, but the development of African Power. And the key to that development is Afro-modernization, the project of putting African culture and societies on an industrialized foundation. And we must accept that, for industrialization, Bourgeois democracy, Sharia, Christianity, Islam, Humanism, Arabization, Europeanization etc., are, at best, wholly irrelevant or decoys. Industrialization is the only key. That’s the secret behind the power today of the Chinese, Japanese, Europeans, Americans, Russians, Indians etc.

The question now is: If you don’t want to continue to be ground down, and to end up like the people of Haiti in your life time; if you don’t want your children and grand children to be exterminated by the end of this century, like what happened to the Native North Americans in the 19th century, and to the indigenous population of Haiti in the 16th century, WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

In bringing about change, the first thing is awareness. Like Noam Chomsky said:

Begin with awareness; you don’t do anything without awareness, obviously—you don’t do anything unless you’re aware that there is something that ought to be done, so that’s the beginning almost by definition.

--Noam Chomsky, Understanding Power, p.187
But what kind of awareness, specifically, do we most need in Nigeria today? I would suggest we follow the advice of Sun Tzu, the ancient Chinese sage and master strategist who said: “Know yourself, know your enemy, and in a hundred battles you will never be defeated.” That’s a good place to start, by educating ourselves about Nigeria, about Africa and its history, its place in the world and how that has come about.

We must especially become fully aware of the aspects of the race war in the 21st century. These include:

1] The AIDS bombing of Africa, by white (European) power, a covert attack that is exterminating Black Africans all over the continent.

2] The wars of ethnic cleansing and extermination to expropriate the Nile basin that the Arab League is waging on Africans.

3] The economic war by debt trap, unfair trade, genetically modified crops, globalization, etc, being inflicted by the European powers.

4] The cultural warfare through Europeanization, Christianization, Arabization and Islamization of Africans.

5] The intra-African proxy wars being orchestrated by white powers from afar, like those in Sierra Leone, Liberia, Cote d’Ivoire, the Congo, Uganda etc.

But there a few other things we need to know:

6] The fact that most Africans today are Christians or Moslems and culturally schizoid, the fact that we are conducting this lecture in English, are the results of our ancestors’ defeats in the race war; defeats that made possible the culturecide and cultural dementia inflicted on us in the 20th century.

7] Lugardism, the AU, NEPAD etc, are not just irrelevant decoys; they are indeed among the prime obstacles to our building African Power. For instance, what good is a NEPAD development that is preparing you for powerlessness and extermination?

8] The problem of the 21st century is the problem of African Power – how to build it, and enough of it, to end the long era of our defeats and disasters in the race war, to prevent our extermination, and to ensure our dignity. If we are not building African power we are doing worse than nothing, and we might as well be dead already.
9] To learn how African Power can be built, we need to investigate how
Japanese power, Chinese power, Soviet power and Indian power were built
in the 19th and 20th centuries, against determined opposition from European
White power.

10] African membership in the UN, the AU, the Arab League, the British
Commonwealth (for former British colonies), l’Organisation Internatinale de
la Francophonie or the Organisation of French speaking countries (for former
French colonies), and Comunidade dos Paises de Lingua Portuguesa or the
Community of Portuguese Language Countries (for the former Portuguese
colonies) are symptoms of African powerlessness. They are the problem, not
parts of the solution.

11] The development and the culture we need to fashion are those that
make African Power possible. For that, Sharia, Anglo-Saxon law, Bourgeois
democracy, Humanism, Christianity, Islam, Marxology etc are simply
irrelevant.

12] Above all, we must accept that the next 50 years are do-or-die for
Africans.

If we don’t build African Power by 2060, we’ll be exterminated by 2100. The
few that are not wiped out by AIDS and other black-specific virus bombs,
will be hunted down and killed off by the ethnic cleansing militias of the
Arabs, like the Janjaweed of Sudan. The very few that escape both AIDS and
Arabs, will end up in zoos and reservations, just like the native Indians of
North America did in the 19th century.

These Lugardist states that litter the African landscape, with their AU,
NEPAD etc, are coffins. Those who fail to get out of them will be buried by
them. They are the false frameworks and wrong foundations for building
African Power.

No matter how poor or rich you are, the rest of this century will be hell
for you if you don’t build African Power. Even if you do a Mobutu or an
Abacha, and steal every dollar of your country’s revenue, you’ll live through
hell unless there’s African Power to protect you.

Unless you build African Power to prevent it, you’ll be killed off either
by AIDS or by Arabs. If you are under 30, you have your life mission spelled
out: help to build African Power! It is up to you to decide to fulfil or
betray that mission.
Wherever you find yourself each day, the paramount question you should ask yourself is: What can I do from here to help build African power? It doesn’t matter whether you are a cook or a carpenter, a soldier or a shrine attendant, a poet or plumber, a gardener or general, a farmer or trader, a teacher or a singer, an engineer or an economist, a mother or a father, a village head or a head of state. You should ask and answer the same question each and every day.

CONCLUSION

In a nutshell, what is my message to you today? What should you take away from this talk? If you want Black Africa to survive and thrive and end its litany of woes and humiliations, you should pay attention to three things and act accordingly:

1] The 20th century has been the most disastrous century, so far, for Black Africa. It was the century in which, under colonialism, Black Africa was subjected to culturecide at the hands of White Power. That culturecide destroyed our ability to resist the genocide that is now taking place. As a result, this 21st century is likely to see the physical extermination of Black Africans, unless those now under 30 organize and defeat the extermination campaign that white power has already unleashed on Black Africa. Therefore,

2] The problem of the 21st century is the problem of African Power – how to build it, and enough of it, to end the long era of our defeats and disasters in the race war, to prevent our extermination, and to ensure our dignity.

3] In setting forth to build African power, you must understand that Lugardism is a false framework and the Lugardist states are the wrong foundation for building African Power. Escape from these coffins and start afresh.

Thank you.
Feel free notice
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[1] Chinweizu is the author of The West and the Rest of Us, (1975) and several other books and numerous articles.
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On Negrophobia: 
Psychoneurotic Obstacles to Black Autonomy 
(or Why I just love Michael Jackson)

Written by Chinweizu

Negrophobia, the fear and dislike of blacks, is a great disease. It has killed more blacks in the last five hundred years than all other diseases combined: more than malaria, more than epidemics and plagues of all sorts. In the coming years, it could kill far more than AIDS. It is a psychological disease, a disease of the mind, which harvests dead black bodies every day.

The blacks who died through slavery were killed by negrophobia. The blacks who died all over the globe from white colonial aggression were killed by negrophobia. The blacks who died in our liberation struggles - Bookman, Toussaint and Dessalines with all their soldiers in Haiti; the Mau Mau warriors in Kenya; the liberation fighters in Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Zimbabwe, Namibia, South Africa, Sudan and elsewhere — were all killed by negrophobia.

The blacks dying from the structures and policies of neocolonialism are dying from negrophobia. The blacks killed by AIDS, a disease manufactured by whites in the biological warfare labs of the USA and deliberately introduced into central Africa and Haiti to kill off blacks, are dying of negrophobia.

Ah, Negrophobia, I didn't know that hate could kill so many!

Negrophobia is a psychoneurosis, a mental disorder. So too is blancophilia, its twin. If someone hates everything black, including the black butterfly, including the most fertile black soil, isn't he mentally disturbed? If someone loves everything white, including white trash, including white arsenic, isn't
he mentally disturbed? Negrophobia and blancophilia form a syndrome, a characteristic set of psychoneurotic passions that occur together.

The negrophobia syndrome is characterised by melanotropism. A magnetic movement away from or toward different intensities of melanin, the skin pigment. Blancophilia induces a reflex movement toward things white, even toward white ugliness. The stimulus object is white skin, any skin that is low in melanin.

Negrophobia, for its part, induces a reflex movement away from things black, even from black beauty. The stimulus object is black skin, any skin blessed with melanin in high dosage.

Negrophobia and blancophilia are, of course, conditioned responses to white power and black powerlessness. In a sad case of stimulus substitution, the responses to superior power have become transferred to white skin, and those to powerlessness have become transferred to black skin. The negrophobia syndrome is a chronic disease with the white race, a disease born of pride of power. It is a disease with which they have infected the whole world, including the black race, giving rise to negro negrophobia, the disease of black self-hate.

Negro negrophobia is a most absurd disease. Can you imagine some black running to escape his blackness? To escape from himself? His obsession with fleeing from himself proves he is unfit to live. His running to embrace his white enemy proves he is a suicide. The entire affair shows he is mad. Some call it alienation, a mental disorder. Yet some black sirens now sing in praise of alienation, beckoning all blacks to acquire the disease.

What are the symptoms of negro negrophobia? Negro negrophobia makes black women bleach, till some proudly sport yellow monkey faces and ebony-black thighs. (or ‘Fanta Orange face and Coca-cola legs’ as some call it). It makes black parents prefer their lighter skinned children to the darker skinned. It makes blacks who marry white or mulatto think they are marrying up and improving the race. It makes a pitch-black Sudanese proclaim himself Arab, on account of just one white Arab ancestor ten generations back; it makes him count as nothing, indeed as a blemish, all his 1,023 black ancestors in that generation, and all the millions before and since.

Negro negrophobia makes African-Americans, and now black South Africans too, believe that integrating white neighbourhoods is social advancement. It makes blacks desperate to integrate white schools, white churches, white communities, white ideologies, white movements and white organizations.
Some would even gladly die to integrate the Ku Klux Klan.

Negro Negrophobia makes blacks defer to whites. It makes bright black boys, the thinkers of the race, obey the IMF, the World Bank, GATT and the UN, even when they know that the orders from such outfits are aimed to destroy their own people. It makes black intellectuals swallow and spout any silly idea, provided it is put forth by some guru of the white world, like Marx, like Jesus, like Mohammed.

Negro negrophobia makes blacks accept leaders of thought and of action that are chosen for them by whites. It makes blacks revere any third class mind, any tinpot potentate, that whites anoint to confuse and mislead them. But for negro negrophobia, we would automatically reject any leader chosen for us by our historic enemies. But for negro negrophobia, we would thoroughly suspect the loyalty to the black race of any black Rhodes Scholar, of any black Nobel laureate, of any black Faisal laureate, of any black Lenin laureate, of any black knight or peer of England, of any black elect of the French Academy. He would have to work extra hard to convince us that he is not an agent sent to help hasten our ruin.

Believing the blancophile dogma that white is right, that white is quick-witted, that white is beauty and virtue and salvation; believing the negrophobe dogma that black is wrong, that black is dumb, that black is ugliness and sin and damnation, the negrophobic black does not feel comfortable in a blacks-only group. Blacks-only associations give him claustrophobia; he must throw open the doors to let in some white skin to boss or spy on him; only then can he relax; only then can he feel that all is well with his world. Negro negrophobia is, thus, a disease which drives blacks to crave racial integration and to espouse continentalist Pan-Africanism.

In multi-racial societies, it drives the black elites to flee to white suburbs. In the name of racial equality, they decapitate their own black communities, rob the ghetto of black leadership, and abandon it to confusion and predatory gangs. In the name of black freedom they flee from the black world. Similarly, in international relations, pulled by the call of the white, blacks are eager to join a British Commonwealth. They are desperate to join a French Community. They sell their sanity to join a Russian Collective. And an Arab empire? They disown their black inheritance to get into its latrine! They will pay any price, suffer any humiliation, to join any club formed by whites. But a black community, or commonwealth, or league? They will not only not join, they will oppose its being formed at all! The idea of blacks getting together, all by themselves, disorganizes their being. In their blancophilia they are self-made orphans desperately seeking white foster
homes. For all their outcry on behalf of the black community, all they want is to disappear into the whiteness of the white world, whether Arab or European. They want to disappear by any means possible or available — physically, mentally, emotionally.

In such ways, negro negrophobia has affected Pan-Africanism, affected Negritude, affected even the great leaders of these Black Redemption Movements. Senghor's Francophilia weakened his Negritude; made him ecstatic to join the "Universal Civilization" by becoming an elect of the French Academy.

Nkrumah's Arabophilia subverted the Garveyism of his Black Star symbol; it truncated his Pan-Negro Pan-Africanism into a continentalist Pan-Africanism which would exclude Garvey from membership of its organizations, and which distorted Pan-Africanism into an Arab and Black African tango.

With Du Bois, when the racial integrationism of his NAACP triumphed, it wrecked the black community in the USA; it bore the bitter fruit of black ghettos whose absentee black leaders squat in white suburbia, squawking as hostages to white power.

Cheikh Anta Diop's Marxism, with its dedication to the primacy of multi-racial class solidarity, made him most unenthusiastic about a sub-Sahara Federation of Black Africa. He would accept it only as a very last resort, only if the Arab invader-settlers doggedly excluded themselves.

Mandela's liberalism, with its dedication to the primacy of multi-racialism, is all set to subvert the cardinal goal of returning to the black aborigines of South Africa all the land stolen from them by the white invader-settlers.

Senghor, Nkrumah, Du Bois, Cheikh Anta Diop and Mandela are proof that not even the best among us are immune from the negrophobia syndrome. Of the great black redeemers of the 20th century, only Garvey escaped the syndrome, principally because he was unequivocal and uncompromising on black solidarity. Significantly, he did not call his movement Pan-Africanism, with all the equivocation on race that is harboured by that term; he called it the United Negro Improvement Association, a name which unequivocally implies a redemption movement of blacks, by blacks, for blacks.

To call yourself a leader of blacks, one leading them to liberation from the white world, and yet run off to integrate white suburbia— isn't that absurd? It can only mean that your Black Consciousness is shallow, or even opportunistic; that hiding under your black mask is a blancophile heart. To call yourself a leader of blacks, one leading them out of the prison cell of
white power, and yet insist on bringing whites into every organization for blacks — isn't that folly of the first order? Those blacks who espouse continentalist Pan-Africanism, are they not like those Trojans who carried the Greek wooden horse into their own citadel, and hastened their people's destruction?

If you are such a black leader or intellectual, take a look at Michael Jackson and see the incarnation of your spirit, see your mind made flesh. Michael Jackson has most publicly done what black negrophobics secretly dream of doing: act out George Schuyler's great satire Black No More! Michael Jackson is the supreme, public example of negro negrophobia, which is why he is such a valuable negative example, which is why I just love Michael Jackson. Every racially integrating black, every continentalist Pan-Africanist black, is Michael Jackson minus opportunity. They are the social and political counterparts of Wacko Jacko, as the white press dubbed him. The only difference is that he has carried his negro negrophobia to its logical, physical conclusion — turn himself into a fake white man! Because the others cannot afford the cash or courage for the skin and bone surgery, they settle for the next best thing: they disappear into white communities, or integrate into white ideologies and white movements. Presumably, from seeing so many white faces around them at all times, they will lose sight of the fact that they themselves are black.

After being created and entrenched by five centuries of white power, Negro negrophobia has, alas, become a character neurosis. From one generation to another, black parents pass on to their children the neurotic character structures which foster negrophobic attitudes and behaviour. The global mechanisms of white power (religion, media, school, advertising, propaganda) then reinforce the neurosis.

Blacks, alas, cannot take control of the Black World until they are cured of this neurotic syndrome. Until they get rid of this neurotic plague, any white boy or girl or child can seize control of their affairs by flashing a bit of white skin. Proof? All you need do is introduce a white face among negrophobic blacks and they become disorganised, they become disoriented. Just put one ugly blondie among them, and their eyes will stray and their minds will wander from the doughnut before them and focus on the white hole. Some will be obsessed with desire for whitey; some will be obsessed with hate for whitey; either way, they lose touch with basic reality and ignore what they must do to keep control of their lives, their situation, their environment. And at that point, any white waif can take them over.

What then is the cure? That is for our medical and social scientists to investigate. But from the sidelines, let me observe that it may require
psychotherapy, both individual and group therapy. It may require cultural therapy, with basic retraining to break the habits of the negrophobic syndrome and inculcate non-negrophobic habits of thought and valuation. It would be the job of homes, schools, media, and social organisations to bring up new generations untainted with Negrophobia and blancophilia. It may require, above all, environmental therapy of a political sort, through the emergence of at least one powerful black nation that would destroy the five-century-old correlation of white skin with power and black skin with powerlessness. That is probably the strategic cure for the syndrome.

My guess is that until the power therapy for this power neurosis is accomplished, all other therapies would be only partially effective. Whatever the case, until the race cures itself of negrophobia, it has no future. Which is why getting rid of Negro negrophobia is perhaps the cardinal task of internal reparation.
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Ancestral Culture and Modern Survival: The Example of Meiji Japan

Written by Chinweizu

Culture as society’s immune system

The primary function of the body’s immune system is to identify and protect what is self and destroy what is not-self. What the immune system learned while the fetus was still in the womb was that anything it came into contact with during that time must be regarded as self. A society’s ancestral culture is the social analogue of the body’s immune system. It identifies what is socially self, i.e. whatever displays the ancestral culture, and protects it from the intrusive and alien. When it is functioning properly, the immune system will repel invaders. One of the ways in which an immune system can go wrong is to assault cells that it is supposed to protect. When a culture is functioning properly, it will react to invaders by mobilizing its society for resistance. Likewise, when a culture goes faulty, it may not only (like an AIDS-afflicted immune system) fail to protect against the alien invasion; it can even (as in auto-immune disease) attack its own society.

The notion that culture is the ultimate backbone of a people, the immune system of a society, is alien to the niggerized consciousness of the populations of PanAfrica. Many of their comprador elite now see African culture as nothing more than a source of fossilized arts and museum pieces to be sold to earn foreign exchange! Others view it as a disgraceful, primitive paganism that should be smashed and consigned to the bonfire. That is a most dangerous situation and needs to be urgently ended if the peoples of PanAfrica intend to survive. To help bring home to Africans the true nature and vital function of culture, there is probably no better example than Meiji Japan.

Meiji Japan: ancestral culture in the modernization process

How and why did Japan survive the Pan European attempt to colonize and destroy it and, within 50 years, 1868-1904, convert itself into a world power? How and why did a Japan that was overawed by Commodore Perry and his few gunboats in 1853 turn itself into a power that defeated Imperial Russia in 1904? To see the Meiji spirit and Japanese culture in action, the book to read is Lafcadio Hearn, Writings from Japan, ed by Francis King, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984; especially the essays “The Japanese
Family”, “A Conservative”, “Christian Converts” and “A Glimpse of Tendencies”. But the whole book needs to be read to get a feel for Japanese culture and how it came to the rescue of the Japanese people and saved them from the White Peril that overwhelmed the rest of the non-European world.

By way of introduction to the Meiji example, here are some excerpts from Lafcadio Hearn:

1. In many ways a human society may be compared biologically with an individual organism. Foreign elements introduced forcibly into the system of either, and impossible to assimilate, set up irritations and partial disintegration, until eliminated naturally or removed artificially. Japan is strengthening herself through elimination of disturbing elements; and this natural process is symbolized in the resolve to . . . leave nothing under foreign control within the empire. It is also manifested in the dismissal of foreign employees, in the resistance offered by Japanese congregations to the authority of foreign missionaries, and in the resolute boycotting of foreign merchants. (p. 268)

2. On "the queer superstitions of the pre-Meiji era concerning" Occidentals

Although recognized as intelligent and formidable creatures, Occidentals were thought of as more closely allied to animals than to mankind. They had hairy bodies of queer shape; their teeth were different from those of men; their internal organs were also peculiar; and their moral ideas those of goblins. –(p. 296)

3. On Foreigners and foreign help

What is worse for the alien than miscomprehension is the simple fact that he is in the position of an invader. (p. 263)

There is also the definite conviction that foreign help is proof of national feebleness (p. 268)

4. On the family as social unit

Though the individual is now registered, and made directly accountable to the law, while the household has been relieved from its ancient responsibility for the acts of its members, still the family practically remains the social unit, retaining its patriarchal organization and its particular cult. (p. 221)

4. The law of duty

From servant to master – up through all degrees of the household hierarchy
the law of duty was the same: obedience absolute to custom and tradition. The ancestral cult permitted no individual freedom: nobody could live according to his or her pleasure; everyone had to live according to rule. The individual did not even have a legal existence; the family was the unit of society. Even its patriarch existed in law as representative only, responsible both to the living and the dead. (p. 287)

5. Ancestor Worship

A samurai boy . . . was educated to revere the ancient gods and the spirits of his ancestors; he was well schooled in the Chinese ethics; and he was taught something of Buddhist philosophy and faith. But he was likewise taught that hope of heaven and fear of hell were for the ignorant only; and the superior man should be influenced in his conduct by nothing more selfish than love of right for its own sake, and the recognition of duty as a universal law. . . . [Accordingly] the young samurai [grew up] fearless, courteous, self-denying, despising pleasure, and ready at an instant’s notice to give his life for love, loyalty, or honor. (p. 293)

6. National motivation and solidarity

[To] a people of forty millions, uniting all their energies to achieve absolute national independence, . . . the existence of foreign settlements in Japan, under consular jurisdiction, was in itself a constant exasperation to national pride, an indication of national weakness. (p.265) The average Japanese would prefer to work fifteen hours a day for one of his own countrymen than eight hours a day for a foreigner paying higher wages. (p. 265)

7. The Japanese soul and the English language

. . . the idea of making English the language, or at least one of the languages of the country, and the idea of changing ancestral modes of feeling and thinking . . were wild extravagances. Japan must develop her own soul: she cannot borrow another. A dear friend whose life has been devoted to philology once said to me while commenting upon the deterioration of manners among the students of Japan: ‘Why, the English language itself has been a demoralizing influence!’ There was much depth in that observation. Setting the whole Japanese nation to study English (the language of a people who are being forever preached to about their ‘rights,’ and never about their ‘duties’) was almost an imprudence. The policy . . . helped to sap ethical sentiment. (pp. 271-272)

The above are from Lafcadio Hearn’s observations on the Meiji Japanese of
the 1890s, in the decade when they were furiously preparing to burst forth as a world power.

The spirit of Meiji was expressed in slogans, such as: Sonno-jo (Revere the Emperor! Expel the barbarians!); fukoku-kyohei (rich country, strong arms!) and fukko (Return to Antiquity). Such slogans were actually implemented. In keeping with fukko, for example, Shinto (the way of kami), the ancient indigenous religious beliefs and practices of Japan, with its multitude of kami (sacred powers: ancestor spirits and nature spirits), was strengthened and institutionalized as the state religion, State Shinto. Shinto festivals and ceremonies became integrated into the affairs of government. Shinto moral teaching was made compulsory in schools, the doctrine of the divinity of the Emperor was inculcated, and the government took up the administration of the country’s more than 100,000 shinto shrines. Everybody (whether Buddhist, Christian or Shintoist) was required, as a patriotic duty, to make obeisance at Shinto shrines. The effectiveness of this anchoring of modernization on the ancestral religion and culture was demonstrated by the fervent national spirit which enabled Japan to become a world power within 50 years. The cultural source of that effectiveness was recognized by the Americans when they attempted to smash the cultural foundations of Japanese power. In 1945, after Japan’s defeat in WWII, despite their democratic propaganda for religious freedom, the American conquerors decreed the abolition of State Shinto, forbade the government to support Shinto shrines, and suppressed the doctrine of the emperor’s divinity.

Lest we think the Japanese thereafter lost their cultural anchor, here is an observation of the Japanese in the 1990s by Graham Hancock:

For no matter how modern, rational and scientific Japan has become, it is still a land in which powerful and ineffable spiritual forces are perceived to move in secret behind all things, to pervade all things, and to underlie the very fabric of reality. . . .


In other words, despite pulling off two miracles -- industrial modernization in the 19th century, and spectacular economic recovery in the 20th century -- the Japanese still remain animists!

How, you may ask, did Japan contain the 'demoralizing influence' of the English language? According to Professor Kinichiro Toba of Waseda University:

My grandfather graduated from the University of Tokyo at the beginning of the 1880s. His notebooks were full of English. My father graduated from the
same university in 1920 and half of his notes were filled with English. When I graduated a generation later my notes were all in Japanese. So ... it took three generations for us to consume western civilization totally via the means of our own language.

**Japanese and Africans compared**

Thus, throughout their Meiji industrialization project, and while preparing their post WWII re-emergence as an economic power, the Japanese took care not to repudiate their ancestor worship, their animism, their ‘pagan’ Shinto religion, and the other core aspects of their ancestral culture. Not for them the foolishness of abandoning Japanese religion and language as a precondition for modernization.
In stark contrast to the Japanese, whenever African societies have been invaded by alien forces in the last millennium, their Islamized, Christianized, or Eurochauvinized members not only repudiated their ancestral culture; they also enthusiastically joined in assaulting their own culture and demonizing their own ancestors for alleged paganism, “unbelief” or primitivism. These “fifth columnists” have zealously destroyed African religions, customs and traditions instead of identifying with and protecting them. In making its members attack itself, such alien-perverted, partially disintegrated, ‘triple-heritage’ pseudo-African societies have manifested the cultural equivalents of auto-immune diseases. African Afrophobia and Negrophobia are symptoms of this class of cultural diseases.

A strengthening, not a weakening, let alone repudiation or liquidation of ancestral Japanese culture was the foundation for the modernization of Japan. Quite unlike Africans who have been brainwashed into thinking that, in order to learn to fly, they must first cut off and throw away their own feet. Of course, having thrown away their ancestral cultural feet, Africans have found it impossible to modernize. They have no feet left to stand upon and sprint for take off!

Lagos, January 2005
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Debt Relief or Treasonable Scam?

Written by Chinweizu

Going by press reports, there are quite a few curious aspects to this alleged debt relief that has brought forth triumphant noises from Presidential circles in Nigeria. Let me highlight a few for the benefit of the public.

The virtual debt: Some press reports say that Nigeria borrowed $17bn; has already paid back $22bn, and is said to still owe $36bn. If these are the actual figures, may I observe that, as the real debt has been paid off with some interest, this alleged debt of $36bn is book-keeping debt, i.e. virtual debt, very much like the book-keeping subsidy or virtual subsidy which the IMF & Co insisted had to be abolished. By the example of that doctrine, this virtual debt should be simply extinguished, shouldn’t it? Should Nigeria not simply repudiate this alleged debt of $36bn, and be done with it? What’s good for virtual subsidy should be good also for virtual debt.

The virtual discount or relief: We hear that the Paris Club is prepared to discount this virtual debt by some 60 per cent or so, by writing off $18bn as debt relief, but only under certain conditions. Since the size of this virtual debt is based on the Paris Club’s say so (press reports have not, as far as I know, indicated that the veracity of the Paris Club’s figures has been ascertained) this alleged discount is much like the discount offered by a vendor whose advert screams at you: “Sales! Sales! Price slashed from $999 to $99!” Yet you have no way of telling whether the price was ever indeed $999. Is there, therefore, not a need for an independent Nigerian public verification of the size of this alleged discount or relief or write off or whatever it is called?

The advance fee fraud: Suppose some conman said to you: “You see that
bank over there? I have $36bn in its vaults, and out of my generosity or pity for your plight or admiration for your village headman’s super-obedience and life-long, continent-wide services to me, I want to make you a gift of half of it, $18bn. But first you have to give me $12bn upfront.” That would be classic advance fee fraud, a.k.a. 419, would it not? A crime requiring the attention of the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC), and other crime fighting agencies of the government. But that is precisely what the Paris Club has told the President. And he is celebrating and actively sourcing for the $12bn to hand over to the Paris Club gangsters.

For avoidance of doubt, please allow me to spell it out: The Paris Club is holding a Nigerian debt stock allegedly worth $36bn; and it wants to charitably give back $18bn of it to Nigeria, on condition that Nigeria hands over $12bn upfront. When that advance fee is paid, they promise to give to Nigeria $18bn worth of that debt stock, and to then arrange for Nigeria to buy back the remainder, at terms yet to be discussed. Now isn’t that 419? In fact, it is more than 419; some might call it Four-one-ten!!

The other criminal aspect: Now, 419 is a crime, not only in Nigeria, but in most countries, including the Paris Club countries. And it is, presumably, a crime in international law since Interpol is interested in such cases. That is one criminal aspect of this “debt relief“ deal. But there is at least one other. If the chief executive officer (CEO) of a corporation were to be set up for a scam by some gangster syndicate which strips his corporation of its assets, wouldn’t that CEO be fingered as an accessory to a felony? Yet, the President, the CEO of the Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN), is party to setting up this scam whereby the Paris Club syndicate of shylock gangsters is set to asset-strip $12bn or more from Nigeria’s reserves. Doesn’t he deserve a quizzing by the EFCC?
Economic treason: It is pertinent to recall here how Nigeria was taken into the debt trap in the first place: Back in the late 1970s, against the wisdom of public opinion, the then military head of state, Gen. Obasanjo, was conned by foreign lenders into taking a $1bn jumbo loan that Nigeria, with its then buoyant oil revenues, did not need. The excuse was that Nigeria was “under-borrowed.” They claimed that Nigeria needed the jumbo loan to build investor confidence, so that foreign investments would flow in and develop the economy. He fell for that trap. But did the expected investments flow in? Now, nearly 30 years later, as President Obasanjo, he is falling for another scam by his white controllers. In the hope of extricating Nigeria from the debt trap into which he himself led Nigeria, he is eager to hand over Nigeria’s reserves, to the tune of $12bn or more, to the same creditor gangsters. As the Chinese say: Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me!

These are just a few of the aspects of this so-called debt relief that I find curious and troubling. Perhaps the press reports on which I have based my observations are inaccurate, but who is to say that they are? The ordinary citizens and even the press cannot uncover the facts much beyond what has already been done. They do not have the administrative instruments or constitutional powers to inspect the documents in the files of the Presidency. Since it is apparent that the EFCC seemed to have been turned into a private instrument for harassing handpicked adversaries of the President, the public cannot trust it to look, let alone impartially, into this debt relief affair. Thus, only the National Assembly (NASS), which has the constitutional power to inspect the documents of the Executive branch, can further illuminate this debt deal. Perhaps this is the time for the NASS (whose own campaign was, wisely, for 100% debt cancellation and not this murky “debt relief” scam) to step in and clarify matters and act in the interest, and to the satisfaction, of the Nigerian people.

Some other aspects that need to be looked into are these:
(a) What could happen to a country addicted to imports if it lost its reserves? Wouldn’t it be forced to go a-borrowing once again to finance urgent imports, and promptly find itself back in the debt trap from which it tried, rather incompetently, to escape? If you gave your entire month’s paycheck to pay off your debt to some shylock, wouldn’t you have to rush out and borrow again to feed and pay health and other bills for the rest of the month - and in your desperation probably accept even worse terms than before? Zimbabwe’s current distress should be a warning to Nigerians against giving away their reserves. If the President goes ahead with this non-transparent debt deal, and exhausts the reserves, wouldn’t the already distressed Nigerian economy simply collapse?

(b) But how likely is it that, on losing its reserves, Nigeria would quickly exit the debt trap? Not bloody likely! It should be noted that the proffered exit treatment requires a PSI with the IMF, plus IMF tracking of performance under that PSI. And therein lies the catch. This requirement allows prolongation of the exit process, through repeatedly moving the proverbial goal post, thereby denying the tantalizing exit. So, exit from the debt trap is not even assured, not being automatic upon paying the $12bn upfront. Like any victim of 419, Nigeria, after losing the $12bn advance fee, could be waiting forever for the promised bonanza to arrive!

(c) The overall result of (a) and (b) would be that Nigeria, upon losing its reserves, would have to go desperately borrowing anew to stay alive, without even getting rid of its present virtual debt burden of $36bn.

(d) An international transaction of this magnitude, which is fraught with dire consequences for the people - one capable, by wiping out Nigeria’s reserves, of devastating the economy, of perpetuating our debt peonage and jeopardizing the society and populace for the indefinite future - does it not require prior legislative approval? Shouldn’t it?
Let me end by exploring, however briefly, this issue and some preventive measures.

Preventive measures: If implementation of this scam is to be prevented, what is to be done? Even if it is deemed legal to proceed without legislative backing, would that be prudent? Would it be prudent of the NASS to turn a blind eye and not investigate what looks, prima facie, like a monumental and devastating scam? The NASS, it seems to me, has two duties to discharge:

(a) Uncover the facts and make them public so as to educate the people about this dubious “debt relief”; and
(b) Act promptly to prevent any possible looting of Nigeria under cover of “debt relief.”

If the NASS feels itself unequal to the task, it could, at least, do two things:

Create a special prosecutor, such as Gani Fawehinmi, the people’s tested lawyer, to investigate this “debt relief” deal, and to prosecute those responsible for any impropriety or fraud found in this whole debt business. The special prosecutor’s office should be independent, and thoroughly insulated from the influence, of the executive branch, and should be mandated to investigate the procurement of each and every loan in the original $17bn debt stock, as well as the execution of the projects for which it was ostensibly borrowed. It should also investigate and prosecute any impropriety or illegality associated with the debt repayment process thus far.

Urgently pass a law forbidding the FGN to pay even one cent to the Paris Club or any other foreign creditors, before the special prosecutor’s work is satisfactorily completed.

From Vanguard Sunday, August 14, 2005
Nija Titanic

Written by Chinweizu

A super-sized slave ship called Nija Titanic, built by Goldie & Lugard Shipyard, was packed full of chained Niggers who had been captured for enslavement on the IMF plantations across the ocean. Admiral Al Capone, alias Tatt [Traitor-at-the-Top] and his crew of Ali-Baba gangsters had a secret deal with the ship owners that the Nija Titanic was, under no circumstances, to offload its cargo of captives or cast overboard the fabulous treasures in its bottom holds. Though hailed as "unsinkable", the Nija Titanic, while in mid-ocean, hit an iceberg and began taking in water through gaping holes below its waterline. But amazingly, for several days nobody on board noticed a thing. The Admiral and his crew were too busy playing kalo-kalo in the casino hall, collecting billion dollar chips to be cashed when they stepped ashore. There was no pilot on board. No lookouts had been posted, the ship’s radar was unmanned, contact with weather stations and position finders had been lost when the ship’s radio communication system fell into disrepair. All the money-addicted crew had been too obsessed with their casino game to do their appointed jobs. So the crew had no way of knowing the doomed condition the ship was in.

When, at last, someone noticed that the ship had stopped moving, the Admiral denied that anything was wrong with the ship, and called a staff meeting of 400 of his most trusted henchmen to discuss, not how to evacuate the stricken ship [it carried no lifeboats] and save the people on board, but how to rearrange the seats in the casino hall, the seats in the banquet hall and the chairs on the deck. When someone was foolish enough to raise the issue of evacuation, the Admiral angrily declared that evacuation was out of the question. The Nija Titanic was unsinkable and all must remain on board; and anyone who raised the issue again would be tried and shot for alarmism and mutiny. And all his crew, amazingly, complied. Meanwhile the stricken ship continued to take in water. And sharks and all manner of sea monsters began to gather and circle the doomed ship, waiting for a lavish feast on the soon-to-be-drowned multitude.

After their staff confab, Admiral Al Capone and his 400 henchmen retired to their fabulous suites, dreaming of the life of abundance they would enjoy for ever after. But suddenly, there was a mighty shaking as an explosion in the fuel tanks rocked the ship, the lowest levels of the ship flooded furiously and the ship began to keel over. Before long the stricken ship upended, and everything that was unbolted to floor or wall came tumbling down. Panic
everywhere as the ship broke into several pieces which began to sink to the depths of the ocean. Admiral Al Capone could not believe what was happening, he tried to make frantic phone calls to shore for a helicopter to come and whisk him to safety, but when none came (the long unserviced phone system was dead, and his desperate calls went nowhere) he fell on his knees and bawled out a tearful prayer. But his god was too busy elsewhere to listen or come rescue him. And he and all his comprador crew, and all the hapless captives on board went down with the "unsinkable" Nija Titanic.

Chinweizu
Lagos,
March 1, 2005
===================================

**Some Questions for Young Nigerians to ponder**

Do the passengers on the Nija Titanic wish to go down with the ship, down to the bottom of the sea? Or to the IMF plantation to be enslaved for ever, without possibility of release?

What is the destination preferred by the captives on the doomed ship of the Nigerian State?

When, and in what condition do they want to arrive at their preferred destination?

What predictable dangers await them in the 21st century?

Is the Nigerian state equipped to evade or defeat these dangers?

What is a state? – Is Nigeria not a failed state, waiting to implode?

What should the Nigerian state do or not do to/for its citizens?

What are the key features of the global environment in which the Nigerian state will operate in the 21st century and beyond?

What are the vital interests of the Nigerian population?

What are the global strategic conditions for defending and advancing those interests?
What is national security, as distinct from state security or the security of the state apparatus and its officials?

What is democracy? And how can it be institutionally entrenched?

What kind of democracy, if any, will help the Nigerian population to control the Nigerian state, to survive and permanently end their enslavement, impoverishment and humiliation by others?

What use to the people is a state or a democracy if its character is to disorganize, and destroy society?

What are the challenges of the 21st century and beyond?

What kind of state or political system is most likely to help the Nigerian population to survive the dangers and challenges of their near future?

What are the nature, causes and remedies for the anarchy in Nigeria?

Can the Lugardian state, which was constructed, from the very start, as an armed bureau of internal plunder and repression and to programmed to enslave and exploit the Nigerian population for the benefit of foreign interests; can it be trusted to change its own character out of sheer goodwill? [bearing in mind Frederick Douglas’ statement that “power concedes nothing without a demand”]

Can the Lugardian state apparatus, no matter how reconfigured, solve the problems that need to be solved for the Nigerian population to survive the 21st century? Can a whale ever swim the desert? Or a camel walk the ocean? Or an elephant fly?

If this Lugardian contraption that is programmed to suppress, exploit, massacre and terrorize the Nigerian population [Aba women1929; Enugu coal miners 1949; Lagos, Kalakuta 1977 & 1978; Talata-Mafara farmers (a.k.a Bakalori) 1980; Odi villagers 1999, Zaki-Biam villagers 2001; etc]—if this Lugardian contraption is not dismantled and dumped on Lugard’s grave, can the Nigerian population invent and institute a state that will serve, defend and advance their own interests?

Will rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic prevent it from sinking?

What went wrong with Nigerian Independence, starting from 1945 or even earlier?
By what measures can office holders in Nigeria be obliged to abide by their oaths of office? Here is a Persian example from the 6th century BC:

**Otanes' chair**

Otanes' father Sisamnes had been put to death by Cambyses [King of Persia]: he was one of the royal judges, and as a punishment for taking a bribe and perverting justice Cambyses had him flayed; all his skin was torn off and cut into strips, and the strips stretched across the seat of the chair which he used to sit on in Court. Cambyses then appointed his son to be judge in his place, and told him not to forget what his chair was made of, when he gave his judgements."

--Herodotus, The Histories,Bk 5; ch 25

**Major massacres of Nigerians**

by the army and police of the Nigerian Lugardian State, sine 1920, i.e. after the initial bloody conquest and pacification ended ca. 1918, and its rule had become instituted, assured and presumably “non-violent.”

1929: Women’s anti-tax protest (a.k.a. Aba women’s riot) in the Owerri and Calabar provinces of Southern Nigeria was suppressed with 55 women killed.

1949, Nov 18: Shooting of coal miners in Iva Valley, Enugu,

1977: Soldiers burn down Fela’s Kalakuta following his boycott of Festac 77.

1978: the military Govt. of Lagos State demolish Fela’s Kalakuta, while he was away at the Berlin Jazz Festival

1980: Farmers in Talata-Mafara, Sokoto State, massacred following protests against Impresit Bakalori, an Italian Company.

1980s: Students at ABU, Zaria, and OAU, Ife killed by police

1999, Nov.: soldiers, deployed to the Niger Delta to protect the oil companies from citizens outraged by the devastation of their environment, sack Odi village, Bayelsa State, killing hundreds.

2001, Oct: Zaki-Biam, Benue State sacked by army, with more than 200 killed
2005, June 7th: Apo Village, Abuja - the slaughter continues as the Nigerian Police laid waste 5 Igbo traders plus 1 Esan girl returning from a party, and branded them armed robbers.
Reconstruction of Nigeria:
Four Delusions on our Strategic Horizon

Written by Chinweizu

This is the danger point. What will become of the Negro in another five hundred years if he does not organize now to develop and protect himself? The answer is that he will be exterminated . . . No race or people can well survive without an aim or purpose . . . The work that lies before us is not so much to identify ourselves with the scattered purpose and greed of others, but to create for ourselves a central ideal and make our lives conform to it. . . . and (to create) for ourselves a political superstate . . . that will make us secure in the . . . world. . . . We are determined to . . . found there (in Africa) a nation of our own, strong enough to lend protection to the members of our race scattered all over the world, and to compel the respect of the nations and races of the earth.

Marcus Garvey in The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey, 1922, 1925 (pp. I 48-49; II 15, 16; I 38, 39)

Africans are capable of achieving their place in the sun, provided that they discard the spirit of individualism which has so far prevented social cohesion. It cannot be doubted that one reason why Africans seem destined to serve other races for ever is because they have no sense of oneness . . . Are Africans not doomed to extermination from the face of the earth because they are self-centred and self-satisfied and selfish? Do Africans not deserve extirpation because they have proved their incapacity to carry on and to disseminate the torch of civilization which their ancestors handed to them in the dim past? . . . Black men and women, when will you cease to drift along the way which leads to the extermination of the black race?

- Nnamdi Azikiwe, Renascent Africa, 1937, (pp.98; 117-118; 207)
Introduction

Ideas rule the world. An idea has brought us all together here today. Let me congratulate my senior and good friend of more than three decades on his success in nursing to fruition his idea of a Centre for Public and Business Policy. I have had the privilege of watching as he nursed it along since he left public office earlier in the decade. I have worried for him and his project like supporters are wont to do. When your friend steps into the boxing ring, you feel the blows he receives. For bearing up under pressure, and bringing his idea to fruition, I salute him. Chu, well done!

The theme of today’s Black Redemption sermon is taken from a sentence from a public lecture given by Chu Okongwu, here in Enugu, back in 1985, on the very same subject as this seminar. Lamenting our economic plight at that time, he said, inter alia, that “it might have occurred to us that we have unhelpful notions about ourselves and our environment.” In so mildly putting the matter, Chu was being properly polite, as befits a public servant. As a certified and permanent private citizen, I may put the matter quite bluntly. We suffer from quite a few delusions about ourselves and our environment, and these delusions, by fogging up our strategic horizon, are terrible obstacles to our progress and survival. But before I go into all that, a few preliminaries.

As I said before, ideas rule the world. Not only is one generation ruled by ideas from the preceding generation, but some ideas rule for centuries, and some even for millennia. Consider some of the ideas which still rule humanity today, and see how old they are. First, two ideas from Black Africa.

The idea of resurrection and judgement day is a most ancient doctrine in the religion of Black Egypt. It is probably older than the first pharaoh of Egypt, thus it is older than 4500 BC. After 6500 years, it is still going strong and dominating the Black World, though in its Euro-Christian, Arab-Islamic and Judaic adaptations.

The idea of the reincarnation of departed ancestors is probably even older than that of resurrection and judgement day. It is still part of African religion, and a force in our lives. One day, a very old man was asked why he went about planting an orchard of fruit trees. To the questioner the old man answered and said: “I am doing it so that, when I reincarnate, I will find the trees mature and ready for me to eat.” So, your future in your next incarnation may well be the one you sow today. Some more recent ideas which, in this century, have been implanted in Africa are the package consisting of the free market, individualism, liberty, progress, egalitarianism,
electocracy, and a secular universe stripped of ancestor spirits and gods, and without the civilizing restraints of resurrection, judgement day and reincarnation. These are joint products of the European Bourgeois Enlightenment in the 17th and 18th centuries AD. They are now being sold to the entire world, and are even being imposed by bullets and bombs on those who don’t want them. They are ideas which have been injected into other societies to help destroy them, the most recent and spectacular case being post-Soviet Russia.

The other idea is that of a world government. It was developed a century ago by British Prime Minister William Gladstone for use as an instrument and cover for Anglo-American global imperialism. He sold the idea to their American cousins, and Woodrow Wilson tried, but failed, to implement it by way of the League of Nations. Then, under the sponsorship of Roosevelt and Churchill, it became the hidden agenda of the UN. And now, after the Cold War removed the Soviet obstacle to its implementation, Anglo-American hegemony, via the UN, is now being successfully, but surreptitiously, imposed on the world. Thus an idea invented by Gladstone, that great liberal and heir to a fortune built on Black slavery, is what Clinton, from the old slaving state of Arkansas, is finally imposing upon the entire globe.

Ideas rule the world; and like all rulers, ideas can build or wreck. Ideas can help or hurt, clarify or confuse, enlighten or delude, facilitate or impede. We must pay careful attention to them to ensure that we do not blindfold and hang ourselves with the wrong ones. Unhelpful notions and delusions if ideas rule the world, then our first stop on the way to social reconstruction of any kind must be at the workshop of ideas. Note that I did not say “the marketplace of ideas,” that place where the lazy mind goes to shop for readymade ideas, ideas prepackaged to serve their maker’s vested interests. We must begin by deconstructing and reconstructing our idea of our society and of its place in the world. We must, indeed, begin by reconstructing our idea of social reconstruction. Indeed, reconstructing our idea of reconstructing Nigeria is the first task, and that is what I shall concentrate upon today.

In rationally considering reconstruction, we would need to correctly determine what is to be reconstructed and why; the environment in which the new construct will operate; and the goals of the new construct if it is to serve our group interests. We would, specifically, need to find out the following: What is Nigeria, and why should it be reconstructed? What constraints is the world of tomorrow most likely to try to impose on Nigerians? What kind of reconstruction does the survival of Nigerians prescribe? If we have the wrong ideas on these matters, whatever reconstruction we undertake will most probably miscarry or prove
counterproductive. In the matter of reconstructing Nigeria, we need to start by ridding ourselves of four delusions which I have singled out for examination today. By doing so, we should be in a better position to appreciate what kind of social reconstruction our strategic situation calls for. But first, let me reflect a bit on my topic: “Social reconstruction in the stabilization of the Nigerian economy.” Now, the idea of social reconstruction for survival might make sense to most people. But social reconstruction for economic stabilization? Many might demur, asking, and quite correctly, which exists for the other, the society or the economy?

Does one reconstruct the social supersystem in order to stabilize its economic subsystem? Should it not be the other way round? Not unless the economic subsystem is judged perfect. But when the economy in question is a neocolonial economy; is dominated by a foreign enclave sector; and is tied to foreign dictates by the chains of debt trap imperialism; and when it keeps most of its members impoverished and harassed through economic anarchism - when that is the case, why would its victims want it stabilized?

Why would they go to the trouble of reconstructing their entire society so as to stabilize their economic misfortune? Washington, London and Paris might like to stabilize Nigeria’s neocolonial economy, but certainly not the Nigerian people, not unless we are mad, or unbelievably masochistic, or plain suicidal. The only valid reason why the Nigerian people should be interested in stabilizing this neocolonial, anarchist economy is as a necessary preliminary step to reconstructing it out of existence. Sometimes a body arrives in hospital so battered and ill that the doctors will first have to stabilize it in order to begin a full-scale regimen of radical therapy.

It is only on that premise that one would justify social reconstruction as a factor in stabilizing Nigeria’s present economy. So, the question is: stabilization for what? Income growth? Industrialization? Development? First, it should be understood that without industrialization, growth is simply bloat and not development. Secondly, if Nigeria’s aim is to catch up with China, Japan, the EU or the USA, then it must be understood that it cannot do so without industrializing itself. Having said that, let me now focus on the first part of the topic, namely, the social reconstruction of Nigeria.

Reconstruction for what? Reconstruction for the survival, security, prosperity, power and prestige of the Nigerian people. I submit that that is the minimum objective which would make worthwhile the enormous risks and rigors of social reconstruction.

But why would we want Nigeria reconstructed? What could be fundamentally wrong with this great nation, this giant of Africa, this hope of the Black
World? I submit that if Nigeria is not reconstructed, its people will be exterminated during the 21st century. Why? There are some powerful forces in the world who want Africa without the Africans, and the Africans, Nigerians included, are in no position today to prevent them achieving their aim. And why can Nigerians not prevent their own extermination?

It is because, in global strategic terms, Nigeria is in a state of decrepitude and cannot withstand an attack even by tenth rate powers. And why is that? Because Nigeria is not an industrialized society and, even more important, Nigeria is not a nation. If all of that is not obvious, that is largely because of the unhelpful notions or delusions we hold about ourselves and our environment. Which brings me to the four delusions I mentioned earlier. These are the propositions that Nigeria is a nation or is engaged in nation-building—it is not, I submit. That Nigeria is developing or industrializing—it is not, I submit.

That Nigeria is potentially a great power on earth—it is not, I submit. That the global system is Blacks-friendly, and wants us alive and strong and participating as equal members who exercise economic and political self-determination—it does not, I submit. It is actually hostile to us to the point of wanting to castrate and exterminate us as soon as possible. Let us examine the delusions in these popular and conventional propositions. The first delusion Regarding the proposition that Nigeria is a nation or is engaged in nation-building, I submit that, though the official rhetoric so claims, Nigeria is not a nation and never has been, nor have Nigerians been engaged in nation-building. If so, what indeed is Nigeria? Nigeria is what some French ethologists, students of animal social behavior, have called a noyau. And what is that? A noyau is a society of inward antagonism, one held together by mutual internal antagonism, one which could not survive if its members had no fellow members to hate. A nation, on the other hand, is a society held together by antagonism toward external enemies and by their defense of a common territory.

The British created a Nigerian state a century ago. In that time, the ethnic groups they forcibly enclosed inside it have created a Nigerian society of sorts, but have failed to create a Nigerian nation. Nigeria simply is a territory, with a state apparatus for internal plunder, and a fountain of petrodollars which together provide a habitat for a multi-ethnic noyau. With between 300 and 400 ethnic groups, and with thousands of autonomous communities which noisily quarrel over the national petrodollar cake; and whose boundary and leadership disputes often lead to mayhem, it is clear that each group’s primary identity is its own, and its solidarity is against its visible neighbors within Nigeria. These basic antagonisms are compounded by regional and religious quarrels. One need only recall such conflicts as
those of Modakeke, Zango Kataf, Ogoni, Tiv-Idoma, Ijaw-Itshekiri, etc.

Also add to the list the Maitatsine and other fanatical religious riots and the OIC crisis. Add too the AG-NCNC crisis in the old Western Region, the Awolowo-Akintola crisis, the NPC-NCNC alliance-cum-crisis, the NPN-NPP alliance-cum-crisis, and of course the Nigerian Civil War and the June 12 Crisis. However much it may be deplored, the fact is that for each of the constituent peoples of Nigeria, the nation is the ethnic group or clan, not Nigeria. For some, it is the religious community. Attack these and their instincts for territorial defense and external antagonism will be triggered. The ultimate sign of Nigeria’s being a noyau is that Nigerians show no sign of having a common external enemy. Not even foreign sanctions would unite Nigerians against the sanctioners. Were Nigerians a nation they would have patched up their June 12 quarrel at the mention of sanctions and united to face the foreign powers.

As a society of inward antagonism, Nigeria has little chance of surviving an attack by another society. Its very instincts will undermine its defensive efforts. This is because a society of inward antagonism, when confronted by crisis, contains no instinctive mechanisms to command the loyalty of its members.

The second delusion

The second proposition is that, for the past four or five decades, Nigeria has been engaged in economic development, and even in industrialization. What Nigeria has been engaged in, actually, is the development of its consumania, using its petrodollar bonanza to feed its appetite for foreign goods and services of every sort. And that, strictly speaking, is maldevelopment: the development of consumania for industrial products without the concomitant development of industrial productive capacity. If indeed Nigeria has been attempting industrialization or development, its failure is stark. After half a century of alleged effort, Nigeria still has no basic industries. In particular, it has failed to build a steel mill despite 30 years and some $10 billion of effort.

It has failed at managing such basic utilities suppliers as NEPA and NITEL. And it has reduced itself to foreignizing the few secondary and tertiary industries that it has Behind this dismal performance lies the criminal wastage of human and financial resources. First of all, foreign contractors build most projects beyond the level of private houses, thus preventing the accumulation of practical experience within the Nigerian population. Secondly, in a quest for quantity without quality, Nigeria expanded and debased the inadequate education system it inherited from the British. As a
result, the land is awash with the illiterate, innumerate, indisciplined and amoral products of our so-called universities. Note that I said amoral, not immoral.

If any condition is socially worse than immorality, it is amorality, the failure to even appreciate the concept of morality. As a result, there are today in Nigeria, a disconcerting number of so-called educated adults who have never heard of the Ten Commandments, or heard of any other moral code, and who cannot distinguish between right and wrong. Among them are the networks of campus gangsters who are wrongly called “cultists” -- those armed rapists and murderers who routinely terrorize the places of learning. An extraordinary and recent example of amorality was that quite articulate cannibal who believed that killing and eating his fellow citizens was no different from “eating potatoes”.

Likewise, in 40 years as an oil exporter, Nigeria has squandered some $500 billion of petrodollar bonanza. Nevertheless, it still begs for a few million dollars of “foreign aid” and “foreign investment”, and it is bluffed and insulted for that. Nigeria could have industrialized itself in that time, and with less than one fifth of that bonanza, and with not a single dollar of foreign investment and foreign aid, but its leadership was not so minded. Its leadership conveniently overlooked the fact that, in addition to numeracy and literacy, industrialization needs a puritan ethos, (what Max Weber called the Protestant Ethic), and it needs, particularly in the leadership strata, the spartan discipline of a miser who is allergic to squandermania, and is addicted to making savings and productive investments.

And so, after 40 years of alleged development effort, Nigeria has little to show. Such a monumental wastage of the key inputs of industrialization, namely human and financial resources, is not development. However, the Nigerian elite believes that it has been working hard at development. But then, a child that rubs its belly with water all morning long will claim that it is taking a bath!

The third Delusion

The third proposition is that Nigeria, by virtue of its size and population, is the giant of Africa, a potential great power on the global arena, and the hope of the Black World. In the days of the oil boom, there used to be glib talk about a Great Nigeria. And even after the oil boom had bust, Nigeria attempted to organize a so-called concert of the medium powers of the world. All that was petrodollar bombast, a farce to help relieve boredom in some quarters.
In actual fact, Nigeria even lacks the profile of a potential great power. Its resource endowment, when compared with those of China, Russia, the EU and the USA, is thin on strategic minerals and plants. Nigeria is not even as richly endowed as South Africa or the former Zaire. And unlike the British or the Japanese, island peoples with few natural resources, Nigerians lack the national power drive to borrow or buy or steal whatever they need from any nook or cranny of the globe. They lazily wait for technology to be transferred to them! Besides, unlike the situation when Britain and Japan became world powers, the resources abroad which Nigeria would need have already been cornered by much stronger powers.

Besides all of that, Nigeria’s land is small, and no strategic strength derives from its location. Geographically, it is neither a vast transcontinental heartland like Russia, nor an offshore fortress like Britain is to Europe or North America is to Eurasia. Nigeria sits across no geostrategic sea or land or air route, and so lacks the significance and power of a focal ground. It lacks China’s regional isolation behind natural barriers of seas, mountains and deserts. And it lacks such natural defences against invaders as the Russian winter.

To make matters worse, Nigerians of the post-colonial era are neither hungry nor greedy nor humiliated enough to exert themselves to become a world power. They are too much addicted to instant and lavish self-enjoyment with little spirit of sacrifice for tomorrow. The great power motivation is sorely lacking in them. On the whole, Nigerians of this era are too soft, too selfish and too naïve for the great power adventure.

All in all, a handful of strategic minerals and plants, a medium sized and poorly located territory, and a realistically estimated population of some 70 million persons who are chronically unmotivated for the rigors and privations of the national power quest: these are not the stuff of which a world power is made in this age.

In summary, what is Nigeria today? It is a noyau and not a nation. It is an unindustrialized, maldeveloped, enclave dominated, neocolonial, anarchist economy controlled by foreign powers through the strings of debt trap imperialism as manipulated by the IMF-WTO-World Bank trinity. It is a strategic nonentity incapable of defending its territory and interests against even the tenth-rate powers of today. If its efforts against Charles Taylor, Foday Sankoh and Bakassi are anything to go by - and they are all we can go by - that must be the honest situation report on Nigeria’s capability.

For lack of heavy industries, Nigeria cannot manufacture its own armaments. So, all it would take is an embargo by its arms suppliers for Nigeria to be
defeated in any war. And if it is a war between Nigeria and NATO or its surrogates, you can be sure that an arms embargo against Nigeria would be made effective. Nigeria’s economic vulnerability is palpable. An economic embargo which withdrew the foreign oil companies and which stopped the importation of rice, spaghetti, champagne, paper, ink, cornflakes, milk, tableware, lace, air conditioners, generators and spare parts would demoralize the Nigerian elite and bring the Nigerian economy to a halt.

It has often been said, by my good friend Dr George Obiozor, the Director-General of the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA), that Nigeria is not a banana republic; indeed it is not; it is something much worse, it is a noyau republic. And that compounds its strategic weakness by making it politically brittle. In fact, Nigeria is what may be called an alewa republic, a sugarcane candy stick republic, all sweetness and brittleness. Hit anything, even a glass pane, with an alewa stick, and the stick is liable to break into pieces. That is an alewa republic for you. I therefore submit that Nigeria is not a potential great power, and therefore is not the hope of the Black World. Nigeria may be the giant of Africa, but it is not one of the giants, actual or potential, of the world. Therefore, if Nigeria is the Black World’s hope, then the Black World has no hope.

The fourth delusion

The fourth proposition concerns the attitude and intentions of the overlords of the global system towards Nigeria and Black Africa. The standard view is that, with the end of colonialism, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, with the rise of globalism, and with the universal promotion of electocracy and the free market ideology, we are now in a new era without imperialism, without white supremacist notions, without racism, and particularly without Negrophobia. Racism is now supposedly ended and taboo; and the term imperialist has even dropped out of usage and has been replaced by the obscurantist term “the international community”. So, all we need do is cooperate with the new system, submit to our mentors in electocracy and free market ways, and we too shall prosper, and we too shall soon arrive at an economic destination that will look like the USA or the EU or Japan. All of that, I submit, is a monumental delusion.

I assume that every normal person is interested in the welfare of its descendants, starting with its children and grandchildren. I would therefore like to share with you my prognosis of what lies ahead for your descendants within the 21st century. The prognosis is bad. Your descendants will most probably be deliberately kept in the prison of national poverty, like the Haitians have been since 1804; or Africans will be driven out of the minerals-rich parts of Africa, like the Cherokee nation was ethnic cleansed
out of its homeland in the USA in 1838; or they will be exterminated altogether, like the Tasmanians were in the early 19th century. The reason is that, like the Haitians, the Cherokees and the Tasmanians before them, Black Africans have now arrived at a position of absolute strategic vulnerability. For the first time since the 15th century, the imperialist powers need your valuable land, but they do not need you to work it for them. They will soon have their anti-malaria vaccine, and their vaccine against melanoma, the skin cancer; both of these vaccines will enable them to settle in all parts of Black Africa and to exploit its resources for themselves. So they will get rid of you, unless you can militarily stop them.

During the last five years, whenever I have pointed out this prospect to Nigerians, their usual reaction has been dismissive. Impossible! How can? This is the 20th century! This is the modern world! We live in a global village! The international community will not permit it! World opinion will not allow it! For those who react like that, I can only direct them to the historical record. Ethnic cleansing and extermination have happened before, again and again and again, and they can happen yet again, and they can happen to you. Why not? Do you have what it would take to stop whoever is powerful enough to attempt them on you? Mind you, if NATO proceeds to exterminate you, CNN will not cover it, the New York Times will not see it as news that is fit to print, just as German radio and newspapers did not cover the extermination of the Jews at Auschwitz!

But, what is more, these options have been considered and are already being implemented against us. In the mid 1970s, during the OPEC oil crisis, some American academics, including Henry Kissinger, floated the idea of a Fourth World of basket case economies into which they would spin off the countries which were not vital to the West. That is no longer a project for the future; it has already been accomplished through the SAP programs which the IMF sponsored, and through the WTO and its Uruguay GATT rules. Most African economies, including Nigeria, are now on their way to join Haiti in the permanent poverty of the Fourth World. To make that clear, let us consider the global economic system and your descendants’ prospect of catching up if the present status quo is allowed to remain. Some economists have calculated that, if the 1986 growth rates were maintained indefinitely into the future, “the poor countries would achieve the income level of the rich countries in 127 years’ time. They would catch up with the rich countries in half a millennium, 497 years to be precise.”

In other words, if conditions had remained as favorable to the poor countries as they were back in 1986, it would take till the year 2113 for the incomes of the poor countries to reach where those of the rich countries were in 1986! And not till the year 2483 would the poor countries finally catch up
with the rich. And, mark you, that was based on figures before SAP flushed the value of the Naira and other African currencies down the drain; and before the Uruguay GATT came into force and the WTO came into being. Needless to say, under WTO rules, the terms of trade have been moved even more sharply against the poor countries.

Under the World Bank-IMF-WTO system of debt trap imperialism, hoping to catch up in income, let alone in economic power, even in 500 years time, is a hopeless delusion. Furthermore, under their system, any country which has not already industrialized would be prevented from doing so.

Also during the 1970s, other American academics, led by Garret Hardin, put forward the twin ideas of lifeboat ethics and triage; and they advocated that the poor countries be exterminated to save for the rich countries the resources of an allegedly overpopulated Lifeboat Earth. In one of the most provocative presentations of the triage idea, Garret Hardin argued against sending famine relief to “overpopulated” countries, saying:

How can we help a foreign country to escape overpopulation? Clearly the worst thing we can do is send food.... Atomic bombs would be kinder. For a few moments the misery would be acute, but it would soon come to an end for most of the people, leaving a few survivors to suffer thereafter”.


In other words, bomb and exterminate the poor, hungry brutes and save their resources for the rich, all in the name of civilization.

Later, George Bush, former president of the USA, was reported as saying that they want Africa without the Africans. He was articulating a view held in some high level environmentalist quarters, that Africa should be turned into a big game reserve, as well as another view held in some high level business quarters that Africa should be turned into an economic resource reservoir for the industrialized world. And, subsequent to all of that, it has emerged that Africa did not become the epicenter of the AIDS epidemic by accident. A strong prima facie case has been established that the AIDS virus is an American biological weapons device, and that the AIDS epidemic in Africa is the result of an AIDS bomb unleashed there when the World Health Organization (WHO) vaccinated 97 million persons in seven central African countries in the late 1970s, in a massive immunization program to eradicate smallpox. Thus, by accident or by design, the proposals to exterminate the peoples of the poor and allegedly overpopulated countries, and to remove the Africans from Africa, are already being implemented through the AIDS
The third option, ethnic cleansing, was tried in apartheid South Africa under its Bantustan program. The aboriginal Blacks of South Africa were forcibly expelled from the best 87% of their land and confined to the worst 13%, and those were constituted into allegedly independent Bantustans. These were scattered fragments of poor quality lands, without amenities. Despite resistance and protest and publicity, the ethnic cleansing continued. The decision to abandoned apartheid was made in the mid-1970s, only after Black liberation armies, backed by the Soviet Union, had won control of Angola and Mozambique, thereby bringing apartheid South Africa within striking distance of black liberation armies. By the time the Soviet Union collapsed in the late 1980s, the project to dismantle apartheid and install a black government controllable by the West and protective of its interest had gone too far to be reversed. Had the Soviet Union collapsed in the early 1970s, the western powers would have felt no need to save their investments by helping to dismantle apartheid. But we must be quite clear on one thing: though the ethnic cleansing option has been abandoned in South Africa, along with apartheid, it can be revived in any part of Africa as need arises. The technique has merely been retired, not destroyed.

Given these facts, we must seriously ask ourselves: Is the international community Blacks-friendly? Those who, in the last six centuries, inflicted the slave catching wars and slavery on us; who conquered, colonized and exploited us; who inflicted genocide on some of us, hunting some of us down like wild beasts for their entertainment (as in Namibia and the former Zaire) - can they be properly seen as our friends? Those who, in the last 50 years, have maneuvered us into permanent poverty, who committed ethnic cleansing into Bantustans on some of us, and extermination on some of us by the AIDS bomb- can they be properly seen as anything but our mortal enemies? So much for our delusion on the humane attitudes and benevolent intentions towards us by the overlords of the global system.

The three prospects for your descendants may be summarized as follows:

The Haiti or Fourth World prospect: that is a continuation of the status quo of malign entrapment in the cage of Debt Trap Imperialism, where they will flounder and famish in the false hope of catching up with the industrialized countries sometime in the late Third Millennium.

The Cherokee or Bantustan prospect: that is where those who inhabit lands with specific resources wanted by the imperialists will be treated to ethnic cleansing and, if lucky, will be confined to some impoverished reservations or human zoos.
The Tasmanian or Triage prospect: that is where they will be selectively and instalmentally exterminated, so that the civilized will not be threatened by the resource demands of the over-breeding poor. Should the AIDS bomb fail to finish the job in central Africa, other bombs are there to be used, and other methods are available, including improved versions of the Auschwitz program of the Nazis.

So, all in all, through the AIDS bomb and the World-Bank-IMF-WTO system, Nigerians, and other Black Africans, are quietly being put through two of these three treatments. The third has already been tried on South Africans and abandoned for the time being. So long as the absolute strategic impotency of Black Africans persists, these and other techniques of destruction can be used against them. It is against this threat that Nigeria’s reconstruction must be aimed if it is to be worth the bother.

Nigeria or ECOWAS?

Given the hostile global environment which I have just sketched, in order to survive, Nigerians need to build an industrialized nation that is a military power of the order of China and India, at the very least, and preferably of superpower rank, like Russia, the EU and the USA. Nothing less will do. And they need to do that starting yesterday; they need to accomplish it by mid-21st century at the latest. Otherwise, they can kiss the earth goodbye whenever the imperialists, having secured their malaria and melanoma vaccines, move finally against them.

The task of reconstruction may seem an obvious one: take this unindustrialized, neocolonized noyau called Nigeria, and turn it into a nation and industrialize it. Right? Not quite! A strategist must also take a look at the opposition. What needs to be made into a nation and industrialized must have the potential to beat off a NATO assault of any type, for NATO is the military enforcement arm of the ultimate enemy. Furthermore, as I already pointed out, Nigeria, for all its boasted endowment, has neither the territorial expanse, nor the resource diversity, nor the human population to place it in the league of China, India, Russia, the EU or the USA. So, what is to be done?

Even in the best of circumstances, nation building is a difficult enterprise. Turning a noyau into a nation will be even more so. But Malaysia has done it in the same period (40years) in which Nigerians have refused to attempt it. But Malaysia did it, not absent-mindedly, not by self-deception, but by a conscious program, intelligently and diligently pursued. Similarly,
industrialization is an exacting project, even for an already consolidated nation. Japan did it in one generation, under the Meiji. China did it in one generation, under Mao. And Russia, under Stalin, even did it in ten years! The two together, nation-building and industrialization, make a formidable project. So, is the combined challenge worth the bother? If our people’s survival is worthwhile to us, then, we have no choice in the matter: the dual project must be undertaken, and carried out in such a way that the projected industrial nation will meet the geostrategic conditions for its survival. There is no point building a paper house when a forest fire is approaching.

There is no point in building a chicken coop when what you need is an aircraft hangar. If Nigerians want to engage in nation building and industrialization at all, they ought to partake in building and industrializing a nation big enough to survive and thrive in the global conditions of tomorrow. And the nearest potentially adequate politico-economic structure that Nigerians could join in building is ECOWAS. If the reconstruction of Nigeria is to make strategic sense, it must extend to the reconstruction of ECOWAS. Nothing less will do.

How to turn ECOWAS into a state, and its peoples into a nation, and how to industrialize it, and develop its strategic might to the level of China’s, at the very least? And how to do so in what little time is still available before NATO invades us in a final campaign to evict Africans from Africa by exterminating us? These are the central problems which the strategic reconstruction of Nigeria must solve. However, that is the theme of Project 2060 which I outlined elsewhere a few years ago and which, hopefully, will be the subject of a future seminar.

Conclusion

I hope all of you here will lend yourselves to the effort to meet this geostrategic challenge. If you are inclined to do nothing, please remember that, by reincarnation, you could be right back here when the Black Africans are sent down their own Trail of Tears to the Black Auschwitz. For those who want to avoid that bitter experience, Black Redemption and the African Renaissance demand that we bring to the challenge all our talents and experience and courage and steadfastness. We either succeed or Black Africans will be caused to vanish from the earth like the Tasmanians.
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Reparations and A New Global Order:
A Comparative Overview


Contemplating the condition of the Black World is vexatious to the spirit: that is probably the strongest impetus which has brought us all here today.

For many centuries, and especially in the last five, the black skin has been a badge of contempt. or instance, it used to be said in Brazil that if you are white and running down the street, you are an athlete; but if you are black and running down the street, you are a thief! And in most parts of the world today, if you are white and rich, you are honoured and celebrated, and all doors fly open as you approach; but if you are black and rich, you are under suspicion, and handcuffs and guard dogs stand ready to take you away. Yes, the black skin is still the badge of contempt in the world today, as it has been for nearly 2,000 years. To make sure it does not remain so in the 21st century is perhaps the overall purpose of our search for reparations.

We are gathered here today, thinkers and activists who want to change Black People's condition in the world. What things do we need to change, both in the world and in ourselves, if we are to accomplish the mission of reparations? What changes must we make in structures, in psychology, in historical consciousness and much else?

We might begin by noting that Blacks are not the only people in the world who are seeking, or who have sought, reparations. In fact, by only now pressing our claim for reparations, we are latecomers to a varied company of peoples in the Americans, in Asia, and in Europe. Here is a partial catalogue of reparations, paid and pending, which are 20th century precedents for reparations to the Black World.

In the Americas, from Southern Chile to the Arctic north of Canada, reparations are belong sought and being made. The Mapuche, an aboriginal people of Southern Chile, are pressing for the return of their lands, some 30 m on hectares of which were, bit by bit, taken away and given to European immigrants since 1540. The Inuit of Arctic Canada, more commonly known as the Eskimo, were in 192 offered restitution of some 850,000 sq. miles of
their ancestral lands, their home range for millennia before European invaders arrived there.

In the USA, claims by the Sioux to the Black Lands of South Dakota are now in the courts. And the US Government is attempting to give some 400,000 acres of grazing land to the Navaho, and some other lands to the Hopi in the south-west of the USA. In 1938, the US Government admitted wrongdoing in interning some 120,000 Japanese-Americans under Executive Order 9066 of 1942, during WW II, and awarded each internee $20,000.

Earlier on, and further afield, under the Thompson-Urrutia Treaty of 1921, the USA paid Colombia reparations, including the sum of $25 million, for excising the territory of Panama from Colombia for the purpose of building the Panama Canal.

In Asia, following WW II, Japan paid reparations, mostly to the Asian countries it had occupied. By May 1949, $39 million had been paid from Japanese assets in Japan, and another unspecified amount had been paid from Japanese assets held outside Japan. And Japan as obliged to sign treaties of reparations with Burma (1954), the Philippines (1956, and Indonesia (1958). More recently, the Emperor of Japan has apologised to Korea for atrocities committed there by the Japanese, and North Korea is asking for $5 billion in reparations for damages sustained during 35 years of Japanese colonisation.

In Europe, after WW II, the victors demanded reparations from Germany for all damages to civilians and their dependants, for losses caused by the maltreatment of prisoners of war, and for all non-military property that was destroyed in the war. In 1921, Germany's reparations liability was fixed at 132 billion gold marks. After WW II, the victorious Allies fled reparations claims against Germany for $320 b on. Reparations were also levied on Italy and Finland. The items for which these claims were made included bodily loss. loss of liberty, loss of property, injury to professional careers, dislocation and forced emigration time spent in concentration camps because of racial, religious and political persecution. Others were the social cost of war, as represented by the burden from loss of life, social disorder, and institutional disorder; and the economic cost of war, as represented by the capital destroyed and the value of civilian goods and services foregone to make war goods. Payments were made in cash and kind -- goods, services, capital equipment, land, farm and forest products; and penalties were added for late deliveries.
Perhaps the most famous case of reparations was that paid by Germany to the Jews. These were paid by West Germany to Israel for crimes against Jews in territories controlled by Hitler's Germany, and to individuals to indemnify them for persecution. In the initial phase, these included $2 billion to make amends to victims of Nazi persecution; $952 million in personal indemnities; $35.70 per month per inmate of concentration camps; pensions for the survivors of victims; $820 million to Israel to resettle 50,000 Jewish emigrants from lands formerly controlled by Hitler. All that was just the beginning. Other, and largely undisclosed, payments followed. And even in 1992, the World Jewish Congress in New York announced that the newly unified Germany would pay compensation, totaling $63 million for 1993, to 50,000 Jews who suffered Nazi persecution but had not been paid reparations because they lived in East Germany.

'With such precedents of reparations to non-Black peoples in four continents, it would be sheer racism for the world to discountenance reparations claims from the Black World.

But our own search for reparations must, of necessity, be tailored to our peculiar condition, to our peculiar experience. Some others may need only that their ancestral home range be returned to them; some others that they be compensated for the indignities of internment and the loss of citizen rights; some others that acts of genocide and other atrocities against their people be atoned or and paid or; some others that lands excised from their territory be paid for. We, however, who have experienced all of the above and more, and experienced them for much longer than most, and therefore suffer chronically from their effects -- we must take a more comprehensive view of what reparations must mean for us. We must ask not only that reparations be made for specific acts, or that restitution be made of specific properties; we who have been such monumental victims are obliged to also ask: What sorts of system, capitalist as well as pre-capitalist, with their values and world outlook, made this long holocaust possible; and what must be done to transform these systems into some other kind where holocaust could not be inflicted on us?

Unless we address and effectively answer that question, our quest for reparations would be flawed and incomplete. We must therefore look into the nature of the old existing global order and see what needs to be done to change it for the better.
The hallmarks of the old global order, which was initiated by the voyage by Columbus may be summarised as a propensity for perpetrating holocaust, a devotion to exploitation, and a passion for negrophobia. It has inflected holocaust, through genocide and culturecide -- but not only on the Black World; it has visited exploitation, through slavery and colonialism -- but not only on the Black World; but it has reserved for the Black World a special scourge: that virulent strain of racism known as Negrophobia!

That old global order just described is not a thing of the past; It is still very much with us. In different parts of the world today, In 1993, even as we sit here in this hall, Blacks are still being subjected to the holocaust of genocide and culturecide (as in the Sudan); to the exploitations of slavery (as in Mauritania), and of colonialism and neo-colonialism (as in every part of the Black World; and to negrophobia, in all its forms and degrees, throughout the entire globe. To end this dreadful condition and to make all the appropriate repairs, i.e. reparations, we need to move from this old global order, where holocaust happened to us, to a different global order where holocaust will never happen to us. we need to move from this old global order. which sucks resources out of our veins and piles debt upon our heads, to a different global order in which our enormous resources shall serve our own prosperity. We need to move from this old global order. which is permeated with negrophobia, to a new global order that is cleansed of negrophobia, one where we would live in dignity and equality with all the other races of humanly.

Now, what are we, the Black World, going to contribute to the making of these changes?

Let me begin by noting that reparation is not just about money: it is not even mostly about money; in fact, money is not even one percent of what reparation is about. Reparation is mostly about making repairs. self-made repairs, on ourselves: mental repairs, psychological repairs, cultural repairs, organisational repairs, social repairs, institutional repairs, technological repairs, economic repairs. political repairs, educational repairs, repairs of every type that we need in order to recreate and sustainable black societies. For the sad truth is that five centuries of holocaust have made our societies brittle and unviable. And as the great Marcus Garvey warned over 50 years ago, if we continue as we re, we are heading for extinction.

More important than any monies to be received; more fundamental than any lands to be recovered, is the opportunity the reparations campaign offers us
for the rehabilitation of Black people, by Black people, for Black people; opportunities for the rehabilitation of our minds, our material condition, our collective reputation. our cultures, our memories, our self-respect, our religious, our political traditions and our family institutions; but first and foremost for the rehabilitation of our minds.

Let me repeat that the most important aspect of reparation is not the money the campaign may or may not bring: the most important part of reparation is our self-repair; the change it will bring about in our understanding of our history, of ourselves, and of our destiny; the chance it will bring about in our place in the world.

Now. we who are campaigning or reparations cannot hope to change the world without changing ourselves. We cannot hope to change the world without changing our ways o seeing the world, our ways o thinking about the world, our ways of organising our world, our ways of working and dreaming in our world. All these, and ,more, must change for the better. The type of Black Man and Black woman that was made by the holocaust -- that was made to feel inferior by slavery and then was steeped in colonial attitudes and values -- that type of Black will not be able to bring the post-reparation global order into being without changing profoundly in the process that has begun; that type of Black will not be even appropriate for the post-reparation global order unless thoroughly and suitably reconstructed. So, reparation, like charity, must begin with ourselves, with the making of the new Black person, with he .making of a new Black World. How?

We must begin by asking ourselves: What weaknesses on our side made the holocaust possible? Weaknesses of organisation? Weakness of solidarity? Weaknesses of identity? Weaknesses of mentality? Weaknesses of behaviour? If we do not correct such weaknesses, even if we got billions of billions of dollars in reparations money, even if we got back all our expropriated land, we would fritter it all away yet again, and recycle it all back ,into alien hands.

We must therefore find out what deficiencies in our sense of identity what quirks in our mentality, what faults in our feelings solidarity made it possible for some of us to sell some of us into bondage; still make it possible for us to succumb to the divide and conquer tactics of our exploiters; make it possible for all too many of us to be afflicted with Negro negrophobia -- our counterpart of the self-hating disease of the anti-Semitic Semite. Twenty years ago, when I was writing The West and the Rest of Us, I gave it a
subtitle: "White Predators, Black Slavers and the African Elite". That was to serve notice that we cannot overlook our complicity, as Black Slavers and as the African Elite, in what happened, and is still happening to us. We must, therefore, change ourselves in order to end our criminal complicity in perpetuating our lamentable condition.

Beyond all that, we must discover where we now are in our history. We must recognise that in 36 years of independence, reckoning from Ghana's in 1957 (just four years short of the 40 years the Israelites spent in the wilderness!), we have been blundering about in the neo-colonial wilderness. And we must ask: Why did Moses lead his people into the wilderness and keep them wandering about for two generations? I do not believe that he, a learned man raised in the pharaoh's court, did not know the direct route to his people's Promised Land. I believe it was a dilatory sojourn whose tribulations were calculated to cure his people of the legacy of slavery. You can't make a free people out of slaves without first putting them through experiences that would purge them of the slave mentality. We, in our own wilderness years, need to take conscious steps to purge ourselves of the legacy of a 500 year holocaust of slavery and colonialism. In that way, when we finally arrive at our own Promised Land -- a Black World cured of the holocaust legacy -- we would be ready for the new liberated phase of our long adventure on this Earth.

To help us get our bearings in this wilderness phase, I would suggest four main measures:

1. The creation of Holocaust Monuments in all parts of the Black World, as reminders of what we have been through and are determined never again to o through. Efforts already being made in this area should continue and be added to. I am thinking, for instance, of the Goree Island Project in Senegal, and the Slave Route Project in Benin Republic. But let me recommend a major monument here in Abuja, this new capital rising in a zone that, in the past, witnessed intensive slave raiding for the trans-Saharan slave trade. We should erect here a monument complex that portrays scenes from the Black Holocaust, scenes taken from all parts of the world; a great Black Holocaust Monument that shall serve as the Black World's counterpart of the Wailing Wall of the Jews in Jerusalem.

2. The institution of a Holocaust Memorial Day, to be observed each year throughout the Black World, as a day of mourning and remembrance, with solemn ceremonies at local holocaust monuments. Perhaps this
date, April 27, on which we have assembled here, should be designated the Holocaust Memorial Day of the Black World.

3. The creation of a Black Heritage Education Curriculum, to teach us our true history, and thereby restore our self-worth as descendants of the pioneers of world civilisation, and supply us with the antidote to the White Supremacist Ideology and its damaging effects. This would produce a post-holocaust Black personality, one cured of the debilities inflicted by the holocaust experience.

4. The creation of a Black World League of Nations, with its complex of institutions, to take care of our collective security, to foster solidarity and prosperity among us, and to prevent the infliction of any future damage on any part of the Black World.

These measures, and others like them, would teach us who we are what we have been and ought to become, and would promote and concretise Black World solidarity. Having made such internal changes in ourselves and in our world, we would be better able to foster in the entire global order two key changes:

a. A different view of global history, particularly of the last 500 years, and of the millennia before 525 BC -- that calamitous year when Black Egypt fell permanently to white invaders, leaving all of Africa open for incursions from West Eurasia; and

b. structural changes that would block the possibility of future damage of the sorts for which we now seek reparations.

To conclude, let me note that, for us, no global order would be truly new without apologies for ancient wrongs, without an end to continuing wrongs, without reparations, without restitutions, without the creation of systems and mechanisms that would ensure that the holocaust we have been through never happens again. Our crusade for reparations would be completed only when we achieve a global order without negrophobia, without alien hegemony over any part of the Black World, and without the possibility of holocaust. From our perspective, a global order which failed to meet such conditions would not really be new or adequate: It would be an order serving us the same old bitter wine in some new bottle.

From here today, I foresee a day when we too shall get back our expropriated lands; I foresee a day when we too shall get compensation or our losses and our pains; I foresee a day when negrophobia and the conditions which foster it shall have vanished from the earth. But between now and that day, much work waits to be done. The most serious part of
that work is the work of self rehabilitation. And so I say: "Black Soul, Heal Thyself, and all shall be restored to you".

I thank you all.
Reparations and the Pan-African War on Genocide

Written by Chinweizu

Now that the American Nazi masters of White Power have started implementing their Global ‘Final Solution’ to what, in the USA, they used to call ‘The Negro Question’ [i.e. ‘What is to be done with the Negro?’], a new and deadly context has arisen for the Pan-African Reparations Movement.

Situation Report

Black Africans, whether in the African homeland or in the world-wide Diaspora, have, for three decades already, been under a genocide attack from the barbarian masters of Global Europe; a sneak attack made by using Biological Weapons of Mass Destruction (Bio-WMDs). Those who, for centuries have orchestrated our enslavement, expropriation and super-exploitation, are now (Surprise! Surprise!) orchestrating our extermination.

Our prospects have, without fanfare, gone from worse to the worst: from a further 1000 years of exploitation, humiliation and the most dire poverty, to outright extermination within this century, if we don’t defeat this attack. Unfortunately, most Africans do not know that they are at war; or that Global Europe has been making war, non-stop, on Pan-Africa for the last six centuries; or that, since the 1970s, the Nazi masters of Globalization [their imperialist ‘New World Order’] have been waging a covert war to exterminate us.

Africans know all too well of AIDS, and of the AIDS epidemic that is devastating Pan-African populations; but they, and especially those of the Homeland, either do not know, or are too brainwashed to believe, that the AIDS scourge was deliberately inflicted to exterminate them, via the World Health Organization (WHO) and its mass vaccination campaign to, ostensibly, eradicate smallpox. That was the campaign in which they vaccinated 97 million people in the 7 countries of Central Africa which became the epicenter of the AIDS pandemic: Zaire, Zambia, Tanzania, Uganda, Malawi, Rwanda, Burundi. [See p.6 for Appendix 1: the article by Pearce Wright, “Smallpox vaccine ‘Triggered Aids virus,’” The (London) Times, May 11, 1987, pp.1, 18]
Who manufactured the actual, but still mysterious, virus that causes AIDS, and why, and how it got into the WHO vaccines is yet another story?

The Challenge

There comes a time when a people must get its act together or perish. For Pan-Africa (the entire Black African World) that time is NOW! If we fail to get our act together, we will have no future left, for we shall, like others before us, be disappeared from Planet Earth by our age-old enemies: the genocide-addicted barbarian masters of Global Europe. We shall be disappeared like the Native Americans of the USA, like the Black Tasmanians, like the Black Aborigines of Australia, like the Tatar Aborigines of Siberia. The challenge before all Africans is, therefore, this:

To wage a relentless War on Genocide and defeat, by any means necessary, this satanic extermination campaign that has been unleashed on us. That is the paramount task, indeed the one and only strategic task facing us in this century.

What is to be done?

As victims of a genocide attack, it is our duty to respond with a War on Genocide.
To that end,

We must rouse the African fighting spirit.
We must mobilize the population of Pan-Africa.
We must reorganize the societies and communities of Pan-Africa to build African Power for Pan-African survival.

But what has reparations got to do with any of that?

Everything!

Indeed, Self-Reparation, the core aspect of reparations, is the key to everything. How so?

The two prime obstacles to African mobilization and organization are a) the Niggerized populations of Pan-Africa, and b) the packed galleries of the Traitors-at-the-Top of Pan-Africa’s societies
and communities: the Traitors Spiritual, Traitors Temporal, Traitors Intellectual, Traitors Political, Cultural, Economic etc; Traitors who are installed by White Power to disorient and lead us astray, and who hold their own people down for the imperialist enemy to rape, loot, exploit and exterminate.

**Remember Marcus Garvey?** That great Pan-African prophet who warned us, back in the 1920s, against the genocide we are now undergoing? What kept us from heeding his call to organize the African Power to deter or defeat this long-predicted attack? It was none other than our de-Africanized, Niggerized and zombified minds. Our first step towards victory must, therefore, be to de-Niggerize and re-Africanize our minds; to get rid, especially, of the Niggerism that is now entrenched in the Homeland.

**But, first of all, What is the Nigger?**

The Nigger is the African mangled by white power, a peculiar travesty produced by centuries of European imperialism and Arab hegemony. And alas! after more than a century of being completely in the dungeons of White Power, all of us Africans today have become Niggers.

The Nigger is the zombie into which White Power has deformed the African.

The Nigger is a fake African – a person of African race, who has been stripped of African culture, and who is culturally Eurocentric or Arabocentric.

The Nigger is a biological African who has internalized white supremacist superstitions, and become Afrophobic, and even Eurochauvinist or Arabochauvinist too, in many cases.

The Nigger is a person with black skin, white mind and white spirit, an African salt that has lost its savor, brown sugar that has turned sour.

The Nigger is that strange creature – the nominal African who despises his race, denies African culture, demonizes his ancestors, and yet expects, and even demands, that people of the other self-respecting races of humanity should respect him and treat him as an equal member of humanity.

The Nigger is the African zombie possessed by the ideas and ideals of White Supremacy; the Afrocidal African who craves to be white, physically (e.g Wacko Jacko), or culturally (e.g. the assortment of Black Europeans in the Homeland, Afro-Saxons in the Diaspora, and Omar Bashir with his criminal band of Arabizer-Jihadeer slavers and ethnic cleansers in the Sudan).
The Nigger, mesmerized by the Phantom of Individual Freedom/Equality/Rights within the White Power system of the enemy, imagines himself liberated even while everything in Pan-Africa – our laws, our customs, our cities, our schools, our beliefs, our ambitions -- still bears the characteristics stamped on it to serve imperialism.

The Nigger is the African enchanted by and addicted to Global Europe’s anti-ecological [i.e. anti-Ma’at] Way; that glamorized, capitalist way that is leading to certain destruction for the biosphere and humanity.

Some Niggers, the Super-Niggers, are so addicted to the satanic gods and conman heavens of their white slave-masters that they are, in effect, already enslaved, not only in body and mind, but also in soul; not only for a lifetime here on earth, but also for eternity in the hereafter.

Imagine a black sheep regurgitated after a week in the stomach of a white python and covered in a thick gel of python saliva; imagine that half-digested carcass staggering about and parading itself as a sheep. Some sheep! But such, alas, is the Nigger!

It takes the Nigger to think or say: ‘Thank God for Slavery!’ or ‘Thank God for Colonialism!’; i.e. to count as blessings those two demolitions of African societies by White Power: demolitions accompanied by viper bites which imbedded fangs and poisons into the body-social of Pan-Africa, fangs which are yet to be extracted, and poisons which are yet to be bled and neutralized with antidotes, poisons which are still coursing through our spirits, leaving Pan-Africa too dazed, decrepit and disoriented to get its act together.

Such is the Niggerized African, whether of the homeland or the Diaspora!

And the Nigger mind is the enemy’s recruiting point for traitors among us.

And it is Niggerism that has made Pan-Africa’s Traitors-at-the-Top squander, in frivolous pursuits, the past 50 years of ‘Independence’, and it has kept them chasing after crumbs from the table of White Power, instead of focusing on their strategic duty to build African Power. And these gratuitous failures have brought us, weak and defenseless, into this vaccination slaughter-yard for genocide.

**Our first task in our War on Genocide is, therefore, to cure Pan-Africa of Niggerism,** with its identity confusions, its strategic blindness, its miseducated and zombified consciousness, its suicidal imbecilities and its infinite tolerance for Traitors-at-the-Top.
Self-Reparation is about effecting this cure. And the operational proof of successful self-reparation is when we build the African Power that brings us victory over this genocide. But the Nigger in us dreads and obstructs this cure.

**Remember Rap Brown? Remember his battle cry? "Die, Nigger Die!"**

We are yet to fully undergo that wise cure he prescribed. There are still too many Niggers in Pan-Africa, doing havoc among us everywhere. In fact, Niggers are proliferating, particularly in the Homeland. We must speedily kill off the Nigger, for **the Nigger must die if the African is to live!**

**Remember Cabral, who taught us to re-become Africans and to struggle against our own weaknesses?**

De-Niggerization, re-Africanization and overcoming our crippling weaknesses are the fundamentals of the self-reparation we must accomplish. Without them, our chances of surviving this 21st century are less than that of a hailstone in a metal-melting furnace.

Killing the Nigger is the foundation for our self-reparation program. And since the Nigger is so hard to kill, we must collectively help one another to kill the Nigger in himself or herself.

So, the basic and urgent task of the African Self-Reparation Movement is clear:

Re-Africanize the Nigger, for that is the only conversion that could save our bodies here on earth, and our souls in the hereafter.

To Africanize ourselves, we must Afrocentrify our minds.

After a century or more of comprehensive miseducation, our first need is to know ourselves and know our enemies.

And for that we must turn to our sages and prophets from down the ages and drink from their fountains of healing wisdom:

We must learn from our anti-imperialist prophets, from Bookman to Biko.

We must learn from our intellectual warriors and pathfinders, from the defenders of the African way: from Garvey, Cheikh Anta Diop, Amilcar Cabral, Martin Delaney, Malcolm X, Blyden, Fanon, Cesaire, Carruthers and
others.

We must seek guidance from our sages across the millennia, from Ptahhotep down to p’Bitek, and from the proverbs of our ancestors.

We must take inspiration from exemplary organizers and mobilizers of African Power, from Mena to Menelik, from Senwosre to Shaka, from Seqenenre Tao, Kamose, Ahmose, Piankh, and Taharka, down to Sundiata, Sonni Ali, Osei Tutu, Dessalines, Nzinga, Yaw Asantewa, Nehanda, Sobukwe and many many more.

We must arm ourselves with the weapon of culture, of African culture; we must furnish our minds with Afrocentric stories, epics, historiographs, parables, riddles, instructions, admonitions; with the sciences and technologies that built the Great Pyramids on the Nile; with the stories of the Good works, Suffering, Death and Resurrection of Ausar/Orsir, the sorrows and saving powers of Ise, the wisdom of Djehuti and the other Akhu/(Enlightened Ones) of the Sep Tepi.

For our African Spirit to resurrect, like Ausar, after these many centuries of menticide, we must erase from Pan-Africa the satanic imprint of White Power and its Afrocidal brand of knowledge.

We must end our tolerance and admiration for those Nigger devils in the Traitors’ galleries who are spotlighted and glorified by enemy propaganda.

We must withdraw our allegiance and followership from the star Nigger misleaders foisted on us by White Power manipulation and praise songs.

We must abandon the acclaimed Niggers who purvey enemy doctrines and, instead, we must soak up wisdom from our own Afrocentric instructors: those who teach in the African Interest.

But while killing off the Nigger in and all around us, and while Afrocentrifying ourselves and our communities, we must not neglect some urgent defensive measures that we need to contain this genocide attack:

1. Do not submit to any mass vaccination program, especially those sponsored by any White Power outfit, like the WHO and other UN agencies.
2. At all times, Practice safe sex and other anti-AIDS measures.
3. Breed as much as you can. Pan Africa has a problem of UNDER-POPULATION, not "overpopulation", and we now need also to breed at a faster rate than the enemy’s genocide machine can mow us down.
4. Give your offspring a thorough Afrocentric upbringing to ensure they
become Africans and not Niggers!
5. Create structures that will make and keep us African in mind and spirit.
7. Insist on Africa for the Africans, and on using Africa’s resources for African Power.
8. Disorganize the imperialist structures that entrap your country, enslave your society and warp your lives.

Remember, at all times, that the battlefront in this War on Genocide is wherever you are. So, take action wherever you are, today and every day:

Kill the Nigger in and around you and Afrocentrify yourself and your fellows!

Slay the Phantom of individual freedom/equality/rights which enemy sirens brandish to delude and cripple us. The only freedom/equality/rights any African can have anywhere on earth is the freedom/equality/rights guaranteed by African Power. Anything else is a mirage that appears and disappears at the whim of White Power.

Recognize that Afrocentrism, like reparations, is all about building African Power, and recognize that the problem of the 21st century is the problem of African Power: How to build enough of it to guarantee the survival and sovereign autonomy of Pan-Africa.

Remember at all times, that there is no individual exemption, no individual escape route, from this genocide attack. A Colin Powell may claim that he isn’t black or African; but can he fool those new and improved Bio-WMD viruses that are genetically engineered to pick out and kill blacks, and blacks only? [See p.10 for Appendix 2: "Biowar and the Apartheid Legacy" by Salim Muwakkil, In These Times, May 29, 2003]

We are all in this together, and must fight the war collectively or perish separately.

**Therefore Organize, don’t agonize!**

Indeed, this War on Genocide is a great summons to us to organize, to build coalitions and establish operational unity between the Diaspora and Homeland zones of Pan-Africa. This is the time for zealous missionaries of Afrocentrism to fan out throughout Pan-Africa to win back our people to our collective interest. And, in particular, all you Afrocentrists of the Diaspora: Come over to Africa and help us Afrocentrify this Niggerized wasteland and
make it fit to build African Power for Pan-Africa’s survival!

And in taking up the challenge, let us arm our spirits with Bookman’s prayer of 1791:

Good God who created the Sun which shines on us from above, who rouses the sea and makes the thunder rumble; 
Listen! God though hidden in a cloud watches over us. 
The god of the whiteman calls forth crime but our God wills good works. 
Our God who is so good commands us to vengeance. 
He will direct our arms and help us. 
Throw away the likeness of the white man’s god who has so often brought us to tears and listen to liberty which speaks in all our hearts.  
--(Bookman, Haitian Vodun priest, Aug. 1791; tr. by Jacob Carruthers )

With Bookman’s spirit lighting up our path

Let us unite and go forward to win this War on Genocide!
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The Trouble with Africa's Political Development

Written by Chinweizu
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Letter from King Leopold II of Belgium to Colonial Missionaries, 1883
The letter which follows is Courtesy of Dr. Vera Nobles and Dr. Chiedozie Okoro.

"Reverends, Fathers and Dear Compatriots: The task that is given to fulfill is very delicate and requires much tact. You will go certainly to evangelize, but your evangelization must inspire above all Belgium interests. Your principal objective in our mission in the Congo is never to teach the niggers to know God, this they know already. They speak and submit to a Mungu, one Nzambi, one Nzakomba, and what else I don’t know. They know that to kill, to sleep with someone else’s wife, to lie and to insult is bad. Have courage to admit it; you are not going to teach them what they know already. Your essential role is to facilitate the task of administrators and industrials, which means you will go to interpret the gospel in the way it will be the best to protect your interests in that part of the world. For these things, you have to keep watch on disinteresting our savages from the richness that is plenty [in their underground. To avoid that, they get interested in it, and make you murderous] competition and dream one day to overthrow you.

Your knowledge of the gospel will allow you to find texts ordering, and encouraging your followers to love poverty, like “Happier are the poor because they will inherit the heaven” and, “It’s very difficult for the rich to enter the kingdom of God.” You have to detach from them and make them disrespect everything which gives courage to affront us. I make reference to their Mystic System and their war fetish-warfare protection—which they pretend not to want to abandon, and you must do everything in your power to make it disappear.

Your action will be directed essentially to the younger ones, for they won’t revolt when the recommendation of the priest is contradictory to their parent’s teachings. The children have to learn to obey what the missionary recommends, who is the father of their soul. You must singularly insist on their total submission and obedience, avoid developing the spirit in the schools, teach students to read and not to reason. There, dear patriots, are some of the principles that you must apply. You will find many other books, which will be given to you at the end of this conference. Evangelize the
niggers so that they stay forever in submission to the white colonialists, so they never revolt against the restraints they are undergoing. Recite every day—“Happy are those who are weeping because the kingdom of God is for them.”

Convert always the blacks by using the whip. Keep their women in nine months of submission to work freely for us. Force them to pay you in sign of recognition—goats, chicken or eggs—every time you visit their villages. And make sure that niggers never become rich. Sing every day that it’s impossible for the rich to enter heaven. Make them pay tax each week at Sunday mass. Use the money supposed for the poor, to build flourishing business centres. Institute a confessional system, which allows you to be good detectives denouncing any black that has a different consciousness contrary to that of the decision-maker. Teach the niggers to forget their heroes and to adore only ours. Never present a chair to a black that comes to visit you. Don’t give him more than one cigarette. Never invite him for dinner even if he gives you a chicken every time you arrive at his house.

“The above speech which shows the real intention of the Christian missionary journey in Africa was exposed to the world by Mr. Moukouani Muikwani Bukoko, born in the Congo in 1915, and who in 1935 while working in the Congo, bought a second hand Bible from a Belgian priest who forgot the speech in the Bible. — Dr. Chiedozie Okoro

We should note:
1] that all missionaries carried out, and still carry out, that mandate. We are only lucky to have found King Leopold’s articulation of the aim of all Christian imperialist missionaries to Africa.

2] Even the African converts who today manage the older churches in Africa (the priests, bishops, Archbishops, Cardinals etc of the Roman and Protestant sects), and especially also those who evangelize Born-Again Christianity, still serve the same mandate. Which is why they demonize African gods and Anglicize African names, and drop the names of African deities which form part of African names; and still attack and demolish the African shrines that have managed to survive, e.g. Okija.

3] Those Africans who voluntarily converted to Christianity before the colonial conquest such as Affonso I of the BaKongo in the 15th century probably did not discern the purpose of the brand of Christianity that was supplied to them. Which was probably why they fell easy prey to the missionaries and the white traders and pirates who followed them.
But their Japanese counterparts probably did discern the game, even without access to some version of Leopold’s letter. But even if the Japanese Shoguns did not intuit what Leopold makes explicit, they clearly realized the danger of Japanese converts to Christianity forming a fifth column within Japanese society and state, a fifth column loyal to their co-religionists in Europe. To rid Japan of that danger, in the late 16th century, the Shoguns began their expulsion of Portuguese and Spanish missionaries on the grounds that they were forcing Japanese to become Christian, teaching their disciples to wreck temples, taking and trading slaves, etc. Then, in 1596, it became clear to the Japanese authorities that Christianization had been a prelude to Spanish conquest of other lands; and it quickly dawned on them that a fifth column loyal to Rome and controlled by the priests of a foreign religion was a clear and present danger to the sovereignty of a newly unified Japan. Soon after, the persecution and suppression of Japanese Christians began. Early in the 17th century, sensing the danger from a creed that taught obedience to foreign priests rather than the Japanese authorities, all missionaries were ordered to leave and all Japanese were ordered to register at the Buddhist temples. When Japanese Christians took part in a rebellion, foreign priests were executed, the Spanish were expelled and Japanese Christians were forbidden to travel abroad. After another rebellion, largely by Christians, was put down, the Japanese Christians were suppressed and their descendants were put under close state surveillance for centuries thereafter. In the 1640s all Japanese suspected of being Christians were ruthlessly exterminated. Thus did Japan, by 1650, save itself from the first European attempt to mentally subvert, conquer and colonize it.

4] The African captives who were taken abroad and enslaved, and the Africans at home after the European conquest, having already been forcibly deprived of their autonomy, were in no political position to resist Christianization. Thus the Christianity still practised in all of the African American diaspora, just as that in the African homeland since the start of the 20th century, continues to carry out the Leopoldian mandate. Hence, for example, whereas the White Born-Agains of the USA, when in the US Navy ships in WWII, sang:

“Praise the Lord,
And pass the ammunition,” the attitude of African Born-Again converts today is best summed up as:
“Praise the Lord,
And lie down for the manna.”

Thanks to a century or more of this Leopold-mandated missionary mind control, African Christians are not an activist, self-helping, economically engaged, politically resolute, let alone militant bunch. Hence their putting
up with all manner of mistreatment and exploitation by their misrulers, white and black. The most they are disposed to do to their misrulers is to admonish them to “Fear God!”—as one protester’s miserable placard read in last week’s Lagos demonstration against the latest of the murderous fuel price hikes by the OBJ Misgovernment. The idea of an uprising to tame their misrulers is alien to the religiously opiated frame of mind of the Nigerians.

5] The lesson in the contrast between an Africa that the Christian missionaries brainwashed and subverted, and a Japan where this brainwashing and subversion was forcibly prevented, is stark and clear. What then must Africans of today begin to do to save themselves from brainwashing by their White World enemies here on earth?—That is the question.
Arab Colonialism Series: USAfrica- The Arab Agenda

Written by Chinweizu
Friday, 01 June 2007

USAfrica- The Arab agenda

1] We must never forget that, despite Gadhafi’s rhetoric against colonialism, he and his Arab fellows are colonialists in Africa--white settler colonialist who invaded, conquered, expropriated and have settled on 1/3 of Africa beginning in 640.

2] Gadhafi’s hurry to implement his USAfrica is suspect. After he has spent 40 years trying to force Libya’s unification with Sudan, to forcibly annex the Auzou strip from Chad, and sponsoring destabilization in Liberia, Uganda etc. should we trust his intentions? We should be highly suspicious of a project by which he would diplomatically swallow in one gulp all of Black Africa where he has, hitherto, failed to militarily grab bits and pieces.

3] In Gadhafi’s speeches in 2005, where he pushed for the fledgling AU to appoint a Defense Minister, and a Trade Minister etc as matters of priority; and called for a continental army, he also urged the AU countries to compete to host the institutions of the AU/USAfrica. This hurry is all highly suspicious.

Clearly, the Arab countries, awash with oil money and with unlimited back-up from the rest of the oil-rich Arab League, will outbid the poor Black countries, leading to Arab domination of the USAfrica; just as the UN is dominated by the gang of imperialist countries where its key institutions are located—the USA with the World Bank and IMF in Washington and the UN Hqtr in New York, and Europe with Unesco in Paris, the Maritime agencies in London, and other key agencies in Geneva.
If the Gadhafi formula for locating its key institutions is allowed, this USAfrica will become an instrument of Arab colonialism in Africa; and will entrench Arab power over Black Africa.

4] Defense is the last thing a sensible sovereign country surrenders. Note that after 50 years of their merger process, the EU states have yet to do that and appoint a defense minister. Yet Gadhafi wants the AU to start with that! Highly suspicious.

5] The dangers of Arab colonialism are evident in Mauritania and Sudan, and should be studied and heeded.

6] Gadhafi’s arguments about the potential economic benefits of USAfrica are invalid. Continental size is neither a necessary nor sufficient condition for becoming an economic power. If it was, Britain, Japan, Germany, France, let alone Switzerland and most of the European countries would be economic midgets, and the Asian tigers too; On the other hand, Antarctica and Australia, as continents, would be economic giants. Gadhafi must believe that he is addressing an audience of economic blockheads!

7] Gadhafi’s Lebensraum statement at the Arab League meeting in Jordan in 2001:

"The third of the Arab community living outside Africa should move in with the two-thirds on the continent and join the African Union ‘which is the only space we have’"

--Col. Mouammar Gadhafi of Libya, at the Arab League, 2001 should be taken seriously as a clue to his intentions and what he and his Arabs will set about doing to Black Africa once they have us in their USAfrica trap.

8] There is a vital need to think through the Black African interest, and negotiate in detail to secure its requirements, before agreeing to this proposal. After it is signed, the Arabs will, predictably, treat any second
thoughts and objections to details as treason.

Black Africans must never again repeat the folly of their leaders in 1973, when the OAU lined up behind the Arabs on the oil embargo, in hopes of getting concessions on oil, without any pre-agreed quid pro quo, and got nothing after the Arabs had exploited African support.

9] Because we are convinced that this USAfrica is a cover for Arab colonialism and Arab expansionism in Black Africa, we urge every Black African president in the AU to vote against it at Accra in July. At the very least, they should vote to postpone any decision on it for five years so that a vigorous debate can be carried out by the people, so they can knowledgeably and democratically mandate their presidents on what to do about it. We could take a lesson from the EU process where key stages of the unification have been preceded by plebisites in each member country.

10] If this USAfrica is agreed this July at Accra, Gadhafi and all Arabs will be laughing at the dumb blacks whom they have easily duped yet again. Don’t forget their view of Blacks, as enunciated over the centuries, most famously by Ibn Khaldun, Ibn Sena and Osama Bin Laden. See the following quotes:

Ibn Khaldun sees the blacks as “characterized by levity and excitability and great emotionalism” and [says] that “they are everywhere described as stupid” . . .

al-Dimashqi had the following to say: “The Equator is inhabited by communities of blacks who may be numbered among the savage beasts. Their complexion and hair are burnt and they are physically and morally abnormal. Their brains almost boil from the sun's heat.”

Ibn al-Faqih al-Hamadhani follows the same line of reasoning. To him . . . the zanj [black Africans]. . .are “overdone until they are burned so that the child comes out between black, murky, malodorous, stinking, and crinkly-haired, with uneven limbs, deficient minds, and depraved
Ibn Khaldun (d. 1406CE) added that blacks are “only humans who are closer to dumb animals than to rational beings.” . . .

Even such luminaries as Ibn Sina considered blacks to be “people who are by their very nature slaves.”

“All African women are prostitutes, and the whole race of African men are abeeed [slave] stock. Your people are like rats plaguing the earth” –Osama Bin Laden to the Sudanese-American novelist Kola Boof in Morocco in 1996.

Here is a 5-point program of action suggested by the CAACBA

1] Fwd this series and program of action to as many Black Africans as you can.

2] Put it on as many websites as possible;

3] Get editors to publish it in your local Black Community Newspapers;

4] Hold community study and discussion meetings on USAfrica and Arab Colonialism, using the series as basic discussion materials;

5] Write to your local newspapers, call your radio stations, contact your church leadership, hold public meetings, organize marches and demonstrations, send petitions to the president and foreign minister of your country-- as well as of other Black African countries —and demand a five-year moratorium on any decision on the USAfrica to enable the black communities discuss and debate it and give the AU presidents a democratic mandate on what to do about it.
Having spent May educating ourselves on Arab colonialists and their USAfrica project, it is crucial that we make June 2007 a month of rallies and demonstrations on the theme: "USofAfrica? No!; USofBLACK-Africa? Yes!"

Every Sunday in June, wherever we are, lets hold warm-up rallies, teach-ins and demonstrations, culminating with massive demos on July 1, to let the AU presidents hear how we feel about Gadhafi's USAfrica trap!

To help mobilise for these demos, please urgently fwd this email, with the attached documents, to as many Black Africans as you can. As you will see, the material we've been assembling has been refined, with help from some websites, down to 3 essential articles, one of which contains URLs to sites where the rest of the series can be found. This format, I think, is more media-friendly. So, please, fwd it to your local media and urge them to publish or broadcast.

Below are some ideas suggested for slogans and placards for the rallies:

2. USofAfrica: a trap for black Africa, by Arab colonialists!
3. Do black Africans really want to integrate into a USAfrica with Arab states that practice racial apartheid and still enslave blacks?
4. Do black Africans really want to integrate into a USAfrica with Arab states that are committed to Islamising and Arabising black Africa?
5. End slavery in Arab lands before we embark on any USAfrica project.
6. Stop Arab landgrabs from Black Africans in Egypt (Nubia), Sudan (Darfur) and Mauritania!
7. Darfur is an Arab landgrab from Black Africans.
8. USAfrica is a cover for Arab expansionism.
9. USAfrica is for the black African population, not the AU presidents, to
debate and decide.

10. We want five years moratorium on USAfrica! Its too serious to be rushed.

11. Down with Arab minority rule in Mauritania and Sudan

12. Stop apartheid and black slavery in Mauritania.

13. Stop ethnic cleansing of Nubians in Egypt and Sudan


16. Work for regime change in Khartoum, by any means necessary.

Chinweizu
for the CAACBA
[Committee Against Arab Colonialism in Black Africa]
Arab Colonialism:
USofAfrica, NO!!! USofBLACK-Africa, YES

Written by Chinweizu
Saturday, 05 May 2007

USofAfrica, NO!!! USofBLACK-Africa, YES
By Chinweizu

In Accra on Sat, 12 May, 2007 the PANAFRICAN GLOBAL ROUNDTABLE ON DURBAN PLUS 5 IN ADDIS ABABA (19-22 APRIL, 2007) ACCRA, (10-11 MAY 2007) submitted its report, including 5 recommendations, to the Forum of NGOs of the 41st session of ACHPR for onward submission by the Forum to the African Commission for Human and Peoples Rights (ACHPR), then to the AU Council of Ministers and the AU Summit; for onward Submission of the Report to the OHCHR Prep Comms. for Review of the UN World Conference Against Racism (WCAR) and Programme of Action on or before 2009.

One of these recommendations was that the black slavery in Arab lands must end before we embark on the "United States of Africa" project.

The background to this recommendation follows:

USAfrica & Arab Colonialism Series: Introduction, the Arab Agenda, Action Program, Contents
Do black Africans really want to integrate into a USAfrica with Arab states that practice racial apartheid and still enslave blacks? That are committed to Islamising and Arabising Black Africa?

Learn about

- Apartheid & black slavery in Mauritania TODAY
- Colorism and Arab enslavement of blacks in Sudan TODAY
• Ethnic cleansing of Nubians in Egypt and Sudan TODAY
• The centuries-old Arab quest for Lebensraum [living space] in Africa
• And many other shockers your schools and media didn’t tell you about all these 50 years!

Get the facts from this series on USAfrica & Arab colonialism!

READ ON.

Wise parents do not let their daughter marry a stranger without thoroughly investigating the character of the suitor and of his lineage.

Wise parents will look into the promises with which the suitor has been wooing their daughter and find out if they are credible.

If the suitor is already married, it is the business of the girl’s parents to look into how he has been treating his other wives.

All of black Africa is being wooed today by the promoters of the so-called USAfrica that aims to unite the entire continent, Blacks and Arabs together, under one federal state.

So, before this wedding takes place, we of this generation, need to do our parental duty towards all the future generations of Black Africans before we give them into marriage with the Arabs. Here are some fundamental questions we must answer correctly:

Who are these Arabs?
What do we know about their pedigree, their character and their ambitions in making this marriage with us?

Why should Black African states integrate with the Arab states into this USAfrica?

What would this USAfrica accomplish for Black Africa that the OAU could not and the AU cannot?

Have we studied the Arabs like we should, particularly through our dealings with them in the last 50 year?

Are there any black Africans already living with Arabs under one state? What has been the experience of such blacks? Something we should all gladly wish to experience?

What are the promoters of this USAfrica promising it will do for Black Africa? And should they be believed?

Who are these promoters? And who exactly is sponsoring them? Who is the godfather of this their USAfrica? And what is his motive?

Now, we need to examine our long history of living with Arabs on our continent, since they invaded Egypt in 640 AD. From that initial incursion, they have conquered and expropriated and settled on some 1/3 of the African continent.

How have they treated the blacks they overran?

Have they not enslaved and Arabized the countless millions who came under their power?

What is the attitude of Arabs to Blacks in general and to black Africans in particular?
Is it true that Arabs are given to color discrimination against blacks and hold blacks in automatic contempt and view blacks as subhuman?

Is it true that Arabs for many centuries raided and enslaved black Africans?

Is it true that Blacks are still being enslaved in Arab ruled countries like Mauritania and Sudan?

Why would black Africans want to integrate with states that still enslave blacks?

Is it true that Arab leaders have vowed to Islamize and Arabize Black Africa?

What would Arabization do to Black Africans? Are there examples to learn from?

How would non-Muslim blacks, Christians and polytheists, fare in this USAfrica?

Is it true that Arabs are ethnic cleansing and seizing land from Black Africans wherever both populations live together under one state, as in Sudan, Mauritania and Egypt?

If you are a black African, would your being Muslim protect you from Arab enslavers and ethnic cleansers? -- i.e. protect you from the treatment inflicted on your Christian and polytheist fellows?

If any of the above is true, would the same treatment not, predictably, be meted out to all of Back Africa by Arabs under this USAfrica? If not, why not?

The essays and stories in this special series on Arab colonialism present evidence to help us answer these and other vital questions.

As for the alleged economic benefits to come from this USAfrica, we shall examine them. The promoters of this USAfrica are voluble on these benefits, and would like us to focus only on them in deciding about this USAfrica. In
doing so, let us not be like the stupid child who was lured with sweets into a kidnapper’s bag and hauled off into slavery.

**Please read on and find, in the rest of this series, material to help you answer these vital questions.**

**The survival and security of future generations of Black Africans depend on you and your answers.**

If any of the above is true, would the same treatment not, predictably, be meted out to all of Back Africa by Arabs under this USAfrica? If not, why not?

The essays and stories in this special series on Arab colonialism present evidence to help us answer these and other vital questions.

As for the alleged economic benefits to come from this USAfrica, we shall examine them. The promoters of this USAfrica are voluble on these benefits, and would like us to focus only on them in deciding about this USAfrica. In doing so, let us not be like the stupid child who was lured with sweets into a kidnapper’s bag and hauled off into slavery.

**Please read on . . .**

**and find, in the rest of this series, material to help you answer these vital questions.**

**Slavery In Sudan: The New Holocaust:** [http://mirrormax.i8.com/custom3.html](http://mirrormax.i8.com/custom3.html)

**Rape of Sudanese Boys:** [http://mirrormax.i8.com/custom2.html](http://mirrormax.i8.com/custom2.html)
AU Leaders Gear Up For A United States Of Africa At July Accra Summit

By Basil Okafor

As the July Accra African Union, AU, Summit draws near many Pan-African commentators are variously concerned about the outcome of the future summit.

The sole agenda item for discussion at the summit is the proposed merger of all African states into one nation-state, to be known as the United States of Africa, USA.

Although a majority of commentators from all around Africa and the Black diaspora advise caution in approaching the proposed merger of all countries on the continent into one nation-state, there are equally, enthusiasts.

Already, campaigners for the utopian state, notably the Wood brothers, of Greenwood, California, United States, co-founders of the USA4USAfrica lobby, among others, are busy painting numerous advantages that await such merger.

On their website, for instance, the USAfrica campaigners already display such items as a flag of the proposed new nation-state and even the photograph of the immediate past Secretary-General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, whom they want “installed” president of the new USAfrica.

“Our Mandate is for the African Union, in 2007, to form an official United
States of Africa with Kofi Annan, (whose term ended December 31st 2006) departing UN Secretary General, being installed as the United States of Africa’s First President in much the same fashion George Washington was ‘installed’ as the first U.S. American President. God willing.”

In his own reaction, USA4Africa’s Mark Wood, comments: “In a United States of Africa, a citizen could freely travel anywhere on the continent to seek education, opportunity, commerce, or the simple pleasure of tourist travel within their vast country.

“A common African currency much like the EU model affords the ability to buy and sell throughout the continent with a reliable backed currency.”

Furthermore, he stated, “Much of Africa's debt could be relieved if freedom and capitalism were able to thrive in any African state from taxes paid by companies involved in business in any African location.”

However, in a February 2007 forum on the subject of a USAfrica, organised by the BBC World Service, many Pan-African commentators have expressed their reservations about the merger.

In response to the Forum’s topic, “Is African unity a dream worth pursuing?” a majority of the respondents broach the question with caution.

Of the 32 contributors, writing in from 14 countries in Africa, Europe and the Americas, two-thirds of them either express caution in embracing the concept of the new Africa, or are downright sceptical about the whole idea. On the other hand, a minority one-third show enthusiasm for the project, with no concern for its pitfalls.

Writing in from Khartoum, Sudan, John Moi, while drawing attention to the situation in his own country and the rest of North Africa, raises the fundamental question of the identity crisis that has continually plagued the continent, of who an African really is. He explains:
“A majority of people will accept that the question of who is an African is still problematic. Culturally, the guys in North Africa including our own Sudan consider themselves as Arabs.”

He further explains, “In secondary school days we learned about the map of the Arab world to really emphasise that my country belongs to that part of the world.

“Pan-Africanism and Pan-Arabism oppose each other to the effect that North Africans have very little to do with the rest of sub-Saharan Africa. We cannot subscribe to the idea of United States of Africa without answering this genuine identity question in clear terms.”

But Dennis Turner of Middlesex, England, thinks otherwise. He prescribes unity as the only panacea for the survival of Africans:

“It's time Africa united. With Africans putting aside selfishness and greed, religious, tribal and cultural differences, then a united Africa would be one of the most powerful states on earth. Otherwise, I foresee an extinction of the African race purely because of selfishness and greed.”

But how could the ideal of African unity be attained without addressing the very fundamental human problems pointed out by the sceptics, by purely dreaming, without confronting the pitfalls?

On a cautious note, Clement Kuol Biong of Mahe, in the Seychelles Island refers to the anecdote of a Sudanese politician, to buttress his point:

“A veteran Sudanese politician, once compared the Sudan Socialist Union of Jafaar Numeiri’s rule to a shadow tree where we come just to share the shade but what each person under the tree is thinking about is not necessarily the same.

“So how can Africa be united when we are still tribally fragmented and no African leader is interested in uniting his own people? How can African unity
become a dream come true when different groupings of the AU have their own hidden agendas?"

He concludes: “The Arabs have never stopped their dream of imposing Islamic culture on African masses by the sword, a practice which is still widespread in Sudan up to today.”

However, despite the caution advised, and the arguments and concerns raised by equally well-meaning Pan-Africanists about the feasibility of a United States of Africa, the continent’s leaders, it would seem, are determined to ignore the dangerous pitfalls.

It would be recalled that on the 31st of January, 2007, African leaders, at the Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, summit adopted as the sole agenda item for discussion at the forthcoming July Accra summit, the theme, "An AU Government: Towards the United States of Africa”.

The proposal was referred to the heads of state and governments of the African Union, by President Abdoulaye Wade of Senegal who, himself, was absent at the summit.

President Wade’s proposal was carried to the summit and presented on his behalf by that country’s foreign minister, Cheikh Tidiane Gadio, with the support of Nigeria.

According to Gadio, "President Wade suggested that the heads of state seize the opportunity offered by their next summit in Accra to devote a special session to the issue of the United States of Africa", while adding that it is necessary to prepare a new roadmap to better determine the next steps to be taken towards African unity.

While Nigeria and French-speaking countries as a whole were in favour of it, South Africa and the Southern African countries were not convinced of the necessity to root for the United States of Africa, an AU official who took part
in the working session revealed.

According to one delegate, South African President Thabo Mbeki told his peers at a closed-door meeting that, "Before you put a roof on a house, you need to build the foundations".

President Wade’s proposal was finally accepted after two days of discussions and will be the sole item on the agenda of the Accra summit, a fact described by Cheikh Tidiane Gadio as a real "historic victory", considering that the summit will convene in Ghana, the country from where Kwame Nkrumah championed Continental Union Government.

Ghana's President John Kuffuor, who was elected the new AU chairman after member states rebuffed Sudan and will host the Accra meeting, said in closing remarks at the Addis Ababa meeting that African states had much to gain by forging closer ties.

"Divided, we are weak," he said, "united, Africa can become one of the world powers, for good."

In the mean time, President Wade has suggested, according to his Minister of External Affairs, that non-governmental organisations, women’s associations, the media, among others, reflect on the subject so that each country will come to Accra with clear suggestions.
Black Africans Must Tread Carefully Over The USAfrica Project

By Basil Okafor

In the past nearly five decades since the formation of the Organisation of African Unity, OAU, many Africans have consistently called for closer ties between the nation-states that make up the continent.

After 38 years and feeling it had attained its main goal of African liberation, the 53-nation OAU transformed into an African Union, AU, on October 15, 2001, to ostensibly give the body political and economic teeth, as a first step to greater continental integration and unity.

In furtherance of this ideal, there is a new suggestion to use the forthcoming July 2007 AU summit, to raise the stakes even higher. At the Accra gathering, proponents of the new African continental enterprise are to push for a United States of Africa. In the new arrangement, the entire continent, if the purveyors of this concept have their way, the entire continent would fuse into one sprawling nation, with one army, one currency (much like the European Union) and free movement of people and goods, with no international borders, as they presently exist.

Clearly, the idea of a “United States of Africa” resonates with the aspirations of Africans everywhere, (both at home and in the diaspora) who desire a better Africa. And predictably, the decision to push for a USAfrica at the July summit has drawn spirited responses from the Pan-African public. But it is also instructive to note the respective tones of the varied responses.

In the first ten days of February, following the January 31 announcement of
the AU decision, Africans wrote in to a BBC World Service Forum on the topic: “Is African unity a dream worth pursuing?” Of the 32 contributors to the forum, none is actually opposed to unification.

However, they fall into 3 main camps in their attitudes and expectations, namely:

(A) The enthusiasts (12)—who so desperately want unification that they appear blind to, or uninterested in the landmines on the way to it;

(B) The sceptics (5)—who don’t believe it will happen and, for assorted reasons, dismiss it as a ‘mirage’; and

(C) The cautious (16)—who want it, but point out some serious problems that need to be disposed of before unification can succeed.

The 32 contributors to the Forum wrote in from: USA 8; Sudan 6; UK 4; Uganda, Ghana, Tanzania 2 each; and 1 each from Cote d’Ivoire, Canada, Cameroon, Liberia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria and Seychelles.

It is significant that two-thirds of the contributors draw attention to the obstacles to its attainment. Even more significantly, every Sudanese contributor highlighted some obstacle to be overcome. And Sudan is where the attempt to unite Arabs and Black Africans within one state has caused a bitter race war that has lasted more than 50 years. Perhaps the rest of Black Africa has much to learn from Sudan. Sudan has been an experiment in Afro-Arab unification: its experience augurs badly for the USAfrica project.

A key issue raised by the two-thirds majority of the contributors who constitute the sceptics and the cautious, is that of identity. The issues they want to see addressed are as follows:

- Who is an African? Do Arabs in North Africa identify with Black Africans or with their white kith and kin in Arabia and the Middle East?
- Other obstacles to the idea of USAfrica they raised are:
• Colourism: the ingrained Arab contempt for Blacks; the conflict between Pan-Arabism and Pan-Africanism and Arab ambitions to impose Islam on Africans and to Arabise Black Africa.

• What principles will this USAfrica follow? Would it be Christian, Muslim or other? Will Muslims accept to be ruled by non-Muslims in the USAfrica? How will obstacles to unification – including tyranny, tribalism, mutual distrust and corruption – be removed?

Contributing from Mahe, the Seychelles, Clement Kuol Biong writes, “A veteran Sudanese politician, once compared the Sudan Socialist Union of Jafaar Numeiri’s rule to a shadow tree where we come just to share the shade but what each person under the tree is thinking about is not necessarily the same.

“So how can Africa be united when we are still tribally fragmented and no African leader is interested in uniting his own people? How can African unity become a dream come true when different groupings of the AU have their own hidden agendas?

“The Arabs have never stopped their dream of imposing Islamic culture on African masses by the sword, a practice which is still widespread in Sudan up to today.”

Atina Ndindeng, from Manchester, England, summarises: “African unity is just a mirage because of greed, dishonesty and corruption among the executive whom we hold in such high esteem and should be setting an example, but they are all failures and political demagogues. Shame to most African heads.”

On their part, the enthusiasts, who constitute one-third of the contributors, rest their hope on a dream that, “the United Africa will be a Green Superpower as opposed to a military superpower and eventually be a key player at the table of world affairs instead of a beggar.”
And, as Mark Wood, co-founder of USA4USAfrica, of Greenwood California, puts it, “A United States of Africa can prevent an African apocalypse on the horizon if unification does not happen NOW!”

But what good is any Green Superpower (if ever such utopia is possible for a united Africa) without the military muscle to even defend its farmlands from the sort of marauding invaders that the continent has known since the Arabs conquered and settled in North Africa between 640 and 1400 AD?

Some of the promoters of the USAfrica regard their project as an already done deal. They insist that, despite opposing views, “Africa WILL unite, as one nation. As a matter of fact, it will happen this July at the upcoming African Union summit in Ghana.”

“The tide,” they maintain, “cannot be turned at this point as the unification of Africa is undeniably in motion...all arguments opposing a united Africa are rendered moot at this point because Africans have finally mandated themselves that they will unite and work out the details from a united position as opposed to being divided.”

These promoters have already designed a flag for the USAfrica and chosen its first president for us:

“Our Mandate is for the African Union, in 2007, to form an official United States of Africa with Kofi Annan, (whose term ended December 31st 2006) departing UN Secretary General, being installed as the United States of Africa’s First President in much the same fashion George Washington was ‘installed’ as the first U.S. American President. God willing.”

As the promoters see it, all that is left for them to do is to propagandise and manipulate us like sheep to acquiesce. How? By, according to them:

1. “Organizing Town Hall meetings to get public support for the Federation and to get ideas on how it could be created.”
“Town Hall meetings should begin soon inside Africa and outside Africa. Town Hall meetings are [to] provide suggestions on how to implement Continental Union Government (United States of Africa). Not a discussion about the Federation, but how to implement it."

2. “Recruitment of celebrities to join the cause and give support and voice to the United States Of Africa. From America: recruit Oprah, Obama, Angelina Jolie, Danny Glover.”

3. Contacting “top hip-hop superstars to mobilise for the United States of Africa”.

By proceeding without a known and public mandate from the people of Africa and, especially, by drawing attention only to what they naively consider the potential benefits of USAfrica, and by trying to restrict their town-hall discussions to implementation alone, these promoters are behaving like a used car salesman who doesn’t want the customer to raise awkward questions about faulty aspects of the car.

However, the issues raised by the sceptics and the cautious, the two-third majority on the BBC Forum, suggest that it is time for Black Africans to wake up and do the hard thinking and ask--and honestly answer--the tough questions we have avoided for 50 years about the sanity of unifying Black Africans and Arabs under one continental government.

For example, why is a USAfrica necessary? What problems will it solve for Black Africa that the OAU could not and the AU cannot, solve?

Who are the shadowy godfathers of this USAfrica project and what is their hidden agenda?

The Forum comments indicate that many ordinary Black Africans are doing some of this hard thinking. The AU presidents should follow suit and do, and be seen to do, the same. They should not rush to implement this shady project before they and the public have, together, thought things through
and in the greatest detail.

There was no popular debate before the formation of the AU and the adoption of NEPAD by Africa’s presidents. Will there be a full and free debate by the people before this USAfrica project proceeds any further? Will the promoters, seen and unseen, of this USAfrica, allow it?

Regardless of the promoters, let us all debate it, every aspect of it, not just how to implement it. Let us all debate the merits and demerits of continental government and do so for the next five years, or till we arrive at an enlightened consensus.

Let us debate it in light of Black people’s experience in Sudan, Mauritania and the rest of the Afro-Arab borderlands. And, in light of the four decades of the OAU/AU, too. Let the AU summit on it be postponed for at least five years, while the people debate it.

Before we, the Black African people, instruct the AU presidents on how to vote, let us examine the motives, objectives, sponsors – overt, as well as covert – modalities and feasibility of this USAfrica and do so in the context of what Black Africa needs to survive and prosper in this century.

Caution should be our watchword for, as Abednego Majack – a contributor from Rumbek, Sudan – puts it, succinctly, “United States of Africa? The phrase sounds good but the question is, do we really see ourselves as African, regardless of our colonial boundaries, religions and regional groupings?

“The AU must be very serious when considering how to make African unity attractive otherwise the continent will still remain in two halves, sub-Saharan Africa and North Africa and problems will develop along that fault line.”

Before this dream of continental union turns into a nightmare for us and our descendants, let us investigate its likely consequences for us, Black Africans.
Prevention is better than cure, as they say!

**USAfrica?: Red alert on Arab Colonialism in Black Africa! by CAACBA**

**USAfrica?: Red alert on Arab Colonialism in Black Africa!**

Fellow warriors for Black African liberation, Greetings!

We are sure you are very busy, each and every one, coping in the belly of the beast, and battling, as best you can, the local manifestations of the Race War. **But an emergency crisis has arisen. Hence this red alert and call to action stations.**

While we have been campaigning for Afrocentrism, reparations, repatriation, Darfur, South Sudan, Mauritania etc, our Arab enemies have stolen a march on us and are poised to trap all of Black Africa in the net of Gadhafi’s USofAfrica, and from there drag all Black Africans under Arab colonialism and, from there, carry us off into captivity, slavery, Arabisation and worse. Sudan since 1955 has been a prototype of Arab colonialism masquerading as Afro-Arab unity. Blacks there, under the Arab minority colonial government, have been subjected to oppression, exploitation, war, mass rape, sex slavery, mass murder, Arabization and enslavement. A united Afro-Arab Sudan is a terrible example of what Black Africans can expect under a continental Afro-Arab Union government like Gadhafi’s USofAfrica.

In our opinion, this new development is very dangerous; and addressing it should become our top priority, starting yesterday. If we lose this battle, and this Arab colonialist USofAfrica is inaugurated, all the local crises we have been dealing with so far, will together be like child’s play compared to what the Arab colonialists will inflict on all of Black Africa. And all our other struggles will have failed. For instance, why would any sane black want to repatriate into an Africa that has fallen under Arab colonialism and slavery?
And even if you got $1bn each in reparations money, can you enjoy it as a slave of the Arabs?

Once this Arabist USofAfrica is enacted by the AU, in Accra this July-- and is, predictably, quickly implemented-- it would be treason to advocate or struggle against the new Federal state. Arabs will, of course, control it as they have controlled the OAU/AU. Then the stage will be set for the Islamization and Arabisation of all of Black Africa. And we'll all be in the same stew where—without much understanding or help from the rest of Black Africa-- the blacks in Mauritania and Sudan have long been. **And then it will be too late for regrets and protests.**

If we don’t mobilize and get the AU presidents to kill Gadafi’s USofAfrica in July, then, just as 1955 was the accursed year when the Black Sudanese were handed over to Arab colonialism by the British, the year 2007 will be the accursed year when **Black Africa stupidly handed itself over to Arab colonialism!!**

So you can understand the urgency of the matter, and why we must do everything we can, between now and July, to kill this enemy project. We all need to shift focus to this task of the immediate future, if we are to have any future at all.

We have formed a Committee Against Arab Colonialism in Black Africa (CAACBA) which is mobilizing black Africans everywhere for two tasks:

(A) To defeat Gadafi’s USofAfrica in Accra in July; and

(B) To promote the Garveyite project of a Black African superpower by 2060.

These two mobilizations are intimately related. The best way to wean Black people from Continentalism is to give them a better project in which to invest their emotions and energies. It’s a bit like the methadone treatment for heroin addiction. Our people, for 50 years have been hooked on
Continentalist Afro-Arab Pan Africanism (CAAPA). We need to substitute a Garveyite Black Power Pan Africanism (BPPA) for that Continentalist disaster. And now is our last chance to do that.

Please read and deliberate on this alert letter and the attached files.

And pass them on to every Black African that you can. As soon as we hammer out a program of action, we shall let you know, so you can play your part in this all-important fight.

Yours in struggle,

The CAACBA
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Enslavement in Sudan: --'Our People Were Turned to Ash'—Victoria Ajang

As introduced and quoted by Nat Hentoff in The Village Voice, New York, March 29 - April 4, 2000

Victoria Ajang, a native of Southern Sudan, testifies that she twice escaped Sudanese government slave raids and now lives in Kansas. 'I am here by myself, with only my children,' she says. (The government in the north of Sudan is the National Islamic Front.)

She told her story to Congress on May 27 of last year. Ajang and the American Anti-Slavery Group are urging American pension and mutual funds, along with cities and states, to get rid of their stocks in Talisman Energy, a huge Canadian oil company. Talisman is a partner of the Sudanese government, which is deeply involved in the enslavement of black Christians and animists. "The dispute over oil," Victoria Ajang begins, "first became an issue of life and death for me in 1983. That year the government began its program to pipe oil from our land in the south up to the north. Students in my town were quite upset about our resources being diverted by the government, and so they held a protest march outside the local school. But the government would not tolerate this.

"On a summer night, the government militia forces suddenly swooped in on our village. We were at home relaxing, in the evening, when men on horses with machine guns stormed through, shooting everyone. I saw friends fall dead in front of me. While my husband carried out our little daughter Eva, I ran with the few possessions I could grab. "All around us, we saw children being in the stomach, in the leg, between the eyes. Against the dark sky, we saw flames from the houses the soldiers had set on fire. The cries of the people forced inside filled our ears as they burned to death. Our people were being turned to ash."
Ajang and her family jumped into a river at the edge of town, and escaped. She continues her story: In another village, "it was a Sunday evening, the 25th of July, in 1992. At that time, I was pregnant with my fourth child. After services, we gathered on the church grounds for singing and drumming. But then suddenly armed forces and government militias attacked. They were shouting, 'Allah Akbar! God is great!' This time it was impossible to grab anything, except the hands of my children. All around us we saw people who had been dancing just minutes earlier, now lying dead outside the church. "Unlike the raid in 1983, I fled with my three children in one direction, while my husband ran off in another direction. I have never seen or heard from him again. My aunt, Laual, aged 45, was dragged off by soldiers, along with her three grandchildren. I know that my aunt died soon after being repeatedly raped by the soldiers. I know this because her grandchildren not only saw her die, but also witnessed her rape. My neighbor, Batul Adam, was captured as well. Her beautiful daughters were taken captive and given to northern masters.

"There is a powerful ideology that drives these slave raids. In the government's mentality, all blacks are slaves. Whether Christian, Moslem, or animist, we should be slaves forever. We are inferior beings who must submit or be killed."

**Colorism and Arab enslavement of blacks in Sudan, by Kola Boof**

- Kola Boof -- interviewed by Janine Howard in 2002, excerpts

**JANINE:** "Hi Kola. First of all..as one Black woman to another, let me applaud you for your courage. I am literally in awe when I read about you. You truly bring to mind the words African Warrior Queen."

**KOLA:** "Thank you so much, but I am not a warrior and I am not a Queen. I am a good daughter and I am a womanist. I believe that the meaning of life
is that your deeds outlive you. But I am not a superwoman."

JANINE: "And so modest, too!" (they both laugh) "Kola, listen...this is really serious. These people who run your country are saying that you are such a traitor to Islam and to Sudan that you need to be...eliminated from this earth. Aren't you scared?"

KOLA: "Well, of course I am. But I would not be the first person who was killed or imprisoned or beaten for speaking out against slavery and Arab Muslim oppression in Sudan. This is a chance I had to take for the Black African people."

JANINE: "I am so shocked that in this day and age we still have slavery in the world. Many of us Americans aren't familiar with what's going on in Sudan, so can you talk about that?"

KOLA: "Slavery...is just a terrible symptom of a horrible disease that has been in Sudan for centuries now. You know, we have ethnic cleansing in Sudan. The lightskinned Arabs are the elite, the ruling class. Everyone wants to be them, look like them and be accepted by them. But what everyone doesn't want--is to be Muslim. This is what causes the civil war. My country is divided into the Arab Muslim North, which is where I am from, because my father was an Egyptian Arab Muslim...and then the South, which is very African and populated by charcoal Black people, the original Kushites as a matter of fact, the Dinka, Nuer, Shilluks and others. In the middle we have the people who are my color--dark brown--but most of them are mixed and they do not consider themselves African. Even as dark as me, they will slap you if you call them Black or African. They want to be considered Arab. Many of them are Nubians who mixed with light Arabs. These Nubians straighten their hair and they go to Turkey and marry White street prostitutes and bring them back to Sudan and try to pass them as respectable women--all because they want to breed lighter children who can pass for "Arab". That is the goal. Many Nubians who can become my color will turn on their own
families and run away and embrace Islam. So this root of colorism is what causes the ethnic cleansing in Sudan, the civil war."

JANINE: "Boy oh boy. You know this reminds me a lot of the color issues in America. I heard that your Egyptian grandmother put you up for adoption because of your skin color."

KOLA: "Oh yes. My Mahdi Pappuh was killed when I was a child because he spoke out in public against the Arab Muslim government in Sudan. His mother, my grandmother, she had always hated that he married an African woman, but such a dark charcoal black one--that is what made him settle in Sudan instead of Egypt. So when my parents were murdered, my grandmother put me up for adoption. Yes."

JANINE: "Wow. I think you're beautiful."

KOLA: "Thank you. My charcoal Black mother was a Gisi-Waaq Oromo. They are extremely beautiful Black women. Very graceful and petite. She never walked on ground, she glided."

. . .

JANINE: "So this is why they want you dead...because you are saying these things out in public?"

KOLA: "I believe that religions are man-made..they are NOT God. God is God. Religions are just institutions that men came up to have power and control. I would like to see us women start our own religion, but anyway, I have scorned Islam...which is punishable by death, that's the nature of the religion you see...and I have revealed that all over the Arab world, Black African people are enslaved and treated like cattle--mainly and foremost, because they are Black. The Arabs have a word that's like Nigger, it's "Abeed", which means 'slave race'. This is what they reserve for Blacks, even the Arab Blacks with so called good hair and brown skin are called "Abeed". Have you ever seen dogs chained up to the back doors of
houses...dogs who live outside and eat outside?...well in Arab countries, there are Black men's children chained to the back of houses this way. There are Black women who work in Arab kitchens--their tongues cut out of their heads. Sudan's Arab government, the NIF, they actually finance this satanic evil. Why don't you just ask Minister Louis Farrakhan? He's good friends with Sudan's Arab Islamic President, Al Bashir. Farrakhan loves the Arab Muslim governments of North Africa. They're his biggest supporters."

JANINE: "My God. Now that's deep."

KOLA: "Not only deep, but true. In Sudan, the Black Africans have a name for Minister Farrakhan. I use it, too. We call him 'The White Bastard'."

JANINE: "Well, Kola, I'm not about to go there with you girl."

KOLA: (laughs) "I know. He might have us killed, ha? Murdered in the name of Allah. You know, it's a shame Malcolm X had to die. In Africa--we really loved Malcolm X. We called him Red Rooster. He was an authentic Black man, a King among men. Him, I would like to give birth to again. He was every Black child's dream. It's a shame that the Arabs only showed Malcolm their living rooms when he visited their world. Their mosques. If he had seen what they had tied up in the bedroom...or pacing the kitchen...or tied to the back door, he would not have been fooled by those Arabs who so love and court American blacks and call them brother to their faces, but NIGGER behind their backs."

JANINE: "Girl, this is deep."

. . .

JANINE: "I have heard that the Black Southerners of Sudan call you QUEEN KOLA--but how do the Northerners react to you? You're a Northerner yourself."

KOLA: "Well, the Northerners mostly hate my guts. But not all Arab Muslim
people are prejudiced, even Nazis, you know. There are many Northern Arabs who have written to me with their love and support. Many of them are also oppressed by Sudan's governments for other reasons. Many Muslim people believe in peace and goodness, but the religion is just too violent and too masculine for goodness to dominate it. And these people are good people...but they're cowards, because they know what is being done to Africans in Sudan and Egypt and yet they do nothing about it."

JANINE: "You have expressed a desire to see Israel triumph in the middle east, a position which is not popular with Black American leaders."

KOLA: "Well, that's because Black Americans are ignorant to the true picture in the middle east. Certainly, the Jews are not brothers to us, either. Israel is not a friend, in my opinion, to Africa. But the Arab nations are like parasites against African humanity. They exploit us, degrade and dehumanize us, enslave us and teach us to hate our own skin and hair. Amiri Baraka had a controversial poem in which he asked...WHO HAS KILLED MORE AFRICANS?....he's such a fool, to me, because he doesn't realize that the Arabs have enslaved and killed African people for thousands of years. If I had to choose between the White man and the Arab...give me the White one. At least he can be manipulated and impressed. At least he is not as psychotic and blood-thirsty as the Arab man is. The White Caucasoid, the Arab, the Jewish Caucasoid, the Asian and the African...all of these men are DEVILS...but the worst of all is the Arab...and because the African man has almost no real power in this world, he is the lesser Devil. But still, the men are the ones who make our lives unbearable and filled with joyless, numbing stupidity".

JANINE: "What do you think about the peace talks and the peace agreement they're trying to sign in Machakos?"

KOLA: "I think it's meaningless, because it won't change the lives of the oppressed Black people of Sudan. To be honest, I don't see much hope of
North Sudan ever having peace and harmony with South Sudan. And I completely blame the Arabs for that. Perhaps if we could have a real African hero, a true Black leader as the President of Sudan with a democratic government--then we could have unity and justice in Sudan."

JANINE: "You have a book out right now...a really good collection of short stories called LONG TRAIN TO THE REDEEMING SIN: Stories of African Women...I loved this book."

KOLA: "Thanks."

JANINE: "But there was a character in one of the stories, a Black supermodel who said, quote....the black man is the biggest disappointment since GOD....."

KOLA: "You know what...I truly love Black men...the love of my life, the only man I have ever loved...is a Black man. Anyone who reads my work knows that I love Black men...but when I wrote that...[that the Black man is the biggest disappointment since God]..I meant that. I truly meant it. Many black women write to me and tell me that's their favorite line in the entire book...."

JANINE: "But why Kola? I felt sorry for brothers when I read that line."

KOLA: "Well I don't. I get so sick of these women who refuse to hold OUR poor black men, OUR men...accountable and responsible for their actions. I have seen this in Africa where the men are so catered to, so spoilt and the women are second class citizens, invisible doormats. Look at me--my vagina cut and marked with tribal markings(!) so that Black men can proclaim me "pure". What bullshit is that? And look at the epidemic of RAPE in Africa..look at how the Black man judges us Black women on the color..the shade..of our skin instead of the content of our character. Look at how he hates the natural God-given African hair of African women and prefers the hair of the White man's mother--then he calls the White man every name but GOD,
which is what he should be calling him considering the condition of the Black race. Look at this evil that we Blacks do to our own mother all over the world...these hip-hop pimps with their toxic rap videos, spreading their self-hatred to black children all over the world...these Black men in America who think that racism only effects Black men and have dishonored their own mother's history just to be VALIDATED by the White man's WHITE mother. Oh, yes...Black women are doing it, too, you say...interracial profiling...but everybody knows from Nairobi to Seattle, that we Black women never wanted these White Caucasoids. We love our Black men, but they don't deserve our love. They are the ones with the power and the freedom--to be selfish and insecure. Look at the way our men are breeding our African children off the planet...in exchange for Tiger Woods, for Vin Diesel, for Jennifer Beales. Look at this weak shit. Look at how they lie constantly on the Black woman, throwing mud upon her character--almost always based upon how Black she is and how African the hair, how African the facial features--only they fail to mention that those are the real reasons they hate her. They hate her because she's black..and Black women..WILL make you black. Niggers don't want to be Black if they can help it. In America, the vast majority of Black children are raised by Black single mothers, which wouldn't be so bad if these women weren't so mentally and emotionally damaged. We have a community that coddles and spoils the Black male, but fails to develop Black daughters at all. It is that way in Africa, too. The society caters only to the men. On the law books, the women have no rights. Everyone talks of the poor Black man, the slavery that only HE went through, the racism that only HE faces, the discrimination and social abuse that only HE puts up with. It's such a load of bullshit. This is the disgrace of our entire race and Black men must not be allowed to degrade and dishonor us. We must not tolerate it."

JANINE: "Wow...I never thought of it that way, but I can’t deny it, either."

KOLA: "Look--it's time for us Black women to give birth to a new King. That
is what I am saying. We women need to become competent and stop being delusional, stop being co-dependent doormats who allow this cycle of self-destruction to continue by trying to pretend it's not there. WE hold the power, because we have the WOMBS. Now let us women come together and use our spirit and nurturing, our innate goodness--we need to give birth to a new Black child. One who loves himself, accepts himself and respects and honors his own goddamned mother. It is time for the niggers...whether they be in Sudan or in Seattle...it is time for the Nigger men to be put to death. We cannot afford to keep giving birth to such worthless sons. A worthless son is like a pet rock. Have you ever noticed how the Black man asks for what he is not willing to give in return? They want love and loyalty, they want someone to stand beside them through thick and thin--but as an African woman, I ask you--Who did THEY ever stand by? It certainly wasn't us Black women. God knows we carried the world on our heads for our men, but look at how we are repaid. With disrespect, contempt and utter slander."

JANINE: "Do you worry that Black men will misconstrue your disappointment in them for...not loving them?"

KOLA: "I love Black men...and if they can’t see that, then they're stupid. But no, I don't care what Black men think about me. I am my own Queen. My loyalty is to my womb, to my children. As usual, we Black women have the important task of saving the race--and that includes the human race."

..."
KOLA: "Well...the sad thing about being Black is that you must always think of yourself that way...for the sake and good of your children. It is the only way to achieve a clarity which can protect them, you see. The men that I praised fully understand that."

... 

JANINE: "In DIARY OF A LOST GIRL...and just let me say that I am nervous for this book to come out, Kola. I mean, honestly, I think it's a masterpiece. It made me cry quite a few times. But it's also incredibly confrontational and controversial...I know average Black folks and I'm not sure how they'll react to this kind of book."

KOLA: "The real Black people will love it...they will "get it", you know. But yes, the ones who are in that gray area between Blackness and delusion, the runaways, they will have a problem with it. Still, this is my soul book. I had to write it and I fought hard to have it published just the way that I wrote it. It's a controversial book, but it's a book that represents me well."

JANINE: "Girl, I'm not even gonna mention how this book ends. I have to tell you...that shocked me, Kola. The ending just left my chin right on the floor. I was speechless."

KOLA: "I wanted to end the book in an African way. Like my bare breasts on the back cover, I wanted to affirm my ancestral mothers. It was fitting the way it ended. And I meant the shit, too."

... 

JANINE: "Aren't you fearful of how people will react to this book, though? Girl, I would be scared for this book to come out!"

KOLA: (In tears) "I meant everything that I wrote. DIARY OF A LOST GIRL is my soul book. This is Kola Boof. I have so many enemies who are very powerful. So many lies are told on me, so much cynicism is used to degrade
and discredit my life. Of course, Black women are used to that treatment. But I must speak my own truth. I must set an example to show that it's alright to speak ones own truth. Black women need to wake up from their delusions." THE WOMEN TAKE A SHORT BREAK

Mauritania--They Live In Slavery
Garba Diallo reports on the last country to abolish slavery.

Shocking, incredible, but true - 1996

Don’t worry; I am not planning to kidnap you 200 years back in history. What I want to tell you about is now, 1995. It is the story about a black Mauritanian slave whose name is Abdi.

Abdi is not an ordinary name which free people choose for their children. Abdi means slave in Arabic and the name is typically reserved for black slaves. Even though slavery was officially abolished in 1980, for the third time in independent Mauritania, slavery and slave trade are still a living reality.

Because of the massive sexual exploitation of female slaves by white male masters, the slave population has increased to become the largest single ethnic group in the country.

Mauritania’s population consists of about two million inhabitants: 32 per cent free black Africans of Fulani, Soninke and Wolof ethnic origins, 28 per cent white Moors of Arab-Berber origin, and 40 percent black slaves known as Abid or Haratin. The slaves belong to the white Moors, who have monopolized the government in the country since the French colonial regime transferred political power to them in 1960. The white Moors have no intention or interest in abolishing slavery, because this may incite the slaves into challenging Moorish supremacy.
New dimension of slavery

In cultural clashes between the Moorish regime and free black Africans, slaves have been used by the regime as buffer and death squads against the Africans. Slaves like Abdi still identify with, and blindly obey their masters. Thus, slavery has assumed a new and deadly, dimension. The current military regime of colonel Taya is aware of this and is exploiting slave power to settle old scores with the free blacks who resist and challenge Moorish hegemony.

Since the Afro-Arab conflict exploded into violent clashes in 1989, slaves have been organized into militia groups, which the government uses to massacre and deport blacks to Senegal and Mali. Like in the apartheid days of South Africa, they are being manipulated into black-on-black mutual destruction.

Slave economy

I met Abdi in his master’s shop near Cheikh Anta Diop University in Dakar on August 3, 1994. Dakar is not just the capital of Senegal, but also one of the busiest urban centers in West Africa. Here, one can meet West African students, academics, elites and officials, who are there to study or to take part in endless regional forums. Dakar is also the meeting point for micro and macro business men and women coming to make or lose money. More colour is added to the urban chaos by all the foreign tourists who come by the thousands in their red, bare legs every year.

Established in 1958, the university is one of the oldest and most prestigious education centres in West Africa. Obviously Abdi did not end up here to learn in order to join the few elite of the region. He was brought here from Mauritania by his master, who was seeking profit. The master can work him
to death with impunity and then send for another slave.

Shockingly, no one seems to notice that a black slave is still being kept in bondage, right in the heart of Dakar by his Moorish enslaver. The modern chaos brings certain freedoms to the rapidly growing informal business underworld.

Like in many other parts of the continent, the colonially created state of Mauritania is withering away. The role of the state has been reduced by the IMF and World Bank conditions that ensure the dictator’s protection from being lynched by the hungry and angry urban masses.

The Moorish master is not worried at all that this capital crime might be discovered, or that people passing by his shop might hang him in the tree growing just outside. Decidedly, the university students who are regular customers of the slave shop must have learned that slavery was abolished in the former French colonies already in 1905.

Prior to the 1980 abolition, slavery had been declared illegal in 1960 and 1966, but only on paper. The slave holders have become so accustomed to exploiting blacks as slaves for the last thousand years, that they cannot give up living on the backs of their slaves just like that. Both slaves and enslavers have internalized the slave-master status quo in such a way, that it would take more than just official decrees to eradicate slavery in the country.

**Slave soldiers**

The latest abolition was motivated by different factors. After a decade of catastrophic drought, most of the nomadic masters became so poor that they were no longer able even to feed themselves, not to mention to keep and feed a large number of slaves. Thousands of slaves were therefore released into the already overcrowded urban centres, where their masters hoped they would be able to collect a living for the masters’ households.
Masters are not supposed to do manual labour. While some slaves were recruited as menial soldiers to fight in the West Sahara War from 1976 to 1979, others hung around and hustled, stealing or selling basics like water. When Mauritania withdrew from the Sahara War, the slave soldiers were demobilized and sent to the streets.

**Aborted liberation struggle**

Enlightened slaves organized themselves and established an emancipation movement called “El Hor” meaning freedom. El Hor’s aim was the total abolition of slavery and effective and concrete measures to help the slaves become economically independent. This was the only way to cultivate self respect and psycho-social emancipation. Although the methods El Hor chose were peaceful and mild, this nevertheless created panic within the white Moorish community and its military regime. The organization was challenging both the traditional social order and the military dictatorship.

Their liberation campaign was about to paralyse the slave market and make it impossible for the masters to sell human beings on the open market. Outside Mauritania, El Hor managed to draw the attention of international media and human rights groups to the persistence of slavery in the country. The result was embarrassing pressures on the regime from abroad.

To prevent a full scale slave revolution leading to real emancipation and the demise of minority rule, the regime of colonel Ould Haidalla decreed on July 5, 1980 abolition and the imposition of the Islamic Sharia Law. Sharia gives masters the right to compensation for setting their slaves free. Thus, the abolition decree stipulated that slavery was abolished throughout Mauritania, and that a national commission composed of Muslim legal experts, economists and administrators would be established to assess how much the masters would be compensated for each slave lost by the abolition.

Nothing was done to free the slaves in any meaningful sense of the word. But the regime managed to achieve its objectives, which were to deflect
both external and internal pressures, while satisfying the masters at the same time. The masters are the same white Moors who control the state machinery for their own exclusive benefit. In this way, real emancipation was aborted.

**Camel torture**

For Abdi it was safer to remain with his master, who is morally responsible for his household and animals. Abdi is not responsible, nor is he a human being with feelings or the right to make a family. He is a machine that works like hell without pay or rest. Like the machine, Abdi needs only to be fed to oil his black muscles from cracking. His master can take him anywhere and make him carry out any task. He can be legally sold, given away, used to pay a bride price, or castrated to avoid mating with the master’s harem.

The master’s right comes before that of God, and he has the right to sleep with any of Abdi’s female relatives, as they are by law his concubines. Abdi is not even allowed to go to the mosque if his master needs him. If he tries to escape, the master applies the dreaded camel torture on him. Abdi is mounted on a thirsty camel with his legs tied under the belly. Then the ship of the desert is allowed to drink. As the huge belly expands, Abdi’s legs crack and he will never be able to run away again.

If Abdi uses his head “too much”, the master sends insects down his ears. A large belt around his head blocks his ears, while both his hands are tied behind his back. As the insects struggle to get out, Abdi is driven to insanity. The vast majority of the slaves are so brain-washed, that they would consider it a sin to escape from their masters. Their ancestors were kidnapped into slavery long ago, and their offspring have been brought up to believe that Allah created two groups of people: slaves and masters, each playing specific and eternal roles in society.
Slave and master go to Dakar

Abdi, another slave and their master had come to Dakar some years ago. Perhaps the master intended to use his slaves as starting capital for his business. Small businesses thrive and bring quick profit, especially for a foreigner with free slave labourers who can melt in as Senegalese in Dakar.

There are no state controlled opening hours, so the two slaves work almost 24 hours a day, and eat and sleep inside the shop in shift. I coincidentally stopped by the shop to buy a drink. Abdi was busy selling basic items to customers from the university. There was another man helping Abdi. I recognized them as Mauritanian slaves, because they were black and spoke the Arabic dialect of the white Moor community of Mauritania.

This made me curious to want to talk with the two men about their business in Dakar. Without telling them that I was actually a black Mauritanian like them, we conversed across the counter of the shop. But they were hesitant to my inquiries concerning their life in Dakar and the situation in Mauritania. After a while though, they said that they were running the shop “together” with their master.

I wondered where the master was.

Abdi smiled and pointed behind the counter. There he was, a little shabby looking white Moor, sleeping (see photograph) while his two black slaves toiled for him. Before he woke up, I was able to steal a couple of shots of him and his two slaves.

The silent North

The UN and diplomatic missions are well aware of the situation in Mauritania. (See box). So, what are the reasons behind the international community’s silence toward slavery in Mauritania?

It is definitely not because of any economic or strategic considerations, that
the rest of the world does not help to eradicate this evil practice.

In my opinion, the most relevant factors are:

- There is little inter-African communication on cultural or political issues. Otherwise, Africans would have realized that the slaveholders consider all blacks to be either tamed or potential slaves.
- This problem is a part of the Afro-Arab cultural conflict, which ranges from the Sudan by the Red Sea to Mauritania on the Atlantic Coast. This conflict has a clear racial element which has been going on for more than a thousand years. Both African and Arab leaders prefer not to talk about this dirty and deadly north-south conflict within the south, because this would suggest a lack of solidarity within the Third World. The traditional “imperialist North versus exploited poor South” attitude in international relations could not be sustained.
- The legacy of trans-Atlantic slavery has left a collective and eternal guilt in the European mind, which makes it difficult for European nations to take a moral stand on condemning Arab slavery in Mauritania.
- Most European writers who have been to Mauritania belong to the romantics who worship the magic of the desert and its rough and violent social order. This love for the desert and the feudal system helps to preserve the evil system in its racist form.

The Danish connection

One of the leading supporters and lovers of the Mauritanian desert society was Henrik Olesen of Denmark. Olesen was the local UN boss, who preferred to be called ‘Le Patron’. He closed his eyes, ears and conscience to the most brutal violation of human rights until one afternoon in June 1989, when Mauritanian security police stormed the UN offices to arrest, undress, torture and deport his black Mauritanian finance director, Mr. Abdoul Diallo, and his
personal secretary, Miss Roukhaya Ba, to Senegal.

When Henrik Olesen protested in a letter to the government, he was told to withdraw the letter and shut up – or get the hell out of the country. He left without delay.

Was there any reaction from the UN or Denmark? Nothing, but silence.

Another Dane who has been deeply involved with the Mauritanian regime is Poul Sihm of the World Bank. When Norway threatened to cut development aid to Mauritania in 1991, because of the racist violation of human rights, Mr. Sihm sent a fax to the Norwegian Ministry for Foreign Affairs with the following plea for the slaveholders:

“To stop this development [aid] would, in the eyes of someone who has been intimately involved in the [Arab owned] livestock sector of Mauritania since 1983 and as such has visited the country at least two times a year, and be a great mistake.” (Fax number 2791/1, October 24, 1991, by Mr. Poul Sihm).

**Liberation struggle**

What all this means is, that Abdi and his 800,000 fellow slaves should not expect much solidarity and support from the Danes, nor other world leaders. As another slave called Bilal told Le Monde in 1990, the slaves have to carry out their own liberation struggle to the inevitable victory of justice over injustice. Time, history, demography and justice are on the side of the victims of this brutal practice. In the meantime, Abdi will work with no pay and without complaining, while his master sleeps deeply into the middle Ages.
DECLARATION OF THE CONFERENCE ON ARAB-LED SLAVERY OF AFRICANS

Sunnyside Park Hotel, Johannesburg: 22 February 2003

Introduction and Preamble

As we penetrate the 21st century, the interrelated issues of racism and the legacy of African slavery as lingering historical and sociological phenomena constitute for Africa and the world one of the most vexatious problem areas in the conscience of the human community. At a time, when people of African descent, particularly in the Diaspora, are calling for reparations for the chattel slavery of Africans in the western hemisphere and its effects, Africans on the continent are making similar demands for Ottoman and Arab-led slavery and its outstanding historical and sociological implications.

In as far as these issues are concerned, The United Nations World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance of August 28th-01st September 2001, in Durban, South Africa, represented a significant milestone in the collective ability of humanity to confront issues of racism as a global phenomenon. The World Conference had been preceded by a half-century of United Nations efforts to eradicate racism and racial discrimination. Indeed, when the international community adopted the United Nations Charter in 1945, it accepted the obligation to pursue the realization of Human Rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. In December 1948, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, which declared in Article 1 that, all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. The Convention on the Prevention and
Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, declared genocide an international crime. Through much of the 1960s, efforts were partially focused on racial discrimination in colonially dependent areas, where the end of colonially institutionalized racism was anticipated as a natural consequence of independence.(1)

On 20 November 1963, the General Assembly adopted the UN Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. In the preamble, to this declaration it was recognized that in spite of obvious progress, discrimination based on race, colour or ethnic origin continued to give cause for serious and unmitigated concern. On 21 December 1965, the General Assembly adopted the International Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Racial Discrimination. The Convention, which is a legally binding instrument, entered into force on 4 January 1969 and now has 155 State parties. This Convention defined racial discrimination as "any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, color, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise ... of human rights and fundamental freedom ...". In 1968, shortly before the Convention entered into force, the first International Conference on Human Rights, meeting in Tehran,, called for the criminalization of racist and Nazi organizations. On 11 December 1969, the General Assembly designated 1971 as the International Year of Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

The First World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination was held in Geneva in 1978, at mid-point of the first decade. Its Declaration and Programme of Action reaffirm the inherent falsity of racism and the threat it posed to friendly relations among peoples and nations.

The Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, held in Geneva, 1-12 August 1983, reviewed and assessed the activities undertaken during the decade and formulated specific measures to ensure the implementation of United Nations instruments to eliminate racism, racial
discrimination and apartheid. (2)

The UN subsequently initiated detailed programmes for (a) Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (1973-1982), (b) Second Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (1983-1992) and (c) Third Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (1993-2002). At the Durban Conference, Mrs. Mary Robinson, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights said “if the World Conference is to make a difference, it must not only raise awareness about the scourge of racism, but it must lead to positive actions at the national, regional and international levels that can bring relief to those who bear the brunt of racism and racial discrimination. This is a subject that required firmness of resolve, disciplined and persistent action, and clear-sighted thinking.”(3)

As part of the proceedings the NGO Forum of the Durban Conference, the Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society (CASAS) undertook a Symposium on, ‘Racism in the Global African Experience”. This symposium drew on the experience and knowledge of a cohort of academics of African descent from within the continent and its Diaspora. (4)

Conference on Arab-Led Slavery of Africans in Johannesburg (22nd February 2003)

Following on the Platform of CASAS held in the context of the NGO Meeting (Durban), and by way of implementing the Declaration of Plan of Action of the UN World Conference Against Racism, Racila Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance (WCAR) Durban, 2001, CASAS and the Drammeh Institute organized a Conference on Arab-Led Slavery of Africans in Johannesburg (22nd February 2003).

The initiative for the conference was advised by the fact that whereas, relatively much more is known about the European-led Atlantic Slave trade, the history and reality of Arab-led slavery of Africans continues to be an area of silence and darkness in African and non-African perceptions of African
society and history. The painful reality of this history is profoundly aggravated by the fact that, slavery continues to the present day in the Afro-Arab borderlands (this area encompasses the broad stretch of Africa running roughly between the 30th degree latitude and the 10th degree latitude across the Africa continent), particularly in Mauritania and Sudan. The conference was intended to provide, for wider consumption, studies, by scholars, on the subject of Arab-led slavery of Africans. At the close of the conference, the meeting produced the following declaration:

On this day, this 22nd of February 2003, we the participants of this conference on Arab-led slavery of Africans, do solemnly make this declaration that, we the people, Africans and African descendants, herein referred to as Africans, striving for the unity of the African Nation, intend to reclaim our voice, and speak for ourselves on the above and related issues, after centuries of silence and non-self-expression.

We attest to the fact that, the African continent and people has served as a millennia-long reservoir for uncompensated labour obtained through brutal and dehumanizing processes for the Atlantic, Mediterranean and Indian Ocean areas and trade routes. Arising out of these labour extraction processes, in the form of slavery, Africans have historically become people whose slavery amongst all others had, for centuries, assumed intercontinental forms. In this context:

WE CONDEMN, in the strongest possible terms, all forms of slavery, historical and contemporary, in all parts of the world.

WE RECOGNISE, that the Arab-led slave trade of African people predates the trans-Atlantic slave trade by a millennium, and represents the largest and, in time, longest involuntary removal of any indigenous people in the history of humanity.

WE RECOGNISE, the need to combat and eliminate the collective amnesia about Arab enslavement of Africans. In this respect, more research needs to
be conducted on the subject of the Arab and Ottoman slave trade of Africans. More workshops need to be undertaken which will facilitate the conscientization of people in Africa and the wider world. Academics and scholars of African descent are called upon to play an active role in this.

WE ACKNOWLEDGE the need to mobilize structures, worldwide, for the elimination and banning of slave practices in the world.

WE DEMAND that the issue of contemporary slavery of Africans in the Afro-Arab borderlands be placed before the African Union (AU).

WE DECRY the impact of African slavery on Africans and its effects towards the cultural denationalization of Africans.

WE ACKNOWLEDGE the need to establish relations between continental Africans and the African Diaspora in the Arab world.

WE CONDEMN, in the strongest possible terms, the practice of forced concubinage of enslaved women, and the use of enslaved women for the purpose of breeding children who become and continue to be property held by Arab masters.

WE CONDEMN in the strongest possible terms the collaborationist role of some Africans in this trade.

WE ACCUSE Arab societies, for historical and continuing crimes committed against African boys subjected to forced castration (of which the survival rate has been one in ten), to create a eunuch class.

WE ACCUSE Arab societies, for the historical and continued taking into slavery of young girls to serve as slaves to their masters with no right to marriage unless prescribed by their masters.

WE ACCUSE Arab societies, in some areas of the Afro-Arab borderlands, of genocide against Africans, particularly in the Sudan.
WE CHARGE the responsible Arab societies of ethnocide of African people through forced cultural Arabization processes.

GIVEN THE FACT that the millennia-long Arab-led slavery of Africans has wreaked incalculable damage on Africans and African society, apologies and reparations are due to Africans.

WE CALL for a civilization dialogue between the Arab and African peoples.

Notes:

2. Ibid. P.3
3. Ibid. P.6
4. The proceedings of this symposium are appearing in 2003.

DIPLOMATIC NOTE FROM BORNU TO EGYPT (c. 1391)
by Uthman Biri ibn Idris (Nigeria)

In this letter a 14th century African king protests to his co-religionist the king of Egypt concerning the slave raids upon his people by Arabs, and asks for the return of those already captured and sold to Egypt and Syria. Observe that this black king claims Arab ancestry and that this does not save his people, not even his own brother, from being enslaved by Arab fellow muslims.

. . . After greetings, we have sent you as ambassador my cousin,
Idris ibn Muhammad, because of the calamity we suffered.
The Arabs who are called Judham and others have taken captive
our free subjects—women and children and old people, and our
relatives, and other Muslims. Among these Arabs are polytheists
and apostates: they have raided the Muslims and killed a great
many of them in a war which broke out between us and our enemies.
And on account of this war they have killed our prince, 'Umar ibn
Idris, a martyr [for the Faith]—he is our brother, the son of our
father, al-Hajj Idris, son of al-Hajj Ibrahim; and we are the sons of
Saif ibn Dhi Yazan, the father of our tribe, the Arab, of the family
of Quraish, as we have been informed by our learned men.

These Arabs have harmed all our land, the land of Bornu, con-
tinually up to the present, and have captured our free subjects and
relatives, who are Muslims, and are selling them to the slave-dealers
in Egypt and Syria and elsewhere, and some they keep for them-
selves.

Now God has placed in your hands the Government of Egypt,
from the Mediterranean to Aswan; and our people have been
treated [there] as merchandise. Send messengers to all your lands,
to your Amirs, and your Wazirs, and your Qadis, and your Gover-
nors, and your men of learning ['ulama'], and the heads of your
markets; let them examine, and inquire, and discover. When they have found our people, let them remove them from the hands of those who hold them captive, and put them to the test. And if they say—‘We are free men—we are Muslims’—believe them, and do not regard them as liars. But when the matter becomes clear to you, release them, and let them return to their liberty and to Islam. In truth, some of the Arabs in our country have turned to evil ways, and are not living at peace. They are ignorant of God's book, and of the *sunna* of our Prophet, and they continue in their wickedness. But do you fear God, and reverence him, and do not abandon our people, to be bought and sold as slaves. ...

Peace be upon those who follow the Right Way.


---

**MAURITANIA – THE OTHER APARTHEID?** *(Excerpt)*

by GARBA DIALLO

Written 1993

**Understanding the Mauritanian Crisis**

In order to give a clear indication as to whether Mauritania is an apartheid state or not, I would like to focus on the more familiar conflict situations in the Sudan and South Africa. The racial and cultural conflicts in all three countries have been a permanent source of tension and destabilisation both
within and across borders.

**MAURITANIA COMPARED TO THE SUDAN**

Mauritania is comparable with The Sudan in that there have been bloody ethno-racial wars between the indigenous black Africans on the one hand and the immigrating Arabs on the other. The Arabs began to arrive into both countries from the north following the emergence and triumph of Islam in the Middle East from the early 7th century onward. The immigrants have been pressuring the original populations towards the south since that time. This has resulted in chronic north-south ethnic conflicts for political power and economic control within both nations. The Arabs have false assumptions of the superiority of their culture over the local ones. This has been manifested by the forced Islamisation and Arabisation campaigns orchestrated by successive Arab regimes.

The history of Afro-Arab relations in the Sudan and Mauritania have mainly been characterized by brutal wars, slavery, forced Islamisation and Arabisation, the systematic destruction of indigenous cultures, values and civilizations coupled with insatiable territorial expansion on the part of the immigrants. As in the cases of South Africa and Zimbabwe, the colonial powers left power firmly in the hands of the settlers in both Mauritania and The Sudan (Markakis, 1985, Diallo, 1991a). It is common to hear black militants say that Mauritania’s independence in 1960 was highjacked by the Arabs as the white settlers did with that of Zimbabwe in 1965 (Diallo, 1991a).

As the Arabs proceeded with the application of their visions of society, the natives set out to mobilize and resist the new imperialist yokes. This was the point of departure for the current civil strife, which broke out between the Arab north and African south in the Sudan on the eve of independence in 1956. The first Afro-Arab confrontation in Mauritania took place in 1961, a few months after Mauritania’s independence was proclaimed. Since then,
there have been constant tensions between the north and south, with the former being repeatedly accused of racial discrimination – or even genocide – as well as political, economic and cultural hegemony over the latter.

Both nations are located in Africa and surrounded by black nations. Yet their leadership behave as if they were not in the dark continent or had large black communities within their societies. These communities were neither consulted nor gave their consent when the Sudan and Mauritania joined the Arab League in 1956 and 1974, respectively. Successive Arab regimes in both countries have been accused of misusing Islam for imperialist ends. This claim was made valid when military regimes introduced Islamic Shari’a laws in Mauritania and the Sudan, in 1980 and 1983 respectively.

Unlike the Sudan however, religion has not played any significant role in the ethnic war in Mauritania. Thus, if used rationally, Islam could play a positive role in the search for a peaceful solution to the conflict.

**MAURITANIA AND SOUTH AFRICA – A COMPARISON**

Mauritania and South Africa are similar in that:

- The colour divide between the whites and black is clear in both countries. The Arabs in Mauritania call themselves *Beydane* (Arabic for white) as the Boers refer to themselves as *Blanke*.
- As the Boers claim historical anteriority in South Africa, so the Arabs claim that they were the first inhabitants and the only true citizens of Mauritania.
- In both countries the settlers have used ruthless methods to gain territorial control through the forced displacement of the natives. Native territories are welcome as integral parts of the nations but the inhabitants of these territories are labeled foreigners.
- The Bantu Education Act of 1953 in South Africa and Arabisation Acts Nos. 65-025 & 65-026 of 1966 were introduced in order to secure cultural hegemony through the education of docile black servants.
• Land Act No. 27 of 1953 in South Africa and Land Act No. 83.127 of 1983 in Mauritania were adopted to give settlers access to and control over the most productive parts of the native lands.

• Banning and confining blacks to remote villages is a method used by both regimes, and

• Divide and rule policies are central in the maintenance of settler hegemony. South Africa has formed and armed black vigilante militia whereas Mauritania constituted a Haratin (slave) militia group in 1990 (Africa Confidential, 1989; Amnesty International, 1990, numbering 6,000-8,000; Diallo, 1991b).

**Better than South Africa?**

In contrast with South Africa, there are no straight forward racially discriminatory laws in Mauritania. For example there are no daily colour lines separating blacks from whites, there are no officially separate schools or housing for blacks and whites, or “independent homelands” whose citizens are foreigners in Mauritania. Blacks do not have to carry pass books in order to be allowed to move around the country, interracial marriage is not illegal; in principle, every mature citizen can vote and stand for election; there have always been 2 or 3 blacks in each government.

Black militants attribute this lack of strict colour lines to the fact that Mauritania has been ruled by weak and violent dictatorship regimes which not only oppress the blacks but also their own race. They do not bother to create laws and regulations.

**Worse than South Africa?**

Mauritanian regimes have surpassed South Africa in the following ways:

• Classical slavery against blacks is still common, despite its official
abolition in 1980.

- Mauritania has deported tens of thousands of its citizens to neighbouring countries solely on account of their ethnic origin. Their number was at least 130,000 in mid-1989, and was increasing all the time, reports *Jeune Afrique* (July 5, 1989). South Africa has not deported black citizens to Zambia or Angola.
- Mauritania avoids even having diplomatic ties with black Africa.
- Mauritania has both introduced and applied religious laws in a discriminatory manner for political purposes.
- Mauritania has systematically refused to release population figures to support the claim that the country is overwhelmingly Arab despite evidence to the opposite.
- There has never been any real democracy even for the Arabs.

*Apartheid practice in Mauritania?*

According to Mauritanian laws it is illegal to discriminate against persons or groups because of their race or colour. While the country has ratified the African Charter on Human and People’s Rights (adopted on June 26. 1981), it has not ratified the main international treaties adopted by the UN General Assembly to protect human rights throughout the world, such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (adopted in 1966) and the Covenant against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment (adopted in 1984).

By ratifying the African Charter, Mauritania has undertaken to respect the right to enjoy human and civil rights and freedoms without discrimination based on race, colour, language, sex, religion, political or any other opinion, national and social origin, fortune, birth or other status. Nevertheless there is ample evidence that blacks in the country have been the victims of racial discrimination at the hands of successive Arab regimes, who have denied them not only the most basic cultural, social, political and economic rights,
but the right to life and citizenship.

1. Amnesty International has issued reports in 1989 and 1990. Amnesty International in 1990 writes: “Since the publication of the Report, the human rights situation in Mauritania has considerably deteriorated. Extrajudicial executions, torture and the cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment of villagers have reached a very alarming level in the south of the country. The targets of government forces and Haratin [slave] militia are black African villagers who are singled out because they belong to a particular ethnic group, Haal-pulaar (Fulanis). Hundreds of black Mauritanians have been arrested, persecuted and often assassinated on very wide pretexts … A curfew whose timing varies in different regions and villages is in force” and Amnesty International in 1991 writes about the reported killing of 339 political prisoners between November 1990 and March 1991: “Details of the killings have only recently come to light, when those who remained alive in detention were released in March and April 1991. In November and December 1990 several thousand black Mauritanians were arrested… Most of those arrested were members of the armed forces and civil servants, the majority belonging to a single black ethnic group from the south of the country, known as the Haal-pullar (Fulani)”


3. In its Country Reports On Human Practices For 1990, the US State Department charged that “the human rights situation in Mauritania continued to deteriorate in 1990.”

4. After boasting in an interview with the Paris-based weekly, *Jeune Afrique Magazine* that “Mauritania is not going to be Liberia”, President
Ould Taya confessed the killings of more than 300 black political detainees without any form of trial *Jeune Afrique* No. 1605: Oct. 2, 1991.

In its adoption of an unprecedented resolution on what it termed “the extraordinary record of human rights violations in Mauritania”, the US Congress points out that “the government of Colonel Taya has instituted an aggressive policy of Arabisation which as been used to persecute and marginalize black Mauritians…” The Congress strongly condemns, “the unexplained killing of over 500 black political prisoners, who were arrested in late 1990, the burning down of entire villages and confiscation of livestock, land and belongings of black Mauritians as well as the expulsion of tens of thousands of blacks to Senegal and Mali”. It adds that “execution, torture and forcible expulsion are only the visible signs of government abuses”. Non-Arabs are discriminated against in all walks of life, including unequal access to education, employment, and health care” said the resolution. “Even the heinous practice of slavery, although formally abolished in 1980, continues in some parts of the country” (*Congressional Record*, 1991).

*Features of Apartheid?*

Mauritanian regimes have gone as far as to deny the existence of black people in the country. In an interview with *Jeune Afrique* on January 1, 1990, Ould Taya declared that “Mauritania cannot be in the process of arabisation as it is an Arab country” (*Jeune Afrique*, 199:37).

The implementation of Arabisation policies, and the imposition of Shari’a laws by Arab regimes on black Africans suggest that deliberate efforts are being made by these regimes to forcibly assimilate non-Arabs. The routine maltreatment of blacks in the country reminds one of black people’s
situation in South Africa. The Mauritanian regime has been accused of ordering the massacres of at least 1,000 and more than 500 black citizens, in April 1989 and November 1990 respectively (Africa Confidential, 1989). Blacks have been singled out for deportation to refugee camps whereas Arabs from neighbouring countries have been welcomed to settle in Mauritania (US Department of State, 1990; FLAM, 1992a). Tuaregs from Mali and Berbers from the West Sahara have been invited to colonize expelled blacks’ villages in southern Mauritania. Slavery is practiced exclusively on blacks by Arabs in the country. Islamic shari’a Law has been exploited by Arab judges in the country to claim “blacks’ heads and limbs” (Afrique International, 1989:16).

The Amsterdam based “City Sun” wrote in its October 4, 1990 edition: “The massacre of black Mauritanians continues in Mauritania. Blacks are dying and disappearing at the hands of the government forces on a scale never seen before in that country, says Amnesty International. A year ago we said the persecution of Mauritanian’s black community had reached a peak ... that appalling situation has now gone from bad to worse ... If the government wants to escape the charge of racial discrimination, it must take steps to calm the fears of the people of south and put an end to the conditions that have led to the disappearance and killing of prisoners, Amnesty International demanded” (City Sun, 1990). During a debate in the French National Assembly, representative Jean-Pierre Bouquet drew the attention of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Roland Dumas, to the situation in Mauritania. He told the minister that: “For some years violent confrontations have taken place between the main Mauritanian communities... the black community has been the object of discriminatory measures which do no longer guarantee, for example, equal access to public employment... During the last few months numerous Mauritanian nationals have been expelled to Senegal under conditions which are difficult to accept.” Based on this he asked the foreign minister to explain France’s position on the issue (Assemblée Nationale, 1990: issue No. 27690-30/4-90).
In a reply letter concerning the situation in Mauritania to the MP, Bernard Stasi, another representative, Roland Dumas writes: “In response to your question on the grave violation of human rights, in Mauritania, whose victims are the black citizens... in the context of last April’s intercommunal confrontations, some 60,000 black Mauritanians were arbitrarily expelled to Senegal while others have been subjected to vicious and discriminatory measures. The French government has intervened with the Mauritanian authorities in the most firm manner... we have a frank and permanent dialogue in order to put an end to these unacceptable practices. As you have indicated, France shall not continue its cooperation efforts in the Senegal Valley should the forced displacement of the population continue...”
(R.Dumas, Paris, march 14, 1990, 000235CM)
Black colonialists: The Root of the Trouble with Nigeria

Chinweizu answering questions from Paul Odili, Lagos, 3SEP06
An Achebe Foundation Interview [edited transcript]

Copyright © 2007 by Chinweizu

You have expressed the view that the process of liberation of Nigeria from colonial rule was not far reaching enough. May we know why you think this is so?

I do so, simply to emphasise that the rhetoric claimed far much more than was actually achieved. In 1960, Nigerian leaders claimed they had achieved independence --the independence of Nigeria from Britain. But that was not true! They hadn’t. Nigeria had merely become a Bantustan—a black “homeland” ruled by black colonialists, and still exploited for imperialism. Far from becoming independent, Nigeria was, and is still, till today, held captive within the economic and cultural structures of the British Empire, which the British politely and craftily renamed “The Commonwealth”. If they had understood what independence is, those leaders would have realized that what they won in 1960, by a negotiated transfer of administration, was, at most, only the first important political battle on the hard road to independence. Far from the struggle being over, the political stage had only just been set for it to seriously begin.

But unfortunately, their conception of their project was terribly limited. As the Nigerian independence movement did not put a premium on political education, they failed to study the imperialist enemy well and produced no analysis or theory of anti-colonial struggle to illuminate their way. Consequently, they had not seen the need to struggle for the total liquidation of colonialism. The leaders were aiming only to replace the white colonialists—i.e. To become black colonialists. Of course, the Sardauna had a slightly bigger agenda. He was concerned also with recovering his imperial inheritance, the Sokoto Empire. For him and his feudal Fulani cohorts, it was also a struggle to recover their pre-colonial Sokoto Empire and then resume its expansion until, as they said, they “dipped the Koran in the sea”. And by 1970, at the end of the civil war, they had achieved that. And they promptly settled down to cream off and feed fat on the oil bonanza of their much-enlarged Sokoto Empire which wore the disguise of Nigeria.

The others simply wanted to replace the white colonialists so as to enjoy “life more abundant”, i.e. The European conquerors’ way of life. If Zik and Awo
had any deeper notion of what their independence struggle should achieve, I am yet to discover where they expressed it. **Lacking an ideology, and not having any intellectual organ to do detailed forward thinking for them, they had no conception of the stages the struggle needed to go through. And at what they called “independence”, a liberation movement did not step into office to continue with what remained of the struggle. If they had conceived of liberation in a correct and thoroughgoing manner—as requiring the total liquidation of colonialism—they might have produced a clear road map to liberation and known what to do immediately after getting into office. Unlike them, Amilcar Cabral, in Guinea Bissau, insisted: “that the national liberation struggle is a revolution, and that it is not over at the moment when the flag is hoisted and the national anthem is played.” . . .and that “so long as imperialism is in existence, an independent African state must be a liberation movement in power, or it will not be independent”** [Unity & Struggle: 134,116]

Liberation or, to use the Nigerian terminology, Independence, is not simply a matter of getting autonomy for determining your policies within the existing local and international structures. Their error illustrates what Cabral called **“the ideological deficiency of the national liberation movements”** in Black Africa. [Unity & Struggle: 122]

Lacking a detailed knowledge of their own reality, and blind to what Cabral called the “presuppositions and objectives of national liberation in relation to social structure”, [Unity & Struggle: 122,123] the **Nigerian independence movement not only failed, but also failed to see that they had failed**, thus proving Cabral correct, not only about revolution but also about liberation/independence, when he said that “If it is true that a revolution can fail, even though it be nurtured on perfectly conceived theories, nobody has yet successfully practised Revolution without a revolutionary theory.” [Unity & Struggle: 123]

If you set out from Lagos to Kaduna, but have no idea where Kaduna is or what it looks like or how far it is, you can leave Iddo and get to Ikeja and think you have finished your journey. The freedom movement in Nigeria had a superficial conception of the colonialism they were struggling against, and even less knowledge of the global imperialism of which the colonialism they attacked was just the local agency. They therefore had no realistic notion of what liberation would require. I think that their failure to study and understand the scope of their project—a failure caused by the intellectual poverty, indeed intellectual barrenness, of the movement—was the fundamental reason why their struggle did not go far enough. And, by the way, this happened, not in Nigeria alone. **In most Black African countries, the leaderships of the so-called liberation/independence movements had made no detailed study of what they ought to be struggling for and how.** As in Nigeria, their
thinking was simply that the White man was enjoying “life more abundant”, and excluded them by the colour bar, and they wanted to join in by taking over the structures in which the white man was enjoying. They simply wanted the colour bar removed. They wanted to enjoy the white man’s jobs and pay; they wanted to go to the white man’s clubs, and to live where and how the white man lived. For those in South Africa, where they faced a white settler community, part of their resented target was the social apartheid structure—they could not move about without carrying passes; they could not vote; they could not live wherever they liked; they could not legally socialise with, mate or marry whites. By the time of the ANC’s Freedom Charter in 1955, they had effectively narrowed down their aims to gaining the same rights/freedoms that whites enjoyed in the Apartheid state, i.e. Down to integrating the Apartheid state and society, and had abandoned the earlier ANC aims of recovering their expropriated lands, restoring sovereignty to the eclipsed black African kingdoms, and regenerating the shattered cultures of the African race. Such an under-conceptualisation of their struggle has proved a disaster for their peoples after their struggles “succeeded” and they came into office. They did not go into office to dig out colonialism root and branch; or to build their people’s power; or to protect their people from imperialism; or to recover the sovereignty their people lost under colonialism. In Nigeria, as elsewhere, having taken over the political administration created by the white colonialists, their aims were limited to taking over the white residential areas—Ikoyi, Victoria Island and the GRAs-- and the senior service jobs, complete with “home leave” and homes in Britain! Such was their conception of independence. Not having studied the nature of colonialism deeply enough, they had only a superficial understanding of what had happened to their people and did not see that they should be struggling for anything deeper and greater. Accordingly, whenever they managed, often at great cost, to politically or militarily defeat their white enslavers/colonisers, these Black African movements did not know what they should do next with their victory. And this was true of all the struggles, from Haiti in 1804 to South Africa in 1994. And because of their failure to continue the struggle to its correct conclusion, what black Africans have been calling “independence” for the last 50 years, has actually been black comprador colonialism. On each country’s “independence day”, it simply moved from being ruled and exploited for imperialism by white expatriate colonialists to being ruled and exploited for imperialism by black comprador colonialists. There had simply been a changing of the colour of the staff, from white to black, in the same imperialist prison. Consequently, white supremacy remains entrenched everywhere, obscured by black buffer, front office governments. For independence to be attained, the struggle needs to be
resumed to overthrow the black colonialists—the black comprador managers of what Nkrumah called neo-colonialism.

_The people you have in mind are highly educated, they were exposed?_

But educated in what and for what? Were they educated in what C. L. R. James called “the political intricacies that the modern world demanded”? Certainly not. Despite their university degrees and general exposure, they lacked the appropriate political education. There is an incident reported in Nelson Mandela’s autobiography that shows that being “highly educated” and “exposed” might even be a handicap in the liberation struggle. Mandela had gone underground to start the military wing of the ANC. At one point he was hiding in Tongaat, a rural community of black plantation workers:

Shortly before I was planning to leave, I thanked one elderly fellow for having looked after me. He said, ‘You are of course welcome, but, Kwedeni [young man], please tell us, what does Chief Luthuli want?’ I was taken aback but quickly responded, ‘Well, it would be better to ask him yourself and I cannot speak for him, but as I understand it, he wants our land returned, he wants our kings to have their power back, and he wants us to be able to determine our own future and run our own lives as we see fit.’ ‘And how is he going to do that if he does not have an army?’ the old man said.

--[Long Walk to Freedom: 330]

That incident took place in 1961. By then the ANC was some 50 years old, and it had just come to realize, and reluctantly accept, the necessity for armed struggle to attain its objectives. Now, what had taken the “highly educated” leadership of the ANC half a century to realize was quite obvious to an “uneducated” rural farm labourer!

So, everything depends on the education they received, what it moulded them into. If you are educated as a lawyer, your mental framework tends to get limited to what you can do in a law court, or within the existing legal and constitutional arrangements. And if your education is such that you think from the point of view of your conquerors, if it moul…
even think of itself as a cat! And that is what this colonialist education has done to Africans for the last two centuries. We have been fundamentally mis-educated, and we cannot even see the world from our own point of view, let alone in our own interest.

You talked about the next stage of the struggle. In the case of Nigeria the white colonialists were clever not to resist demand for independence, and so, since there was no resistance the next stage could not have been initiated by our founding fathers, to recover political sovereignty?

First of all, point of correction: What founding fathers? Zik, Awo, and Sardauna, according to the unthinking Nigerian cliché, are "our founding fathers". But what exactly were they the founding fathers of? Certainly, not Nigeria. The founding fathers of Nigeria were the British. Specifically, Goldie, Lugard and their gang. Your so-called founding fathers were simply the heads of the local black comprador gangs that inherited Nigeria from the British. If they founded anything at all, it was the black comprador colonialism that is still the root trouble with Nigeria. And they did that, not on their own, but as junior partners of the British Government. This was quite unlike the American Founding Fathers who broke away completely from British rule, created a wholly new and independent republic based on new ideas and institutions, and with no participation in the process by the already expelled representatives of the British Government. After 50 years of being exploited for imperialism by these black colonialists, Nija niggas have yet to catch on to the fact that their "independence" was a hoax, and that their nationalist leaders—these so-called founding fathers—actually ended up as black colonialists! By failing to push ahead to the next stages of the struggle, they fell into the trap the imperialists had set for them and became black colonialists.

Now, the lack of resistance by the British is neither here nor there. The point is, if you know that what you are doing is a jailbreak, your taking over the prison, even if with minimum resistance, does not mean you declare the jailbreak over. That takeover only sets the stage for you to organize to march your people out of the structure that has imprisoned them. The minute you drive out the commander and guards you must pull down the prison and go build something else to house your people in safety. You don't stay in the prison, take over the jobs and houses of the expelled prison commander and guards, and then carry on doing what they did to your people. And this is where all these movements failed. This failure took place in Ghana in 1957, in Nigeria in 1960, in South Africa in 1994 and everywhere else in between.
The same failure had been blatant in Haiti in 1800, when Toussaint, having defeated the French, Spanish and English, took over the entire island of Hispaniola and set up his black-ruled colony within the French Empire! He reconstituted the old slaving system but with black generals and the French planters running it together. That was because the black leaders “considered the European way as the good life and wanted only to be included in it”.[The Irritated Genie: 35]

Toussaint’s black-ruled French colony was a precursor of these Bantustans of Black Africa today. Reflecting on Toussaint’s travesty, Dessalines, the ultimate liberator of Haiti, told his people, in his proclamation of Haitian independence in 1804: “... Your struggles against tyranny [are] not yet done . . . . Our laws, our customs, our cities, everything bears the characteristics of the French, . . . And you believe yourselves free and independent of that republic.” [The Irritated Genie: 125]

Dessalines, in effect, was urging his people to embark with him on the next stage of consolidation: the struggle for cultural liberation. Dessalines made it quite clear that if their notion of ‘the good life’ was that of their French enslavers, then they were still slaves, despite their military victory over the French. “And what a dishonourable absurdity—conquering in order to be slaves” he added. [The Irritated Genie: 90]

Whereas Dessalines identified the cultural stage of the struggle back in 1804, Nkrumah, in the early 1960s, pointed out the economic stage by his denunciation of neo-colonialism—the economic structure that imperialism used to constrain Ghana’s sovereignty. But, of course, Nkrumah didn’t address the question of cultural liberation. In each black African country, having taken over the political structure that the conquerors instituted, these movements should have gone on, and at once, to the next stages of the struggle—the cultural, the economic, etc. The task was to use the opportunities of self-rule to fight those further stages of the liberation struggle. Dessalines and Nkrumah, to their credit, saw the next stages, but the majority of each leader’s comprador followers opposed his insights and, impatient, as Cabral puts it, “to have a little enjoyment of the crumbs of colonialism” [Unity & Struggle: 65], finally got rid of him as the obstacle to their Europhile and materialist ambitions.

What I am submitting is that these Black African movements failed in defining, and in embarking on, the stages beyond what they were naively celebrating as independence. So when I said they were not far reaching enough, it is because, if they had realised that they were trapped in a global structure that was designed to enslave and thoroughly exploit their people, they would have known that until they dismantled all their links—including the psychological—to that structure and got beyond its reach, and their society had taken total control of its
economic, cultural and social life, their struggle was not completed.

Your submission indicates that what happened in Nigeria and elsewhere was inevitable, because these structures were not demolished by our founding fathers, and by extension the crisis that trailed Nigeria resulting in civil war shortly after independence was also inevitable?

I do not know about “inevitable”. If you are standing on an escalator that is taking you into a furnace, that you will roast in the furnace is inevitable only if you are too foolish to jump off the escalator, and in good time. All I am saying is that their concept of liberation/independence was superficial and flawed, and has yet to be corrected. Theirs was an intellectual failure. It flowed from their failure to study the enemy thoroughly. They failed to understand that you do not get independence by sewing a flag and singing a national anthem and having your leaders move into the colonial masters’ jobs and houses. And that was what happened almost everywhere: Zik moved into State House, Marina; Nkrumah moved into Osu Castle, where the British governor used to live. Mandela’s case was even more revealing. I don’t know if Mandela moved into the official residence of the President of the Apartheid State on becoming president of the “New South Africa” in 1994. But even if he didn’t, he privately did something symbolically even more stunning. In his autobiography he states: After being released from prison, I set about plans to build a country house for myself in Qunu. By autumn 1993, the house was complete. It was based on the floor plan of the house I had lived in at Victor Vester. People often commented on this, but the answer was simple: the Victor Vester house was the first spacious and comfortable home I ever stayed in, and I liked it very much. I was familiar with its dimensions, so at Qunu I would not have to wander at night looking for the kitchen.

–[Long Walk to Freedom: 728]

Why did people comment? We need to know that the house he copied was the deputy chief warder’s comfortable house within Victor Vester Prison, where Mandela was kept for 14 months before his release in 1990. In a world where symbolism matters, his choice to build for himself a replica of the prison warder’s residence must have reassured the Broederbond leaders—the intellectual inventors of Apartheid who were then orchestrating a transfer of office to some appropriate blacks who would preserve white supremacy behind a mask of black majority rule -- that Mandela was their man for the job. A man who would voluntarily build for himself a replica of his prison accommodation could be trusted not to pull down the system he would
soon be managing for his jailers! But it was also symbolic of that mentality of voluntary cultural servitude in Toussaint that had drawn from Dessalines the scornful comment: “And what a dishonourable absurdity—conquering in order to be slaves!”

The choice of these residences by the leaders of Black African independence movements – Nyerere was probably the only one who didn’t move into the residence of the colonial governor-- was symbolic of the fact that taking over the management of the colonial prison was what they were really after, and that our so-called independent countries are just the old colonial prisons being run by black overseers for the absentee white colonialists—i.e. By black colonialists who believe that the European way of life is “the good life” into which to assimilate.

**Would it have been different if independence were delayed and the leaders of these countries would have been better prepared?**

Not at all! Independence is not something that the colonial situation prepares you for. The key to the colonizer’s project is to destroy your sovereignty; and the longer you stay under him the more your society’s habits of sovereignty would erode. **Just like after the flag independence, you think the imperialist would help you develop your abilities? Of course not. Because it is against his fundamental interest.** I do not think that staying longer under European colonial rulers would have improved your ability to struggle for or exercise sovereignty. Some people may think that the idea has some merit. So, let’s look at the case of India. India was under the British for two centuries, but for the last hundred years, following the Indian mutiny of 1857, the British government ruled the country directly instead of through the East India Company. And in that century, they built a tradition of governance where, by 1910, the civil service, 99% staffed by Indians, was a coherent and effective instrument of administration. The Indian army recruited Indians--it was 65% Indian by 1910-- and the tradition of political neutrality was entrenched. So you could say that if the British ruled for one hundred years more, and did here like they did in India, they would have created a tradition of seasoned administration of the British type, and a seasoned military tradition of the British type. But the most that could do for you is give you a solid administrative structure which, at independence, you still had to adapt to new purposes. That was the most you could have gained from a delay. The question you would have to ask yourself is: can a civil service, even if trained for a hundred years to serve the British by adhering to British norms, survive the incursion of armed comprador bandits like Murtala Mohammed and Olusegun Obasanjo who, overnight in 1975, destroyed the ethos and
efficiency of the civil service? Because they wanted to loot and enjoy “life more abundant”, these black colonialists, under the guise of fighting corruption, destroyed the structural constraints that could prevent them from looting. They made the civil service insecure and destroyed its ability to function with confidence. Now, even if you had a hundred years to train your administration, whatever you gained would then be lost in a week. The issue is not how much time you had to build the administration, the point is that it may not survive when armed comprador bandits attack and scatter the administrative structures.

On the other hand, had the struggle met stiff resistance and become protracted, the ensuing difficulties might have obliged the movement to do the hard ideological thinking required for success. **But you can’t count on that happening with any movement that puts no premium on ideology, political education, analysis and forward planning.** People who think through what they are doing, like Cabral, tend to do so from the start. And even before they start. Cabral actually diagnosed and articulated the required orientation even before the Guinea-Bissau armed struggle began in 1963. This can be seen from the programme for “total independence” adopted by his party, PAIGC, in 1956, the year it was formed; a programme which included among its aims “Elimination of all relationships of a colonialist and imperialist nature” and “Economic, political, diplomatic, military and cultural independence.” [*Revolution in Guinea: 136*]

With the advantage of that ideological clarity, Cabral was able, in 1961, to diagnose what crippled the black African independence movements as “a crisis of knowledge” [*Revolution in Guinea: 14*]—i.e. What C.L.R. James alternatively described as not being trained “in the political intricacies that the modern world demanded”[*At the Rendezvous of Victory: 243*]. That crisis of knowledge or lack of training needed to be cured by political education of the sort that the colonial situation, by itself, did not supply. Back in the 1930s, George Padmore and C. L. R. James got some of that education from the Stalinists and Trotskyites and imparted as much as they could to Nkrumah before he returned to the Gold Coast in 1947 to play his role in the anti-colonial movement there. Of course, the imperialists did all they could to shield their colonial subjects from Communist influence and tutelage. So, just delaying independence would not, by itself, have helped prepare these leaders.
Dr Nnamdi Azikiwe once said that Nigeria got her independence on a platter of gold, but do you think if there had been an armed struggle the orientation would have been different?

First of all, nobody hands independence to another, let alone on a platter of gold. In the history of the world, every genuine case of independence/liberation was won through hard-fought struggle. [For an example, from China, of hard-fought struggle for liberation see *Recalling the Long March*.] Zik’s remark is, therefore, ample evidence that whatever Nigeria got in 1960 was not independence!

Now, to your question about armed struggle. Not at all! Haiti went through armed struggle; Mozambique, Angola and Zimbabwe went through armed struggle; still they all became comprador colonial Bantustans misruled by black colonialists. The failure I am talking about is true of those who went through armed struggle and those that did not. The defect did not derive from unarmed struggle, it came from the intellectual unclarity about what liberation is and requires, and the unwillingness to follow things through. If that clarity is lacking, whether you engaged in armed struggle or not, you would still end up in the same mess of comprador colonialism. Cabral sums it up very well when he said: “the national liberation of a people is the regaining of the historical personality of that people. . . . National liberation exists when, and only when, the national productive forces have been completely freed from all and any kind of foreign domination.”[Unity & Struggle: 130] What counts is what you do when you get into office, not how you get there. Do you, or don’t you, get promptly to work removing the foreign domination of your productive forces and your culture? Armed struggle has its own role and virtues in a liberation struggle but does not, by itself, produce that orientation. A thorough study of your history and society, and of imperialism, is what produces the correct orientation. And that study is what these movements failed to make.

And, by the way, getting the correct orientation is not even a matter of being “educated” or “exposed”. Dessalines, you must remember, was “uneducated”—he grew up as a field slave in Haiti, didn’t go to “school” or university or travel the world outside Haiti. On the other hand, the crucial insights into imperialism were already publicly available before WWII: Garvey, Marx, Lenin etc had already published their works. If Nkrumah, Zik, Awo, etc. Read them, they somehow failed to absorb the important insights that could have helped them figure out what to do the morning after the Independence Day celebrations. Nor have these insights been absorbed by Black Africans even today, half a century later. So, the failure was entirely intellectual—due to “a crisis of knowledge” which arose because they did not have the mental independence, and ideological clarity to seek the political
knowledge required to win a liberation struggle against imperialism. This may be seen by comparing the writings of Cabral and Biko, on the one hand, with those of Nkrumah, Zik, Awo, Senghor, Kaunda, etc. On the other hand, the failure of the latter was not due to insufficient time for preparation or to lack of armed struggle but from the Philistinism, crass materialist aspirations and even anti-intellectual mentality of the class that they led. What C.L.R. James noted, in 1961, about the West Indian Middle Classes was largely true also of their counterparts in Africa:

They are professional men, clerical assistants, here and there a small business man, . . . Administrators, civil servants and professional politicians . . . They as a class have no knowledge or experience of the productive forces of the country. . . . Knowledge of production, of political struggles, of democratic tradition, they have none. Their ignorance and disregard of economic development is profound . . . Most of the political types who come from this class live by politics. . . . and carry into politics all the weaknesses of the class from which they come. . . . What kind of society they hope to build they do not say because they do not know. . . . What happens after independence? For all you hear from them, independence is a dead end. . . . I do not know any social class which lives so completely without ideas of any kind. They live entirely on the material plane.

--- C.L.R. James, “The West Indian Middle Classes”, 1961 in Spheres of Existence

It might be useful to look at how other peoples accomplished their liberation from imperialism. The Chinese are liberated, the Japanese are liberated. In the 19th century, the European powers tried to conquer and partition China into colonies just like they did to Africa. But look at China and Africa today! What made the big difference? Faced with the same White Peril as the Africans, the Chinese, from 1840 onwards, went into a political and social convulsion and into an intellectual ferment. The Chinese people staged reform and revolutionary movements which aimed to extricate China from the foreigners’ grip. Peasant uprisings and other rebellions flared up repeatedly against the Chinese Government for being ineffective in defending China from foreign invaders. Then, in 1911, the Qing dynasty was overthrown, and a republic was proclaimed by Dr Sun Yat-sen. Nevertheless, forty more years of bloody struggle were required before, in 1949, the Maoists finally threw out the imperialists and their Chinese comprador lackeys, ending a century of anti-foreigner uprisings, civil wars and revolutions. The Maoists founded a completely new state—the People’s Republic of China—and then made sure that no foreign power could control any aspect of production or culture in China. They reconstructed China completely, changed its internal and external economic relations,
industrialized it and built up its power. Along the way, they fought America and its imperialist allies to a draw in Korea, then built China’s atom bomb etc. Thus, despite the advantage of starting from semi-colonial conditions in 1911 rather than colonial conditions; and despite the even greater advantage of 2000 years of China’s political and cultural unity, it still required another 70 years of relentless, clear minded and well-led struggle to achieve and consolidate China’s liberation. The proof was that when China eventually joined the UN and the WTO, it was not on terms dictated by the imperialists. China did not diminish its sovereignty to get some transient economic advantage. Similarly with Japan in the 19th century. Commodore Perry and his American gunboats made an armed intrusion on an isolationist Japan in 1853. Thereafter, unequal treaties were imposed on Japan by the USA, UK & other White powers. The samurai spirit of the Japanese ruling class found all this humiliating and reacted by overthrowing the Tokugawa Shogunate which had been unable to prevent such humiliation. The new Japanese rulers launched their Meiji revolution in 1868, and were determined to make Japan an equal power with the foremost western powers. In this project, they sought to modernize but not Westernise Japan. They sent emissaries abroad to study their white enemies thoroughly. And they were interested in finding and adopting only those aspects of European civilization that would help in building Japan’s national power. They united the energies of the entire population to achieve absolute national independence from foreign capital and foreign rule; accordingly, they regarded foreign help as proof of national weakness. They were focused on building enough Japanese power to prevent their being conquered, and to wipe out their national humiliation by foreign encroachments and tutelage. The Meiji nationalist ideology, whose basic aim was to preserve Japan’s independence, was summarized through such slogans as: sonno-jo:i:“Revere the Emperor; expel the barbarians”; fukoku kyohei: “enrich the country; strengthen the military”; wakon yosai: “Japanese spirit; Western technique/talent”; shokusan kogyo: “Economic development; industrialization”; goshinhotan: “Perseverance and determination”.

Within 50 years, Japan had industrialised itself, defeated Russia in a war, and was recognised by all as a major world power. [The book to read on the Meiji spirit is Writings from Japan by Lafcadio Hearn.]

Such cannot be said for any of our Black African countries—with their unselective aping of all things European, their lack of a sense of humiliation at having been colonised, their pathetic addiction to foreign aid, their abject craving for foreign investment, and their absolute disinterest in industrialising themselves into economic and military powers. What African countries achieved between 1957 and
1994 was politically roughly equivalent to what China achieved in 1911. It fell certainly far short of what China achieved in 1949 and then still took another 30 years to consolidate. As yet no Black African country has pushed ahead to attempt what China did after 1911 or Japan after 1868. National liberation is manifested when you run your economy and society and culture entirely in your national interest. And if you join any of these imperialist “international institutions”, you do so on your own terms, not on the terms its imperialist organisers impose. Tiny Cuba under Fidel Castro did much the same thing, with a little help from the Soviet Union. Cuba’s economy is run in the Cuban interest: there is no foreign power determining Cuba’s policies, which is not true of any black country in the world.

Cuban system makes it difficult for private interest to thrive, and multilateral organisation to come in?

Whose private interests? Whose multilateral organisations? The anti-Cuban private interests and multilateral organisations of Cuba’s imperialist enemies? Why should Cuba’s enemies be allowed to enter and thrive in Cuba? The cardinal point about independence is that Cuba’s economy is controlled by Cubans, not by anybody else, whether through the IMF or World Bank, or through Wall Street, Bank of America, General Motors or United Fruit. It is organised by Cubans and for the Cubans. Which is why, for example, Cuba’s health service is rated one of the best in the world today, better even than America’s. Despite Cuba’s small size and resources, public health care in Cuba is of high quality and is entirely free of charge whereas, in the USA, health care is a very costly privilege beyond the reach of tens of millions. The same independence is true of Japan. No foreign companies dominate the Japanese economy—that is the crucial point! So too with China. If you go into China, it is on China’s terms: they tell you what you can and cannot do, and they monitor you very closely. When Microsoft went into China, it went on China’s terms. Some Americans complained that Microsoft caved in to Chinese intimidation, but the point is that China controls its territory, controls its economy, and if you want to play in the market in China, it is under China-made rules and under Chinese supervision. That is the key point about economic independence. As Cabral maintained, until we have mental independence—“absolute independence in our way of thinking and acting” [Unity & Struggle: 79]—and apply it to control our territory and economy and culture, we are not independent. So, the
independence that Black African countries claim is fake, because they do not control any of these vital aspects of their existence.
The crucial point is that the movements that liberated China, Japan and Cuba were led by people who did hard thinking about their reality, and who applied some ideological perspective to illuminate the problems of their society. They did not allow that 'crisis of knowledge' that afflicted the Black African movements to ever arise.
However, unlike most of the other liberation/independence movements in Black Africa, and to its credit, the African National Congress (ANC), during Oliver Tambo’s 30 years leadership, worked closely with Communists, was keen about the political education of its cadres, provided itself with theories of society and liberation, and had taken every opportunity to acquire training in “the political intricacies that the modern world demanded”. The mystery, then, is that the Mandela ANC, on getting elected into office in 1994, did not quickly become a “liberation movement in power”, and has shown little inclination to proceed with the next stages—cultural, economic etc.—of liberation in South Africa. With no effective and sustained move made thus far to abrogate the 1936 Native Trust and Land Act that legalised the white settler expropriation from black South Africans of the best 87% of the land in South Africa, it is as if, for the Freedom Charter ANC, black majority rule—black faces in the offices of the unreconstructed Apartheid state—was an end in itself, was the final destination of their liberation struggle. But does the Freedom Charter, which Tambo himself described as a “drastic concession”, imply forfeiture of their stolen lands by the black Africans? I think not! That "South Africa belongs to all that live in it, black and white" does not imply that the white settlers should keep what they stole. They can live in South Africa, but need to be dispossessed of the stolen lands if liberation is to be completed. In addition, the white settlers, and all South Africans for that matter, also have to be culturally Africanised, for as Biko correctly stated: one cannot escape the fact that the culture shared by the majority group in any given society must ultimately determine the broad direction taken by the joint culture of that society. . . . A country in Africa, in which the majority of the people are African must inevitably exhibit African values and be truly African in style. . . .

Our kindness has been misused and our hospitality turned against us. Whereas whites were mere guests to us on their arrival in this country they have now pushed us out to a 13% corner of the land and are acting as bad hosts in the rest of the country. This we must put right. . . . We (want) to remove (the white man) from our table, strip the table of all trappings put on it by him, decorate it in true African style, settle down and then ask him to join us on our own terms if he liked.

--[I Write What I Like: 24, 86, 69]
Unfortunately, like all the other liberation movements in Africa, the ANC, despite the ideological illumination it welcomed under Tambo, seems to have now fallen into its own brand of the “crisis of knowledge” and to have settled into the imperialist trap of economic and cultural neo-colonialism. With this delay in pushing ahead to the next stages of the struggle for total liberation from imperialism, with this loss of liberationist momentum, the black South African elite, like their counterparts in the rest of Black Africa, have probably already coasted, and probably unconsciously, into the role of black colonialists that was devised for them by imperialism and the Broederbond—the organised intelligentsia of the Afrikaners and custodian of their white supremacist ideology. So, in the “New South Africa” white supremacy and imperialism live on, wearing a mask of black majority government. Just as in the rest of Black Africa, it is “White power behind a black mask”.

But that’s nothing new, I must stress: **Black liberation movements are the global champions in the strange game of winner-lose-all**. After all, Black Africans are consistently stupid about power; always too quick to concede too much to the white enemy! In two centuries of liberation struggles, from Haiti to South Africa, blacks grabbed the empty hole in the doughnut and celebrated "victory" while the "defeated" whites held on to the dough! No wonder whites make saints and celebrities of black leaders after easily duping them. Those few they can't dupe, like Dessalines and Cabral, they get other blacks to assassinate.

We need to study the black liberation struggles, from Haiti to South Africa, to see why, in two centuries of victories, military and political, none both achieved and consolidated its liberation. It seems that, in Mandela’s words, “as new conditions create the temptations of self-interest and personal enrichment”, short sighted black leaders, in their desperate hurry, as Cabral said, “to have a little enjoyment of the crumbs of colonialism” invariably became casualties to what Mao called “the sugar-coated bullets of the bourgeoisie”. [*Journey into Revolutionary China*: 96]

*In your book The West and the Rest of Us, you appealed to the African elite to strive to build an African power. It does not seem like that call has been responded to, especially in Nigeria which, by size and population, should be a big African power. Are you disappointed that no attempt has been made at all?*

*Why are Nija niggas so hung up on their size and population? What’s the size and population of Singapore or Switzerland or Cuba?* A big population with an abysmally low political, scientific, cultural, ethical and productivity level is certainly not an asset. Indeed it is a fatal liability.
Nothing to be proud of.

**Let me turn to the issue of disappointment. You can only be disappointed if you have hopes or expectations.** But the character of the African elite, as I described it in that book in the early 1970s, gave no basis for thinking that they would attempt anything like that. The analysis in the book simply pointed out what needed to be done by whoever got around to the task of liberating black Africa. And since nobody outside the elite could be expected to work through a 500-page historical analysis, the book was, inevitably, addressed to the elite. But did I expect these niggertrash elites to do the job? Not really; it would not be in their class character. Don’t forget what Fanon had already said of them by 1961: "the bourgeois phase in the history of under-developed countries is a completely useless phase. When this caste has vanished, . . . It will be seen that nothing new has happened since independence was proclaimed, . . . [that] that caste has done nothing more than take over unchanged the legacy of the economy, the thought and the institutions left by the colonialists. . . . And that everything must be started again from scratch. . ." --[ *The Wretched of the Earth*: 142]

Of course, if some crisis were to force some of the elite to ask “what needs to be done?” they might look for clues in a work like *The West and the Rest of Us*. That was the best that could be expected. **In any case, I was merely echoing Marcus Garvey. He was the one who enunciated this idea, back in the 1920s, that we need a Black African power, and in Africa, that would gain respect for the black race throughout the world.** But these black compradors are not interested in that. To understand the nature of the comprador class and why they cannot do anything like that, you have to study Franz Fanon’s *The Wretched of the Earth*. You have to study Cabral’s works too. But I am sure they are not part of political education in Nigeria—if there is any political education in Nigeria. **Nijaniggas do not read, let alone read Garvey, Cabral or Fanon.**

**Unsurprisingly, building an African power is not on their agenda.** As for Nigeria spearheading the struggle to build an African power, such a role is beyond its mentality. Nigeria is not even competent to manage itself let alone build anything. Unlike Saudi Arabia, Qatar or Dubai, Nigeria can’t even organize the orderly distribution and consumption of its oil bonanza! It does not have the mentality, it does not have the knowledge, it does not have the skill, it does not have the will or interest to tackle anything major. A junk state that, in fifty years and despite its oil bonanza, can’t even complete the Ajaokuta steel mill, that can’t maintain basic law and order, that can’t maintain the postal and railway services it inherited from the British, that can’t conduct a credible population census, that can’t maintain its refineries or clear garbage from its pot-holed streets—can such a failed and incompetent state build African Power? Anybody pinning his hopes on Nigeria is wasting his time. **If Nigeria is the hope of the black world**
then the black world has no hope.
Just look around Lagos, our black colonialists’ self-proclaimed “centre of
exc"ellence”. So much visible unemployment; so much work crying to be
done to make it clean and liveable; but the state government can’t gather
the teeming idle hands roaming the streets and organise them to do the
work that’s crying to be done! The black colonialists, at every level of
government, are too busy looting to spare a thought or moment to organise
the work needed in the society. Furthermore, at the local government level,
after some 25 years non-enforcement of public nuisance laws, the level of
noise pollution from the ubiquitous churches of the born-again lunatics is
intolerable. **They mount the most powerful loudspeakers and from
there blast their prayer meetings, with hand-clapping, singing,
drumming, and shouting of “Praise the Lord, Hallelujah!”; “In Jesus
name” etc. And they do so, usually from midnight to dawn, not just
on Sundays, but whenever the anti-social devil spirit moves them,
thereby subjecting all within earshot to the nightly torture of sleep
deprivation. They must believe that their god Jehovah is so deaf that
he can hear their desperate prayers only if made in the stillness of
deepest night, and loud enough to wake the dead.**
As they say, Nigerians are an incompetent people. **We are allergic to
detail, logic, analysis, precision, principles, foresight, discipline,
vigilance.** We are not mentally thorough or tough. We are not like the
Germans or Japanese. We are not even like our now despised and
demonised ancestors who created the exquisite works in the acclaimed
exhibition “2000 years of Nigerian Art” that toured the world in 1980. After
100 years of colonialism—the white expatriate phase followed by the present
black comprador phase— we have totally degenerated, in character and
competence, from our so-called primitive, pre-colonial ancestors. **Similarly,**
**whatever fighting spirit their ancestors had has been squeezed out of
Nija niggas. And whatever codes of “death rather than dishonour”
and “victory or death” their ancestors may have had, have been long
discarded by Nija niggas. The Nija nigga is now possessed by the
“never-say-die” spirit, and this, in his case mans: the spirit that, like
Saddam Hussein, desperately avoids dying, and clings to another
day of life even if he has to dishonourably crawl into a rat hole or
shit pit to hide and see the next sunrise.**
These days phrases like “imperialism” and “neo-colonialism” have disappeared from popular usage and public consciousness, even when we know it is real. Why do you think this is so?

I guess there are several contributing factors: (1) the collapse of the Soviet Union; (2) the invasion by the globalisation rhetoric; (3) the upsurge of the infantile/primitive prayers-and-miracles religious worldview that is uncongenial to socio-historical thinking, and that has deeply depressed the scientific, cultural and ethical level of the population—depressed it from a level that had been quite low even in 1960; (4) the ideological vacuum, Philistinism and even anti-intellectualism bequeathed by the independence movement—it left no tradition of pamphleteering, of debating and applying the illumination of analysis and ideology to socio-political problems; (5) the impact of SAP on the rickety infrastructure of intellectual life in Nigeria—the universities have been in a state of collapse for a long time; publishing is moribund, with vanity publishing now the norm; the press is pathetic—daily doping the public with a diet of scandals and sports and mindless entertainment. There are no weeklies or monthlies of ideas and social criticism—no equivalents of Britain’s Punch, New Statesman, TLS, or America’s Atlantic Monthly, New Yorker, New York Review of Books etc. There are no venues for proffering insights into, and debating alternative solutions to, societal problems. In short, Nigeria is an intellectual desert. As a result, Nigerians have grown incapable of, and even impatient with social and political thinking. And concepts and categories of social analysis—including imperialism and colonialism—have disappeared from what little thinking there is.

Your question, as you can see, would need a long interview of its own to explore these complex factors that have created the intellectual vacuum into which the globalisation rhetoric has rushed in and imposed its aversion to terms like imperialism.

In this degenerate intellectual climate, the money-and-miracles mentality reigns unchallenged: money—and ever more money—and the miraculous intervention of God, are seen as the solution to all problems in the here and now, just as Jesus is the solution in the hereafter. Hence the Nija nigga’s extreme passivism in the face of chronic misgovernment.

All in all, Nija niggas have no sense that the population should take responsibility, thought and action to shape their society. That is the main reason why, here in Nigeria, you do not find people who think and understand what their basic problems are.
So there is no understanding of the problems even amongst the intellectual class?

If there is, there is no evidence of it in the political culture and the media of the last 50 years. They do not show that the intellectual strata understand the problems, or even try to understand them. Just take the example of the Nija nigga’s notion of the democracy that is nowadays on everybody’s lips. According to a survey reported by Oluwole Adejare: nation-wide responses to the question, ‘what is democracy?’ . . . Produced sickening banalities among which are the following examples: 
(a) when Obasanjo rules again, 
(b) when soldiers hand over to civilians, 
(c) when they give government to the Yoruba people, 
(d) when everybody can do what (s)he likes, 
(e) the government after Abiola and Abacha died, and 
(f) when we vote for politicians.
He adds that: 
The cliché, ‘government of the people, by the people, for the people’ was recited with no depth of understanding . . . By respondents such as civil servants, students, teachers, politicians, journalists etc. Who constitute about 60% of the sample population. 
--[Democracy: 15]
Pathetic! But not surprising in a country that, in its century of existence, has not had organs for political education or for discussion of ideas.

Is the leftist school of thought in Nigeria entirely dead or simply in retreat? The black condition persists- mental slavery and idolising of the white accomplishments; poverty, neo-colonialism, HIV/AIDS; it seems hopeless for the black man?

What leftist school of thought? You mean the leftist school of thoughtlessness, with its sterile version of ‘class analysis’? They used to mouth the language of imperialism, here as in the rest of Africa; but that finally disappeared when the Soviet Union disappeared. The best of them were Marxologists; they were parroting the Marxist rhetoric they heard from their European masters. As far back as the early 1980s, even before the collapse of the Soviet Union, some of these Marxologist parrots had converted from Marx back to Jesus. Like Trotsky said to C.L.R. James in 1939 about their counterparts in Europe in the 1930s, when the world socialist movement was suffering setbacks: “Many of them are returning to all sorts of vague
things—humanism, etc. [even] to God as well as to democracy.” If you can go, in one week, from Marx to “Praise the Lord, Hallelujah!” something was unsound about your Marxism. Either you did not understand it, or it was just another fad. Let me read you what Mao said of their type in China in the 1930s:
He is unable to apply the method of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin to the concrete study of China’s present conditions and her history or to the concrete analysis and solution of the problems of the Chinese revolution. . . . He goes to Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin not to seek the stand, viewpoint and method with which to solve the theoretical and tactical problems of the Chinese revolution but to study theory purely for theory’s sake. He does not shoot the arrow at the target but shoots at random . . .
--Mao Tse-Tung, “Reform our Study” (1941) in Selected Works Vol. III, pp. 19, 21

The best of our Nigerian leftists could keep you spell bound talking about the minutiae of the French revolution or the Russian revolution, but they showed little aptitude for investigating and understanding our local situation. Unlike Cabral, our Marxologists did not apply their class analysis to the concrete problems of Africa or African liberation.

The trouble with the intellectuals in Nigeria is that they do not like to think, are too lazy to think, and most do not even know how to think. Nigerian intellectuals are highly allergic to ideas of any kind. They, and the rest of their black colonialist class, are a prime example of what C.L.R. James called “an elite that lives completely without ideas, that lives entirely on the material plane.” You cannot be talking about a leftist school of thought among such unthinking parrots.

As for the conditions you enumerated—mental slavery, poverty, idolising of whites, neo-colonialism, HIV/AIDS, etc—well, they are cause for alarm about the future of black Africans. In particular, with the deliberate genocidal AIDSbombing of Black Africa, by the US Government and the World Health Organisation (WHO), now wiping out millions of people and communities, and with a patented cure for AIDS being mysteriously withheld from the public, [State Origin: The Evidence of the Laboratory Birth of AIDS, by Boyd Graves] the black race seems to be on its last legs, on its way to extinction. Unless they summon the will and intelligence and energy to achieve in the next fifty years what they should have organised in the last 50 years, there will be no black Africans left alive on earth by the end of this 21st century. If they have lost the will to organise themselves to survive, despite Garvey’s warning eighty years ago, their extinction will be purely a case of enemy-assisted race suicide.
Considering the origin of Nigeria, a colonial creation, and what the leaders have made of it, do you think it is a waste of time reforming the country, the way various governments have attempted?

Yes of course. Trying to reform Nigeria from the top is a total waste of time. Can cats reform themselves to stop killing mice? Black comprador colonialism cannot be ended by any reforms, least of all by reforms carried out by the black compradors themselves. It would be irrational to expect these black compradors to reform themselves out of existence. Only the total abolition of neo-colonialism, with liquidation of the black colonialists, can bring about any changes fundamental to the survival, dignity and prosperity of the Nigerian population.

But what specific reforms do you have in mind? Reforms with what objectives? Just take the case of the current OBJ reforms. Like IBB’s SAP and Abacha’s Vision 2010 TINA reforms before it, OBJ’s reforms are teleguided by the IMF and the G8. They are designed to make the Nigerian state even more subservient to imperialism, and more predatory on the Nigerian population. OBJ, in his personal vendetta against Nigerians, has even added his own vampire extras to the reforms mandated by his imperialist masters. By deliberately destroying the refineries, allowing uncontrolled price increases, and resorting to importation of petroleum products through a cartel of his agents, OBJ has craftily reduced Nigeria to a vast economic torture camp. The population have been locked into an economic structure where they must have petrol and kerosene to keep alive. All it takes is an artificial scarcity orchestrated by OBJ’s cartel of profiteers to bring Nigerians to their knees, clawing at one another and begging for a drop at any price. In this situation, whatever little fighting spirit the Nija niggas have—and they never had much—is used up fighting one another: Unlike black South Africans, Nija niggas do not have a tradition of political militancy with high courage and self-sacrifice. They can’t spare any fighting spirit for resisting the government that is torturing them. Under the cover of market-friendly reforms, OBJ has set up things so that, at the slightest hint of opposition to any government action or policy, he and his gang can bring the entire Nigerian population to heel by orchestrating an artificial petrol scarcity! These OBJ reforms amount to a war on the Nigerian population—OBJ’s private war on Nigerians, to avenge his stay in jail for coup plotting against Abacha!

Incidentally, the sad thing is that Nigerians had a good chance to prevent these OBJ vampire reforms from being implemented in the first place. But they refused to heed Adams Oshiomole’s NLC when it repeatedly called them out on strikes in 2003-2005. Complaining that even a two-weeks long strike would be too much hardship for them to bear, their half-hearted strikes failed, and the government confidently went ahead with its hefty price hikes.
and anti-people reforms of the petroleum sector. All those other reforms of the last 40 or 50 years—simplistic, piecemeal, ill-conceived, and arbitrarily implemented reforms like the Buhari-Idiagbon War Against Indiscipline (WAI) in the 1980s [with its biased enforcement and sacred cows, as in the 53 suitcases scandal] and the earlier Murtala-Obasanjo bull-in-the-china-shop attack on corruption in the 1970s—have each contributed to the decay of Nigerian society into anarchy and the degeneration of the quality of the population. They were no better than attempts to rearrange the curtains and chairs and to repaint the interior of the Nija Titanic slave ship; but you can’t save the Titanic from sinking by doing that; the ship cannot stay afloat and the peoples trapped in Nigeria had better build life boats and get out fast. But the comprador crew are self interestedly fostering the illusion that it is going to stay afloat and even steam ahead to some fine harbour. It is all so tragic.

Nigerians need to grasp one simple fact: **Nigeria? Can’t reform it, can’t repair it, can’t develop it!** The house of Nigeria is far too rotten for renovation! Just pull it down! Besides, as they say: Reform always comes from below. Nobody with four aces asks for a new deal.

*If you think the elite has sold out and are incapable of creating a genuine country, how should the people go about recovering their country?*

You talk about selling out. Selling out is a conscious action by somebody who, instead of doing what he knows he should do, does something else because he has been bought off. But these black comprador colonialists are so brainwashed that nobody has to buy them off. These characters do what they do because they are a lunatic elite; you cannot buy off a lunatic. His irrational behaviour is not open to purchase.

Now, about “the people“ recovering “their country”. First of all, does Nigeria belong to its population? Who actually owns Nigeria? Legally and in practice, Nigeria actually belongs, not to its population, its nominal citizens, but to what are nowadays called the “stakeholders”: i.e. The imperialist corporations and the black colonialists who manage the Nigerian state apparatus for them. By the Land Use Decree of 1978—a.k.a Land Thief Decree-- the entire land of Nigeria now belongs to the Nigerian state; and furthermore, by extending to all of Nigeria what Lugard, the conqueror, had decreed in 1903 only for Northern Nigeria, the 1999 Constitution has given all the resources under the land to the Nigerian state. Oluwole Adejare argues that in law, “land includes the physical earth with the mines and minerals beneath the surface and buildings erected on the surface.” And that “section 44(30) [of the 1999 Constitution] gives the Federal Government the
contents of the same land” [Democracy: 259-267] Thus, by the Land Thief Decree and the 1999 Constitution, Nigeria does not belong to its population. The Nigerian state has stolen all the land and landed property in the country from the population, and given them worthless Certificates of Occupancy (C-of-Os) that can be revoked by the state at its pleasure. If Adejare is correct, that means the black colonialists, through the Nigerian state, have quietly stolen 100% of the land from the black Nigerians. And the dumb Nija niggas don’t even know it yet. As a result, the Nigerian population is in a worse plight than even the black South Africans who were openly robbed of only 87% of their ancestral lands by the white settler colonialists! So, legally, if the population insists that Nigeria is theirs and want, as you say, “to recover their country”, they have to struggle and take it back from the “stakeholders’, just like the black South Africans, Zimbabweans and Namibians have to struggle to take back their lands from the white settlers among them.

Secondly, who exactly are ‘the people’? As Cabral points out: “The definition of people depends on the historical moment which the land is experiencing . . . The people are defined in terms of the main stream of the history of that society, in terms of the highest interests of the majority of that society” [Unity & Struggle: 89, 90] Since the founding of Nigeria a century ago, our historical moment has been that of foreign domination. So, the definition of the people has to be, as Cabral said: “all those born in the land . . . who want what corresponds to the fundamental necessity of the history of our land”, namely, those who want liberation from foreign domination.

Accordingly, nobody who accepts the comprador idea of the ‘good life’ belongs among ‘the people’. Needless to say, the black colonialists, being agents of imperialist domination, are not part of “the people”. Furthermore, after 50 years of social and cultural degeneration under the black colonialists, are there any “the people” left? What you have to realise is that the rot, which was still confined to the top at “independence”, has now seeped down to those usually considered “the people”. All that is wrong with the comprador elite is now also wrong with almost everybody, down to the villagers and infants. In fact, in a talk, subtitled “The Lunatic Elite”, which I gave in Abuja in 1995 at the National Health Summit, I said that we have to focus our attention on those under 20, if we want to get out of our mess. And somebody remarked that that age would be too late, that we should focus on those under five! The lunatic comprador mentality now permeates the entire culture, and is promptly imbibed even by newborn babies. There are hardly any Nigerians today who see foreign domination as against their interest; and escape from foreign domination as their cardinal interest. So who are “the people” who are going to recover “their country”? 
But the job has to be done somehow.

Does it? Like Cabral points out, there is a time you have to give up. And his reason is quite instructive. He says:
our objective is to ensure progress and happiness for our people, but we cannot achieve this against our people. If some persons in our land do not want this, we face an alternative. Either they are not the people and then we can do anything against them, even imprison them. Or they are numerous and represent the people, and at that point we give up. We can do nothing more because one cannot ensure happiness and progress for anyone against his will.
--[ Unity & Struggle: 90]

We have gotten to a point where those who accept the comprador idea of the ‘good life’ are most probably in the overwhelming majority in Nigeria. Probably more than 99.99% of the population! That means that most Nigerians are culturally committed, even if unconsciously, to the side of foreign domination, i.e. Committed to imperialism, and not against it. And unless a coherent and critical mass of the population actively rejects the comprador idea of the ‘good life’, and sets out to organise national liberation from black comprador colonialism, Nigeria will continue to decay. Until a movement emerges to defeat the black colonists and finish the aborted struggle for independence; until such a movement expels the black compradors from Nigeria just like Castro expelled Batista and his comprador gang from Cuba, or the Maoists expelled Chiang Kai-shek and his comprador cohorts from China; until that is done, there is little chance of the Nigerian people recovering “their country”. But if all the people have been brainwashed or otherwise reduced to accepting this rubbish as the way to live, what, as Cabral points out, can anybody do about it? Just give up!

But you know Nigerians do not like living like this?

Don’t they? It is not enough for them to say and in private: “I do not like this, and I don’t like that”. If somebody is sitting in his living room and says he does not like the stench and the flies, and you tell him to remove the bucket of shit that’s there, and he makes no move to do so, then you know his complaining is just make-believe. Most Nigerians grumble about the Nigerian situation, but none of them dislike it enough to realise that they have to do away with the Nigerian state apparatus that’s giving them these things to complain about. All the grumbling has not even stimulated serious thinking about and analysis of the social decay, let alone a proffering of
remedies. Until they give to their grumbling an organized political expression, their grumbling is just make-believe. You have the unfortunate situation where they have enough oil money floating around and they do not have to work or think hard for anything, and all their ambition is to grab the oil money and squander it. So long as that prospect is there, they are not going to exert themselves to repair or change Nigeria.

You see, the political, scientific and ethical level of Nija niggas has plummeted outrageously since 1960, and it wasn’t very high in 1960 to begin with. Nigerians are now political Neanderthals and have a stupid mindset. They are addicted to seeking individual escape routes from social problems. And each has the delusion that if only he grabs enough money he can individually buy his way out of all his problems and discomforts. **Unfortunately for them, no amount of money can buy your individual way out of anarchy! Only a fundamental and comprehensive social reorganization can abolish the bureaucratic anarchy whose consequences are the things these Nija niggas complain about.** But that little fact is too big for their lazy minds to grasp. Nigerians need to learn that social problems require social solutions collectively devised and collectively implemented. But they are too pathologically individualistic and money obsessed to get that into their skulls. Each Nigerian is hoping that, some day, he or his descendants will get into some public office and loot “his share” of oil money. So, they don’t want to dismantle the system. But they don’t ask: Will Nigeria still have oil a thousand years from now? And if so, what is the probability that any of his descendants will by then get into one of the looting stations and loot “his share”? Nigerians are too mentally lazy or deluded to ask such basic questions. If they did, they might see that the odds are heavily against their hopes. In any case, your oil reserves will be exhausted within a century. If these Nija niggas could curb their naïve optimism for a moment and realise this, they might wake up to the need to destroy the system now, even at the risk of their own lives, so as to save their descendants—assuming they are interested in the welfare of their progeny, which I seriously doubt.

**Are you of the school of thought that oil is curse?**

Of course it is a curse. All these immature countries that have been hit by the oil boom, go and see what it has done to them. The Shah’s Iran was a major example. Oil has been a blessing to a country like Britain or Norway, which was already industrialised and well organised, and oil was just another source of revenue which they could fit into an established system. Those countries that were not solidly organised before they found oil, and that did not have the wise leadership to manage the bonanza, became a mess. For
them the oil boom has been oil doom! Certainly, Nigeria’s oil boom has been a curse. It instigated all kinds of delusions and illusions; it diverted people from what should be the central concern of politics—organising the public welfare [i.e. Territorial defence; internal law and order; dispensing justice; building and maintaining roads; delivering the mail; seeing to the efficient and nationalistic management of political and economic institutions so as to provide opportunities for productive employment for all, produce most of the food you need, manufacture the things you need daily, provide enough electricity, water and adequate health care etc.]

**Oil money has distorted everything. The Govt, getting fabulous revenues from the oil companies, doesn’t feel any need to gather taxes from the population, and so feels no pressure to consult or heed their wishes. Furthermore, thanks to oil money, politics is now organised from the top down rather than from the bottom up! The parties are funded from oil money by the govt. The 50 or so registered parties are, in effect, government agencies, not organs of the population.** So they cannot challenge a president who can cut off their state subventions. Even more distorting is the fact that the Constitution gives a president legal immunity for whatever he does, gives him control over huge oil revenues, and over the bureaucracy, the army and police forces. Yet people expect a man loaded with such enormous and unchecked powers to remain normal and not become a dictator, get power drunk and go berserk. Even Jesus would go berserk if given such powers! Furthermore, in a system where you need to spend so much to run for any office, only a looter, or one sponsored by looters can ever hold office. And yet Nijas niggas righteously denounce godfatherism, not recognizing that it is inevitable in a political system where it costs millions to seek office but very few have any millions. Of course, the black colonialists installed such a system to ensure that they will hold a monopoly of power, either by themselves or through lackeys they sponsor.

Oil boom diverted people from attending to the nuts and bolts of how to run a country. As Nigerian politics became simply the means to grab easy money, it ceased to be about the public welfare and degenerated into sheer racketeering and gangsterism, like it has blatantly been since 1999. We need to recognize that when the objective or activity of a formal organized association is a crime, the association is a crime syndicate or mafia; its activity is racketeering or organised crime; its members are mobsters/gangsters. Since the crime of looting the treasury is now the primary objective in Nigerian politics, by these standard definitions, the 50 odd registered political parties in Nigeria are mafias or crime syndicates racketeering to loot public funds; their members are nothing but mobsters. Incidentally, **if the RICO Act of the USA were to be enforced in Nigeria, every member of every registered political party, from OBJ down, and every member of the bureaucracy, would be serving long jail**
terms for racketeering: engaging in criminal activity as a structured group. In fact, Nigerian politics is just organised crime, with the assassinations—gangland slayings—that go with that. As a result the Nigerian political lexicon is full of misnomers:

Corruption = euphemism for looting/plundering the public treasury;
Politics = misnomer for organized crime/ racketeering to loot the treasury;
Political party = misnomer for a crime syndicate/mafia organized to loot the treasury;
Politician = misnomer for mobster, a member of a crime syndicate. And the funny thing is that what, in the USA would be prosecuted as racketeering or organised crime, in Nigeria is hailed as “our nascent democracy”. And our Al Capone in Aso Rock--whose PDP [People’s Destruction Party] is the premier syndicate-- is the don of dons, the head of the National Crime Syndicate as it were. Can you imagine Al Capone in the White House, even as a visitor, let alone as the occupant busy installing his henchmen in every looting station in the land? But then, Nigeria has become, under the black colonialists, a lunatic asylum where the craziest inmates are now in charge!

When you have all this easy money floating around, people do not face up to the hard realities they should face up to. Take the case of the Niger Delta. What has kept the Ijaws from solving their problem by exercising their people’s right to self-determination, and getting it enforced through a UN plebiscite, like the East Timorese did? It’s the easy money from oil. Ijaw leaders—the black colonialists of Ijaw extraction—all except for Asari Dokubo, are too wedded to Nigeria’s easy money to undertake the project of founding their own independent country. Look, they keep grumbling about being cheated in the Nigerian game even though it is being played with their ball. If they take their ball and go away, the Nija game will abruptly end and the cheating will stop. So why don’t they do just that? Instead of taking their ball and walking out of a game in which they are clearly being cheated, they are crying for “three more states of their own”, claiming they don’t want to destroy Nigeria! This very same Nigeria that is destroying their land and people. You see, the Ijaw elite—the Ijaw black colonialists—desperately want to be Nigerians. The only people more amazing than them in this desperation to remain Nigerians are the Ibo stratum of black colonialists who also desperately want to be Nigerians, at whatever cost to the rest of the Ibos. Of course, if the Ijaws took their oilfields and left Nigeria, they would have to protect themselves. They would have to organise Ijawland and Ijaw power in an Ijaw sovereign state. Organising power, organising a society is hard mental and physical work. And compradors don’t like to work at all if they can help it. They will settle any day, anywhere, for easy money—even into slavery! The Ijaw black colonialists are intimidated by the prospect of organising Ijaw power and an Ijaw sovereign state. So they sit back and allow the caliphate colonialists to take the money from their oil and give
them crumbs, which they use these bandit kidnappers to extort from the government. They pocket the occasional million naira ransom money and they are individually happy, when they could collectively get Nigeria’s $10 billion or more per year in oil revenue, and fix up Ijawland to be like Kuwait, Dubai or Brunei. But that is beyond their imagination. It seems that a 500-years-long habit of being compradors for the European slave procurers and the British has become so ingrained in Ijaw mentality that they cannot think outside the framework of this comprador colonial Nigeria. That, I think, is why they are allergic to the idea of self-determination for Ijawland.

**From what you are saying if oil dries up today we might be getting somewhere?**

If oil dries up today you would have an economic earthquake that would force the Nigerian population to start rethinking everything; at least they would start thinking of the fundamentals of how to build and run a viable country and society. The crisis would be so earth shaking that only the dead would not start doing some hard thinking. The best thing that could happen today to all Nigerians is for Ijawland to exercise its right to self-determination. Then, everybody would get a big jolt and sit up and get to work to solve all these problems they ignore or just grumble about.

**From your perspective, give us your thoughts of the place of Nigeria in Africa and the international system?**

Simply put, Nigeria, like all the black countries in the world, is just another comprador-colonial Bantustan in the UN imperialist system of White European supremacy. All their economies are directed from Washington, New York, London and Paris just like the economies of those classic Bantustans of Apartheid South Africa were directed from Pretoria. Under UN imperialism, each year, in drawing up the budgets of these black African countries, the fundamentals are first agreed with the IMF and World Bank. In those Apartheid Bantustans, the political rulers were Pretoria’s stooges; those in Black African countries are stooges of the G8. They, like the South African Bantustan leaders, in Biko’s words, “are subconsciously aiding and abetting in the total subjugation of the black people” of each country. [I Write What I Like: 85] That is why, from Haiti to South Africa, these are all Bantustans of the imperialist G8 system. Nigeria is exceptional only in being misruled by what is probably the most anarchistic, greedy and decadent of these black colonialists.

Nigeria’s place in Africa specifically? Nigeria’s true role is that of an obstacle to the emancipation of black Africans.
That is contrary to the popular view.

The popular view is not necessarily correct.

**Why do you say that Nigeria is an obstacle?**

Let's take a current issue. **Nigeria is sitting here doing nothing at all as black Africans are being ethnic cleansed by Arabs in Sudan’s Darfur province.** Nigeria is not just doing nothing; it is, along with its AU co-criminals, even aiding and abetting the Arab minority regime in Khartoum in its crime against black humanity. America threatens to come with NATO forces to stop the ethnic cleansing, and the AU comes up with this stalling scheme to go in with an AU force. And the AU force is, predictably, incapable of doing the job while, by its very presence, it is giving cover to the agents and allies of the Khartoum regime to continue their deliberate mass murder of black Africans. Ending this crime is not of interest to their Arab-arse-licking AU minds. As far I am concerned they are not helping the black world at all. Black Africans have been ethnic cleansed in Mauritania for the last 20-30 years, and the OAU/AU, did not even acknowledge the issue. So what good is Nigeria to the black Africans? Nigeria is just a big clay elephant. It just sits there like a statue blocking the escape route for desperate black Africans under attack by Arab settlers.

**But Nigeria has played leading roles in liberating South Africa, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and now Cote d’Ivoire-- many African countries, has it not?**

Nonsense! Is any of these countries liberated? Liberated from what and when? And what did Nigeria’s intervention accomplish? Talking about South Africa, **did big Nigeria do as much as little Cuba, which is not even an African country, in liberating South Africa?** Please go through the records. Cuba was the one that stopped Apartheid South Africa from marching to Luanda. Troops flew from Cuba to fight the South African army. Where did Nigerian troops go to fight? Did they fight in Zimbabwe? Did they fight in Mozambique? Did they fight in Angola? If Nigeria’s intervention is so great, lets compare it with little Cuba’s?
Nigeria committed a lot of resources and had strong international voice?

That’s nonsense! That’s just Nigerian state propaganda! Even little Guinea-Bissau, under Cabral, by militarily defeating the Portuguese army and triggering the 1974 collapse of the Portuguese regime and of Portuguese rule in Angola and Mozambique, did far more for the liberation of South Africa than big Nigeria with its abundant resources and “strong voice.” But, let’s examine just one example of that international voice. Why has there been the problem of white settlers and land in Zimbabwe since about 1999? As Cabral said: “compromises with imperialism are counter-productive” [Unity & Struggle: 134] Was Nigeria not one of the states on the OAU Liberation Committee, in 1979, when Robert Mugabe was forced by the “frontline states” to accept the Lancaster House Agreement, a compromise that was robbing Zimbabweans of military victory and its fruits? [We need to recall that starting from April 1978 when a meeting in Lagos was chaired by the Nigerian Foreign Minister, Brigadier Garba, between representatives of the Front Line States and British and US officials, Nigeria became practically an adjunct or co-opted member of the Frontline states.]

Here you are, the black Zimbabweans have almost defeated the white Rhodesian army, and Britain, to save the white race from the humiliation of an outright military defeat by blacks, convenes the Lancaster House Conference in late 1979. But rather than strengthen Mugabe to achieve the unconditional surrender of the Rhodesians, the black “frontline” states basically gave him an ultimatum: ‘you accept the Lancaster Agreement if you want our continued support’. Instead of giving Mugabe what he needed to obtain the unconditional surrender of Smith and his white supremacist regime, the man is forced to forfeit the main fruits of his hard struggle. What role did Nigeria play in all that? Where was Nigeria’s “strong voice” when Zimbabwe, and the long humiliated black race, sorely needed it? Did it back Mugabe? If not, why not? What difference might an arrival of Nigerian troops to help the Zimbabweans have made to the terms of the Lancaster House Agreement? Might it have secured the unconditional surrender of the Rhodesians and thereby ended the issue of the stolen land once and for all? Why were they not sent? We have to be critical of the self-lauding rhetoric of the Nigerian state. What they say and what they accomplish may be quite different. Our political scientists and historians should go and look into these claims, case by case. Nigerians should insist on being told the detailed story of what Nigeria actually did, or failed to do, for the black African liberation struggles from 1963-1994. Let us judge these interventions by what they produced, not by the government’s posturing. Yes, Nigeria gave money through OAU, but how
much exactly? On this point, it would be useful for our scholars to obtain from the OAU Liberation Committee, and make public, their records of oil-rich Nigeria’s annual per capita financial contribution and compare it with desperately poor Tanzania’s for the years 1963-1994. Nigeria gave diplomatic support, but all that should be compared to what was needed, and to what white people did for those black liberation struggles. What did the Soviet Union and others do? Compare it to what Nigeria did. We must learn to put things in proper comparative context. You are in trouble and your big “black African brother” who was in a position to give you a thousand dollars gives you just one dollar, and some white stranger gives you the rest of the money to get you out of the predicament, and your ‘black brother’ is boasting that he saved you! Nija niggas are so gullible! They swallow any rotten ball of lies provided it is from “Government”! Whatever “Government” says the Nija nigger will trust and obey. He does not have the good sense to doubt even one word.

In 1979, Nigeria either helped sell out, or didn’t prevent the selling out, of the Zimbabweans to the British. Then in 2001/2002, Nigeria’s OBJ sided with the white members of the Commonwealth when they organised Zimbabwe’s suspension for taking back some of its land from white settler thieves. And to compound the injury to Black Africa, OBJ has taken land from some Nigerian villages and given it to racist white farmers expelled from Zimbabwe. All in devoted service to his white masters. And worst of all, there has been no public outcry from Nija niggas!

To get back to the point about Nigeria being an obstacle to black emancipation, has Nigeria ever sent troops anywhere to fight European or Arab settler governments which oppress Black Africans? Did it send troops to help the South Sudanese? Or the Afro-Darfurians? The black Mauritanians? To fight alongside the blacks in Rhodesia? Angola? Mozambique? South West Africa? It seems able to send troops only to help other black colonialist regimes when they are challenged by their black victim populations—Liberia, Sierra Leone, Cote d’Ivoire—just like it sent troops locally to Odi, Zaki Biam and Anambra to massacre and overawe restive Nigerians.

During the John McPherson Constitutional debate in 1948, the nationalists kicked against stronger regions and weak centre, today people are asking for stronger regions and weak center, can we get it right?

Such are the dumb alternatives that preoccupy Nija niggas! Strong vs. Weak center; Westminster vs. Washington models of democracy! Does a fish choose between a bicycle and a tricycle? Was any of those options designed
to solve our peculiar problems?
Getting it right depends on what your objectives are. If you are not clear about your objectives, you cannot get anything right. As they say “If a man does not know where he is going, any road can take him there”. So what is Nigeria for? This question has to be asked before you can talk about getting anything right. What does Nigeria exist for? What is its national purpose? Until you ask those questions and answer them thoroughly, you have no yardstick for measuring what is right and what is not. What is your criterion for being right? If your objective is to share the ‘national cake’, then a strong centre or weak centre becomes an issue. Those who control the centre would naturally want a strong centre so they can chop most of the ‘cake’; and if you control only a region, then you would want regions to be stronger so that you can chop more of the ‘cake’. So if your objective is “lets chop the national cake”, the life-more-abundant notion of government and independence, then you can get it right or wrong on that criterion. But if your objective is to build a Nigeria strong enough to do certain vital things---defend its territory, defend its population, industrialize its economy, achieve social peace and prosperity for its population etc.---then strong or weak centre is not a relevant criterion for getting it right or wrong. You can have either and still not achieve a strong Nigeria.

What do you think should be Nigeria’s national purpose?

Let’s put it bluntly: If Nigeria is to serve its population rather than imperialism, its national purpose must be to help build, in the next 50 years, by say 2060, a black African power that would do what Garvey stipulated, or do at least an African equivalent of what China did after 1949. Your history, if you know it, dictates what your objectives should be. Since our problems in the last one thousand years are because of our inability to defend our territory, our population, our civilisation and our culture, the only reason for us to tolerate and live under any political structure is that it provides us security from all enemies-- Arab or European invaders who come to loot our resources and brainwash our population with their self-serving imperialist religions and ideologies. The minimum purpose must be to create structures and policies that defend our land, people and culture from foreign invaders and enslavers. Now, all the things Black Africans have suffered from --slavery, conquest, colonisation, neocolonialism, underdevelopment, poverty, the AIDS plague-- are as a result of the fact that we could not defend our borders. Those who can defend their borders do not go through such disasters. Therefore, that should be the cardinal purpose of Nigeria, South Africa, Congo, the Economic Community
of West African States (ECOWAS), the Southern African Development Community (SADC), or whatever political structure Africans organise. You have to start from the premise that that is the fundamental problem you must solve; without that you cannot industrialise, you cannot be prosperous because other people can take away your resources, which you should be using for yourself, and you will remain poor. All the things on your wish list stem from your inability to defend your land or population against anybody who comes to take them—whether it was the Arabs and Europeans yesterday, or the Americans and Arabs today, or the Chinese and Indians tomorrow. If you cannot do that, whatever else you do is as nothing. So I would say that that is the yardstick people should use to measure what anybody is trying to do in Nigeria or any of these glorified Bantustans. And if these entities are not doing that, then they are not the countries we should be perpetuating.

And let’s apply this to a current matter, this PRONACO rubbish. Chief Anthony Enahoro and his PRONACO group are just jokers. Just a disaffected wing of the black colonialists! Enahoro himself should be held accountable for his “self-government-in-1956 motion” of 1953: we have seen what disasters his so-called independence motion has brought to the population. He is now talking about reinventing Nigeria, but he has not reviewed the mistakes of his generation in the independence struggle and he is coming with new solutions. And, what’s worse, these new solutions are nothing but to go back to the parliamentary system. Would a return to the parliamentary system overthrow the black colonialists, or produce a Nigeria that is strong enough to defend its land and population from all attacks? But even if it could, why didn’t it do so the first time? Has he told us? Has he analysed it, and told us why and how it can be made to work this time? Just telling us that it is less costly and cumbersome than presidential system is no answer. Somebody gives you one medicine for malaria, you take it and the malaria does not get cured, it gets worse; then another doctor gives you another medicine and the malaria keeps getting worse; and then the first doctor reappears and says you must get back to that drug you tried before. That is what Enahoro is doing with his PRONACO—offering us the old medicine that did not work the last time, and for that he is hailed as a hero! Nija niggas are so gullible.

**Why did it not work, you should tell us since you have thought about it?**

That is not my job. Don’t ask me to give you fish when you can well go and fish for yourself. If your generation is serious about surviving the disaster that is Nigeria, I am sure you can figure it out for yourselves— if you put
your minds to it. You have to grapple with the facts and collectively discuss and work out the answer. But if you are too lazy to do that, the alternative is for you to insist that the advocates of that option give you their answer to evaluate. Those who want you to buy that idea should be made to tell you: Why did it not work before? And why will it work now? These are elementary questions and must be answered. Getting them to answer is your job. My interest is to ask your generation to start asking the right questions. And the first step is to recognise that it did not work before and that somebody who is telling us to go back to a medicine that did not work the first time is fooling us again. Maybe things have changed now to make it work, but Enahoro has to be asked to make a case for it. This failure to ask him is an example of the poverty and laziness of political thinking in Nigeria.

When the same Enahoro gang called itself NADECO, during the Abacha regime, somebody asked Fela about NADECO, and he said ‘what do you say their name is again?’ and when he was told NADECO, he exclaimed: ‘Na decoration!’ You can imagine what Fela would have made of their new name PRONACO. It is the same black colonialist gang, still pretending to be nationalists, playing to the gallery and confusing the public with silly half-baked ideas. They were Zikists and could not get their thinking correct; they became Awoists and could not get their thinking correct; they have landed us in the mess of their comprador “Independence”. And they are still coming at us with recipes that don’t work. As far I am concerned we cannot get things right unless we ask the right questions, and you young people should start thinking out what the right questions should be.

**Constructing an African power used to be the rallying cry in those days of the 60's and 70's. OAU leaders’ rhetoric was for liberation of the continent, end to apartheid, mobilisation of third world nations to challenge the West and create a new world order. But all that seems to have petered out, African leaders and people seem to have given up. Why is that, in your view?**

First of all, point of correction: constructing an African power was never a rallying cry in the 60’s and 70’s. African unity was the rallying cry, not African power. The OAU was not founded to construct an African power. OAU was invented to foster a union government for the African continent-- that was Nkrumah’s delusional project. But an African union government is not necessarily an African power. You can have African unity inside the dungeon of imperialism, which is what the AU is. It is not an African power. You can have unity in your weakness, as Cabral warned: “we must realize that union does not always make for strength, there are certain kinds of union which make for weakness.” [Unity & Struggle: 30] You can all be chained together
in a slave dungeon: that is unity-- OAU/AU style. OAU was never about creating African power. It is important to remind people of Cabral’s levelheaded and gradualist approach to African Unity. In 1961, even as a confused, impatient and wild-eyed Nkrumah was exhorting and deliriously stampeding people into an immediate and continental unification of the African neo-colonial Bantustans, Cabral quite sensibly told them in Cairo at the 3rd Conference of African Peoples: “We are for African unity, on a regional or continental scale, insofar as it is necessary for the progress of the African peoples, and in order to guarantee their security and the continuity of this progress”. [Revolution in Guinea: 15] A few years later, in 1965, even after the OAU had been formed, Cabral insisted: “In Africa we are for African unity, but we are for African unity in favour of the African peoples. We consider unity to be a means, not an end. Unity can reinforce and accelerate the reaching of ends, but we must not betray the end. That is why we are not in such great hurry to achieve African unity. We know that it will come, step by step, as a result of the fruitful efforts of the African peoples.” [Revolution in Guinea: 65] Cabral’s was the sober approach of a meticulous builder, the step by step and stage by stage approach of an agronomist, a grower of crops, but Nkrumah’s hasty “instant coffee” approach had prevailed. It is significant that, before he died, Nkrumah told Cabral: “Cabral, I tell you one thing, our problem of African unity is very important, really, but now if I had to begin again, my approach would be different.” [Return to the Source: 91] But alas, Nkrumah’s belatedly regretted approach had been institutionalised and has now landed us in the AU dungeon! As for mobilising the Third World to challenge the West and create a New International Economic Order (NIEO), African leaders were just camp followers. The movers and shakers in that movement were not African countries; it began with the Arabs, when they tried to use their oil power against Israel and the West. But that movement failed for reasons that need not detain us.

Why have Africans given up? First, the case of the Black African elites—the black colonialists. They are like a python which is digesting a sheep it has swallowed. Since inheriting the colonial prisons from the white colonialists, they have been interested only in digesting their catch—exploiting the prisoners-- and using the proceeds in catching up with the West in consumerism, not in anything else. So, the first answer to your question is that they never tried at anything but consumerism--and you have to try before you can be said to give up-- and the reason they never even tried anything important is that, as a comprador class, they are not concerned with building anything. They are a historically useless class, as Fanon said. Secondly, for the black colonialists, a pseudo-bourgeoisie, government is simply a bureau of internal plunder. And though they are locally recruited, their mentality is that of feudal invaders whose only interest is to plunder
the land and squander the loot on their luxurious estates back home, in this case in Europe or Arabia---their cultural homelands. This is perhaps most readily visible in the extreme case of Nigeria where the feudalists of the Sokoto Empire have exercised hegemony since 1970 and infused their mentality into the entire black colonialist caste. As such, they are not interested in anything beyond plunder-and squander.

Thirdly, black colonialists can never attempt anything that is against their imperialist masters’ interests. Just take the matter of the industrialization of Africa. **Imperialism long ago decreed for Africa the role of a raw materials supplier, and doesn’t want Africa as an industrialized rival. Even though most black colonialists are too lazy to be interested in attempting industrialization—as one Nigerian comprador moneybag said in the early 1970s: “why make when we can buy?”— Nkrumah, the only one of their leaders who tried, got promptly removed by their masters. Others who might have been tempted to follow Nkrumah’s example have quietly carried on doing nothing about industrializing their Bantustans.

If the African people also seem to have given up, it is probably because the black colonialists have demoralized them. They are too crushed by the burden of carrying these black colonialist white elephant elites to attempt anything. In being handed over from white colonialist rulers to black colonialist misrulers, they had gone from the frying pan of disciplined, sadistic Gestapo jailers into the fire of anarchist Idi Amin mad dogs! Which is why some Africans have been wishing for a return to the ‘good old days’ of the white expatriate colonialists. Which is understandable, as rule by madmen is far worse than any tyranny.

But the cure for the failures of “independence” is not a return to white expatriate colonialism, with the genocide, forced labour and racial humiliation that characterised it between 1884 and 1945, but rather a resumption and proper completion of the liberation struggle, with liquidation of the black colonialists. For as Cabral said, “the neo-colonial situation, . . . Demands the elimination of the native pseudo-bourgeoisie so that national liberation can be attained.”[ *Revolution in Guinea*: 88]

Just as the Chinese got rid of the comprador Republic of China in 1949 and founded the People’s Republic of China to consolidate their liberation, Africans need to get rid of these comprador Bantustan Republics and found African People’s Republics to save and serve black people.

To take an example of the population “giving up”, in Nigeria, which is by far the worst of these Black African Bantustans, in just fifty years, the population have become completely confused, disorganized, and demoralized by the black colonialists. In fact, all our black colonialist presidents, governors, legislators, LGA councillors, politicians, policemen, soldiers, clergy, UN bureaucrats, miracle-mongering missionaries etc. Are the enemy within: the black agents, within our ranks, of our imperialist
enemy. But with their lack of political education, and in their consequent false consciousness, most Nigerians still see these black colonialists as their leaders, as being still on their side rather than as the enemy. So they can’t take any initiative, because they are still naively hoping for leadership from those who have long ago transformed into their black colonialist enemies. In this, Nigerians are like sheep waiting for leadership from wolves in sheep’s clothing!

Furthermore Nigerians have been brainwashed into passivism, a passivism produced by a psychological feeling of powerlessness which has been deliberately cultivated by the black colonialists. Like black South Africans in the mid-1960s, Nigerians have been cowed into what Biko called “dogged acceptance of all that comes from authority”[I Write What I Like: 18]; into “a slave-like apathy that bordered on timidity”. [I Write What I Like: 34]. Incidentally, this passivism is probably not unconnected with the platter-of-gold mentality. The Nija nigga expects the remedy to his problems to be given him on a platter of gold, just like independence allegedly was. He wants a Sovereign National Conference, as well as petrol available at affordable prices, but he is not prepared to organise and demonstrate in the streets for it, let alone risk his precious limb and life to fight for it. Grumbling at home and moralising in the newspapers, he believes, is all he needs to do to get whatever remedy he wants! If that isn’t enough, then God, he believes, will himself come and do whatever is needed, or surely send a saviour-hero to do whatever dying is needed to bring about the relief he desires. Not for the Nija nigga Steve Biko’s accurate observation that “God is not in the habit of coming down from heaven to solve people’s problems on earth.” [I Write What I Like: 60] So the Nija nigga grumbles and hides under his bed waiting for godot! But Money and God—the two panaceas Nija niggas believe in—have not solved the Nija nigga’s problems all these 50 years; indeed, his problems have gotten worse and worse. Of course, these panaceas cannot solve Nigeria’s problems; only the population can, by taking thought, action and risks to get rid of the black colonialists and the imperialist system they serve. Nothing else will work.

Unfortunately, the Nija nigga is totally risk averse. As Nigerians constantly say, to presumably justify their passivism, “Nigeria is not worth dying for!” Quite rightly, but the proper question is rather “Is Nigeria worth dying from?” That is the question Nija Niggas, who are daily and slowly and inexorably being killed off by Nigeria, need to face. If they don’t kill off Nigeria, Nigeria will assuredly kill them off. It is either Nigeria or them. Both cannot survive! So, are Nija niggas prepared to save themselves from the Nigerian neo-colonial state and its black colonialists? Just like the black South Africans were prepared to save themselves from the white colonialist Apartheid state? Apparently not! So far there is no sign that they are. The Nija nigga is unwilling to risk anything, not for Nigeria understandably, but not even to save himself and his family from the disaster that is Nigeria. It is
said that a cornered rat will fight. But, as a Nigerian joke says: “A Nigerian, pushed with his back against the wall, will break the wall and keep retreating!” So, there! By their own joking admission, in their passivism/pacifism, Nija niggas are not just subhuman; they are even lower than rats! By that joke, the long held Arab view of Blacks as subhuman, as monkeys and natural slaves, is valid for Nija niggas, even if not for any other blacks. **Even Osama Bin Laden’s assertion that blacks are “like rats plaguing the earth”**[Diary of a Lost Girl: 167] is also, by that joke, valid for Nija niggas. This passivism of the Nija niggas, like their political ignorance, is a standing invitation to would-be tyrants and misrulers, and the black comprador colonialists have consciously cultivated and taken full advantage of it these 50 years. But why are Nigerians such dehumanised passivists? To adapt to Nigeria a diagnosis by Biko on South African blacks in the mid 1960s under apartheid: Possibly a little should be said about spiritual poverty. What makes the Nija nigga fail to tick? Is he convinced of his own accord of his inabilities? Does he lack in his genetic make-up that rare quality that makes a man willing to die for the realisation of his aspirations? Or is he simply a defeated person? . . . The logic behind black colonialist domination is to prepare the Nija nigga for passivism. . . . To a large extent the black colonialists have succeeded in producing at the output end of their [anarchist] machine a Nija nigga who is man only in form. This is the extent to which the process of dehumanisation has advanced. . . . Nija people under the pre-1960 white colonialist government were oppressed but they were still men. . . . But the type of Nija man we have today has lost his manhood. Reduced to an obliging shell, he looks with awe at the [. . . ] power structure and accepts what he regards as the "inevitable position". . . . His heart yearns for the **flashy displays of the black colonialists and the comforts of the white world** and makes him blame himself for not having been "educated" enough, **or not having been born white**, to warrant such luxury. Celebrated achievements by whites in the field of science - which he understands only hazily - serve to make him rather convinced of the futility of resistance and to throw away any hopes that change may ever come. All in all the Nija man has become a shell, a shadow of man, completely defeated, drowning in his own misery, a slave, an ox bearing the yoke of [anarchist] oppression with sheepish timidity. **This is the first truth, bitter as it may seem, that we have to acknowledge before we can start on any programme designed to change the status quo. It becomes more necessary to see the truth as it is if you realise that the only vehicle for change are these people who have lost their personality. The first step therefore is to make the Nija nigga come to himself; to pump back life into his empty shell; to infuse him with pride and dignity, to remind him of his complicity in the crime of allowing himself to be misused and therefore letting evil reign**
supreme in the country of his birth.
--Adaptation of a passage by Biko on blacks under apartheid in South Africa. [I Write What I Like: 28-29] Nigeria-specific changes are in bold.
And what is the remedy for this spiritual poverty and subhuman passivism? Biko’s Black Consciousness recipe worked psychological wonders in South Africa; it “diminished the element of fear in the minds of black people” [I Write What I Like: 145] and produced those brave schoolchildren, too proud to be scared, even at gunpoint, whose Soweto uprising in 1976 revived the fortunes of the South African liberation struggle.
In other words, the Nigerian passivism and spiritual poverty, like that of black South Africans in the mid-1960s, is curable by the psychotherapy of political education of the Black Consciousness type. Those few young Nigerians who seriously want to bring about a liberated Nigeria would do well to study and learn from the 1970s Black Consciousness Movement of South Africa.

What in your view is the problem of education in Nigeria?

The so-called education in Nigeria is not really education; it is neo-colonial brainwashing. It is a type of Bantu education for the Nigerian Bantustan: It is a process for grooming and recruiting black colonialists to manage the Bantustan for imperialism. It is like black education in Apartheid South Africa, which taught, as Biko said, that “the white man was some kind of god whose word cannot be doubted” [I Write What I Like: 69]; it likewise disparages the African, his culture and civilization. It, therefore, produces black persons who aspire to whiteness and accept white behaviour as their norm. It produces persons that are loyal to Europe or Arabia, but not to Africa, or even to Nigeria.
Furthermore, the skills it teaches are not suited to the needs of Nigerian communities. It is simply a certificate-spraying mill. It does nothing for the physical, moral and intellectual improvement of the students and society. It does not train people for the rigorous and comprehensive thinking required to solve problems. It spews out mobs of certificated but incompetent barbarians; unemployables with slave-minds and with a self-righteous sense of their entitlement to the highest standard of consumerism in the world. And to grab the money to enjoy that entitlement, they are most selfishly and amorally determined to loot the treasury, extort from the public or rob their neighbours, as opportunity arises. After all, they do not learn or care about the Ten Commandments or any other ethical code: these not being emphasized in school or by the ubiquitous prayer & miracles hustlers plaguing the land. In short, it is a miseducation system that
breeds a highly certificated and amoral lumpen-proletariat—with all the usual vices of a lumpen-proletariat. Not being raised in a milieu of production, they lack the skills, discipline and outlook of the productive classes—the peasantry and industrial workers. So, with their certificates, they know only how to breed, shout Hallelujah, and loot and consume. If each Nigerian was given a PhD certificate at birth and let loose on society at twenty-one, he would be no worse than he is after going through the Nigerian education system and getting all manner of paper degrees.

Nigerian education is wrong basically because it was fashioned to create mental slaves. The British colonial masters founded an education system to enslave us mentally, so that we look up to them, obey them and do whatever they tell us to do. And that is the slave-making system that Nigerians are still voluntarily continuing with, long after “independence”. If Nigerians want to change Nigeria, they must first define what Nigeria should do in the world, its national purpose, and do the hard work of figuring out the kinds of citizen it would take for Nigeria to do it. And then design an education system that would produce those kinds of citizen. All that mental work has not been attempted, not even recognised for 50 years. So it is no wonder that Nigerian education is in the peculiar mess in which it is: no political education, no historical consciousness, no nationalist consciousness, no moral code, no sense of the citizen’s social responsibility for society is being inculcated by the schools. The universities are a special disaster area. They are infested with armed criminal gangs that misleadingly call themselves “cults”; they are busy robbing, raping, shooting and killing fellow students. Is that what universities are for? The university authorities pamper these campus criminals, the state authorities tolerate them. This campus gangsterism cannot be stopped until the authorities, if and when put under intense public pressure, have the gumption to prosecute, convict and hang at least a few as a deterrent. Those who started and still secretly head the entire set of evil gangs go about parading themselves as the ‘wasted generation’. They are the generation that wasted Nigeria, but they trickily get your sympathy by calling themselves “the wasted generation”. But let’s leave aside its decay and perversions: even at its best, Nigerian education is a disaster because it is simply a ladder for potential black colonialists to climb into the system and exploit the population for their imperialist masters. There are many things wrong with the education system, and we could spend two full days talking about them.
What is your view of Ndi-Igbo in Nigeria’s political development.

I do not know who you mean by Ndi-Igbo, there is no such thing! You have Ibos, you do not have Ndi-Igbo. The difference is fundamental. **Ndi-Igbo ceased to exist a century ago. Their physical descendants became Ibos. They abandoned their Igbo culture, they lost their Igbo language and religion, they became Christians, they became Angophiles and then enthusiastically took on the name Ibos that their new British masters gave them. Today, Ibos share very little culturally with their Ndi-Igbo ancestors. Like the insane who are afflicted with fundamental self-alienation, Ibos—the born again Christians especially—even demonise their Ndi-Igbo ancestors. For a century now, each generation of Ibos has had less grounding in Igbo culture than the previous one. Ever since the British conquest, Igbo culture has steeply and steadily declined. Ibos started going back to their ancestors’ name only after the civil war, but it is only as a mere label with no implication for how they live.** Now that we have looked into the terminological matter, let’s talk about the Ibos.

The Ibos in Nigeria’s political system? During the civil war Hausas used to say, quite correctly, that Ibos do not have “number six”—i.e. Political sense. In a world that demands sociality, Ibos are pathologically hyper-individualistic, are indeed political idiots! They are allergic to political organisation. That remains true and has been true for a century. A graphic example was in 2003, when the late Chuba Okadigbo and others were seeking the presidential nomination of the ANPP, and all these clowns thought that it was a beauty contest or job interview, and they went there as individuals hoping that the one who looked best would be picked to represent the party. Their behaviour was an aspect of the Zik “beautiful bride” syndrome. Well, politics is about group power, not about individual power; you have to organise for group power and take and hold it. It is not a beauty parade where some judges look at the best individual and say “you are a fine-looking chap: come and take the power”. The misconception goes back to Zik. Because he was a sportsman, Zik thought politics was a sport. There were rules and you obey the rules, and there are referees who judge the game and bestow the trophy. This is a fundamental mistake that has endured since the Ibos were manufactured a century ago. Zik’s role in this is important: because he was the first Ibo leader, he implanted the false notion that politics is a sport, with rules and referees. Of course, when the British administrators were here they were the umpires, they operated the system and they knew and picked the kind of people they wanted for any position. They had the uncontested power to enforce their choices. Then they left, and Nigerian politics became a raw scramble for power between rival ethno-religious groups, a brutal game where there are no rules and no referees. It
requires a change of mentality for Ibos to realise that the game is now entirely different. Basically, Ibos have the wrong ideas about state power politics. As a people, Ibos lack authority structure, and that is the main reason they cannot organize for this game. And more importantly each Ibo politician comes out for a soccer match holding a racket and dressed for a singles tennis game. They still don’t know, and refuse to know, that the state power game is a group game; it is not a one-man affair.

Some say Igbos are republicans in nature?

It has nothing to do with republicanism; it is just political idiocy. Ndi-Igbo were probably village republicans, but Ibos are simply confused anarchists and hyper-individualists. Go and look at all the republics in the world, the power game is a group game. Group members organise and seek power for the group. Even within a political party, it is factions that compete for power, not individuals. The prominent individuals are faction leaders, not just individuals. Ibos do not understand that; do not blame their political incompetence on republicanism. You can’t, as one man, be so strong that you alone can defeat a rival soccer team. Only a disorganised and disoriented people like the Ibos can think that in Nigerian power politics you can show up as a one man army and they would say “great leader, the messiah, come and rule us!” The question Ibos should ask all these Ibo contractors who want to be president is: assuming, by some foolishness, you are elected president of Nigeria, who is going to watch your back? When you get into Aso Rock, who will guard you? Why should any state security operative protect you? What allegiance does he owe you? These business contractors who strayed into politics seeking bigger contracts--Orji Kalu, Chimaroke Nnamani, Peter Odili—they can have all the money, but none can survive in Aso Rock for one night! If you don’t have a loyal team attending to all the places that need to be covered to make sure that nobody is coming to shoot you or kidnap you; if you are not carried into Aso Rock on the shoulders of an organisation that can make sure that somebody loyal to you knows who is coming to get you, even before the man begins to make his move, you are a joker in state power politics.
So this whole talk about Igbo presidency is bunkum?

It is suicidal. The last Ibo person who occupied that position, what happened to him? Has that experience been studied and the proper lessons learnt by the Ibos? Aguiyi Ironsi even had the advantage of being a military man and the commander of an army in which he had a preponderance of Ibo officers whose ethnic loyalty was to him. Despite that enormous advantage, power was taken from him the way you snatch a piece of yam from the fist of a six months old baby! Why did he lose power just like that? And these “Ibo presidency” clowns have, evidently, not studied their history; have not learnt the necessary lessons from that disaster. They are going to repeat the disaster, because they do not understand the nature of the state power game. If Ibos are interested in Ibo presidency, they should concentrate, for the next generation, on building an Ibo power organisation. It is that power outfit that can take them to the presidency and maintain them there, assuming it is necessary for Ibos to have the presidency, which is quite a different thing from having an Ibo as President.

You do not think it is necessary?

The cost of wielding power has to be taken into account. Sometimes you are better off playing second fiddle than being the headman.

They have been playing second fiddle?

Wrong! They have been playing no fiddle at all! They do not know how to fiddle, so how can they even play second fiddle. A chap who shows up for a soccer match holding a tennis racket, and all by himself!

Why was it easy for Ndi-Igbo to lose their identity?

Figuring that out is one thing Ibos should seriously be doing, but I do not think they are. For those who want to pursue the matter, and I think it is an all-important matter, they cannot do any better than go back to re-read and think hard about Chinua Achebe’s works-- especially Things Fall Apart and Arrow of God. Some 50 years ago, Achebe gave Ibos a fictional portrait of their society in the aftermath of their shattering and detailed defeat by the British.
I think Ndi-Igbo lost their identity so easily because of the trauma inflicted by their detailed and comprehensive defeat by the British. It made them lose confidence in their culture, and it induced an extreme awe and enthusiasm for the culture of the victors. The simultaneous smashing of Igbo political and religious leadership—exemplified by Okonkwo and Ezeulu in Achebe’s fictions, accompanied by the self-devaluation by Ndi-Igbo of their Igbo language and education, and all within a single generation, was perhaps the key factor in precipitating identity loss by Ndi-Igbo. No other ethnic group in Nigeria, as far as I can tell, was conquered and traumatized so suddenly and simultaneously in all the key departments of culture. None had it so bad. Once Igbo religion was smashed and abandoned, and the Igbo mother-tongue was held in contempt by its native speakers, the foundation of Igbo culture and society collapsed, and no effort has been made to put things together ever since. The so-called “Ibo receptivity to change” was simply a manifestation of their rejection of their defeated and despised Igbo culture and their flight into the prestigious European culture of their British conquerors. From Achebe’s fictional presentation of the disaster, you can glean the reasons why such a society could have been defeated as disastrously as it was. They had no cohesion, no institutional authority to define and give a group answer to the unprecedented questions that faced them. It was every man on his own, implementing some ill-informed personal solution. They had the bickering ‘spokesmen’ from the various village sections; there was no overall leadership. They were just like the Ohaneze of today. If you read Achebe’s works carefully you can see the parallels with Ohaneze: why they were ineffective then, and why they are ineffective now. Ibo persons from the black colonialist stratum, individuals without a following, individuals who are seeking to be noticed for government contracts and appointments, mount the platform they call Ohaneze, and they think they can decide what will happen to Ibos. Uwazurike’s Massob, which is an actual organisation, has more authority among Ibos than Ohaneze. Ohaneze could not solve the problem of Chris Uba and his gangsters and they think one of them can go and rule Nigeria. You think a Chris Uba could emerge in Kano and not be disciplined? They have an authority structure there that would put him in his place even before he took his first step. Despite being an agent of Aso Rock, a Chris Uba simply wouldn’t have dared in an organized place like Kano.
What should Ibos be doing now, which they are not doing?

To look into that we would have to do a weeklong interview. But basically, Ibos need to do first things first. They need to set about the task of cultural and social self-rehabilitation. And they have to reconstruct their society in a way that organises them for state power politics. And this is where Achebe’s parable *How the Lion Got its Claws* is important for Ibos to study. Furthermore, Ibos, like the Ijaws, need to give up their fixation on Nigeria. They must focus on surviving in the world, whether or not the Nija Titanic sinks.

The basic problem of Ibos is cultural—Ibos don’t know who they are. Having rejected and demonised their Ndi-Igbo ancestors, some are now gorging and doping themselves silly on the fantasy that they are Israelites. What a desperate superstition! Ibos are suffering from both the alien-self and anti-self disorders, possibly the most advanced case of that syndrome in the world today. And their affliction is probably terminal by now. They are so “detribalised” that they have almost ceased to be a people. When a people abandon their language and customs, and go so far as to demonise their ancestors, they kill their culture and disintegrate and perish as a people, and become just a population, and then are liable to disperse and dissolve into other peoples. Just as the cells of a body cannot long survive the disintegration of the organism of which they are constituent parts, so too will the individual members of a group not long survive the disintegration of the culture that binds them into a group. If Ibos desire to survive, even as individuals, they must attend to what it takes to survive as a group. They must carry out the fundamental work of cultural repair. To adapt from Cabral, they must “rebecome Ndi-Igbo.” They must, as a starting point, reconstitute, revitalize and readopt the culture of their Ndi-Igbo ancestors, and grow from their Ndi-Igbo roots. But the very first thing Ibos need to do is create an organisation of Ibo intelligentsia to continuously think and plan ahead for their group interest; to study their situation comprehensively and in detail; and work out an ideology for their group existence in the world, an ideology to guide their political and other leaders. In this, they would do well to learn from the Broederbond of the Afrikaners.
The challenge of cultural repair and desatellisation and social reconstruction seems hard, if not elusive.

It is a hard and monumental task, but not impossible. China did it. Starting from a semi-colonial condition, it took them some 70 years to reconstruct and consolidate the New China. But the thing, for Nigerians, is to start. And to start by asking the right questions, and then to proceed to get a basic political education—with Garvey, Cabral, Biko, Mao and Chomsky as initial teachers-- and then go on to do the hard and systematic thinking to answer the questions. Here are a few examples:

Some Questions for Young Nigerians to ponder

1. What predictable dangers await Nigerians in the 21st century?

2. Is the Nigerian state equipped to evade or defeat these dangers?

3. What is a state? – Is Nigeria not a failed state, waiting to implode?

4. What should the Nigerian state do or not do to/for its citizens?

5. What are the key features of the global environment in which the Nigerian state will operate in the 21st century and beyond?

6. What are the vital interests of the Nigerian population?

7. What are the global strategic conditions for defending and advancing those Interests?

8. What is national security, as distinct from state security or the security of the state apparatus and its officials?
9. What is democracy? And how can it be institutionally entrenched?

10. What kind of democracy—formal, participatory, or any other—will help the Nigerian population to control the Nigerian state; help them to survive and permanently end their enslavement and impoverishment by imperialism, and their humiliation by Europeans and Arabs?

11. What use to the people is a state or a democracy if its character is to disorganize, and destroy society?

12. What are the challenges of the 21st century and beyond?

13. What kind of state, or political system, is most likely to help the Nigerian population to survive the dangers and challenges of their near future?

14. What are the nature, causes and remedies for the anarchy in Nigeria?

15. Can the Lugardian state, which was constructed, from the very start, as an armed bureau of internal plunder and repression, and was programmed to enslave and exploit the Nigerian population for the benefit of foreign interests; can it be trusted to change its own character out of sheer goodwill? [bearing in mind Frederick Douglass’ statement that “power concedes nothing without a demand”]

16. Can the Lugardian state apparatus, no matter how reconfigured, solve the problems that need to be solved for the Nigerian population to survive the 21st century? Can a whale ever swim the desert? Or a camel walk the ocean? Or an elephant fly?
17. If this Lugardian contraption that is programmed to suppress, exploit, massacre and terrorize the Nigerian population—if this Lugardian contraption is not dismantled and dumped on Lugard’s grave, can the Nigerian population find the political space to invent and institute a state that will serve, defend and advance their own interests?

18. By what measures can office holders in Nigeria be obliged to abide by their oaths of office? Here is a Persian example from the 6th century BC titled Otanes’ chair:

Otanes’ father Sisamnes had been put to death by Cambyses [King of Persia]: he was one of the royal judges, and as a punishment for taking a bribe and perverting justice Cambyses had him flayed; all his skin was torn off and cut into strips, and the strips stretched across the seat of the chair which he used to sit on in Court. Cambyses then appointed his son to be judge in his place, and told him not to forget what his chair was made of, when he gave his judgements.”
--Herodotus, The Histories, Bk 5; ch 25
-----

Here is a list of major massacres of Nigerians by the army and police of the Nigerian Lugardian State, since 1920, i.e. After the initial bloody conquest and pacification ended ca. 1918, and British rule had become instituted, assured and presumably “non-violent.” It should be noted that more of these massacres have been perpetrated, since 1960, i.e. Under the black comprador colonialists than under the white expatriate colonialists:
1929: Women’s anti-tax protest (a.k.a. Aba women’s riot) in the Owerri and Calabar provinces of Southern Nigeria was suppressed with 55 women killed.
1949, Nov 18: Shooting of coal miners in Iva Valley, Enugu,
1977: Soldiers burn down Fela’s Kalakuta following his boycott of Festac 77.
1978: the military Govt of Lagos State demolish Fela’s Kalakuta, while he was away at the Berlin Jazz Festival
1980: Farmers in Talata-Mafara, Sokoto State, massacred following their protests against Impresit Bakalori, an Italian Company.
1980s: Students at ABU, Zaria, and OAU, Ife killed by police
1999, Nov: soldiers, deployed to the Niger Delta to protect the oil companies from citizens outraged by the devastation of their environment, sack Odi village, Bayelsa State, killing hundreds.
2001, Oct: Zaki-Biam, a town in Benue State sacked by army, with more
than 200 killed

Finally,

19: What is to be done about Nigeria by the population?

Do you want your country to be powerful, prosperous and respected in the world, like China is today? If so, please note that it took a century of struggle by hundreds of millions of Chinese to achieve that. Are you prepared to be one of the tens of millions of Nigerians who will liberate Nigeria from black comprador colonialism? If so, what exactly are you able and keen to do?

Thank you.

------------------
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Black World League I & II

I: Towards a Black World League of Nations, Communities and States

By

Chinweizu

A paper for the 7th PAC, Kampala, April 1994

Objectives: The Black World League (BWL) of Nations, communities and States aims to guarantee the survival, security, sovereignty, prosperity and dignity of the Black race. Its motto is: Black unity, autonomy and one destiny. It shall be an organ of Black civilization, effective in the daily life of the Black peoples of the world. It shall serve as a centre for harmonizing actions for social reconstruction, economic cooperation, industrialization, the resolution of inter-Black conflict, cultural advancement and autonomy in the Black World, and for the collective defense of the shores, lands and skies of the Black World.

Membership: Membership shall be open only to the Black states, nations and communities in Africa and in the three black diaspora: the trans-Atlantic, the trans-Sahara and the trans- Indian Ocean.

Principal Organs: Its directing organs shall be
1. The Black World Congress (BWC) of nations, communities and states (the highest policy body of the BWL, which shall meet every five years)

2. The Standing Committee of the BWC (which shall guide the BWL between the sessions of the Assembly)

3. The Black World Secretariat.

**Other organs shall include:**

4. The Black World High Command (to coordinate defence)

5. The Economic Reconstruction Council

6. The Peace and Arbitration Commission

7. The Black World Bank

8. The Black World Academy of Knowledge, Pure and Applied

9. The Council of Black World Religions

10. The Anti-Negrophobia Society (to campaign against Negrophobia in all its forms)

11. The Council for Black Culture (which shall promote solid knowledge of Black Civilization and cultures, and institutionalize the 10-yearly Black World Festival of the Arts)

12. The Black World Games.

13. The Black Ankh Brigade (for emergency relief and rehabilitation, and which shall have the ankh, the Kemetic cross and symbol of life, for its emblem)
14. The Black Pioneer Movement (for the Afrocentric orientation of the very young)

15. The Black Shield Organisation (for community self-protection and leadership training of the youth).

The Case for the BWL

1. At the heart of the multitude of problems of the Black World is one sad fact: we have lost internal control of our societies at every level — the mind, the family, the village, the town, the economic production unit, the state; and also lost control of our external economic, political, military and cultural relations. The white world, European as well as Arab, controls us, and meddles in our affairs all the way down into our soup pots, thoughts and dreams. When the BWL is operational, no aspect of our lives would be open to control or direction by other races.

2. The BWL institutionalizes the solidarity of the Black race. Those who suffer together on account of their race must organize together to end their suffering. Those who are attacked because of their skin colour must organize and fight back together. That is a simple rule of life. The BWL
would remedy the dangerous absence of a Black World organisation, and address our manifest need for collective security in its crucial dimensions — economic, military and territorial.

3. The BWL recognizes the diversity of political and cultural units in the Black World (states, pre-colonial nations or ethnic groups, diaspora communities) and gives them representation. In particular, the BWL consciously brings into the fold of Black solidarity the trans-Indian Ocean diaspora which is usually left out of account in Pan-Africanism.

The BWL is the natural institutional embodiment of Pan-Africanism, which George Padmore, the principal organizer of the 5th PAC in Manchester in 1945, defined as "an independent political expression of Negro aspirations for complete national independence from white domination, capitalist or communist." The BWL is the appropriate 21st century vehicle for the Pan African Movement's traditional role as articulator of the demands and needs of the Negro race, and for its paramount concern to ensure that the Negro race should develop un-hindered by other races.

The BWL is also the natural institutional embodiment of the Garvey Movement which, in Du Bois's words; was a "people's movement ... to unite the Negroes of the world." The BWL is also the natural institutional embodiment of the Negritude movements (such Black Cultural Affirmation
Movements as the Negro Renaissance in the 1920s USA; Indigenism in Haiti and Negrism in Cuba in the 1920s and 1930s; the Francophone Negritude Movement in the 1930s and 1940s; the Black Consciousness Movement of the 1970s in South Africa; and their offsprings and successors). The BWL is thus the institutional vehicle for uniting the Black World behind a shared set of vital and enduring aspirations.

4. It perhaps needs to be emphasized that Pan-Africanism was founded as a movement of blacks for the advancement of the Black race. In Du Bois's own account of its history, given in his opening address to the 5th PAC in Manchester, we find the demands of the earlier Pan-African Congresses described as the demands of the Negro race. Specifically, those of the 2nd PAC are introduced by the phrase "The Negro race, through their thinking intelligentsia, demand:". Similarly, the resolutions of the 4th PAC begin with the phrase "Negroes everywhere need:". The resolutions of the 1st PAC contain the phrase "The Negroes of the world demand". And those of the 3rd PAC are studded with the phrases "black folks", "black Africans", "blacks". Nowhere do the resolutions of these four congresses, by Du Bois's own report, say: "The Negroes and Arabs demand", or "The Negroes and Boers demand", or "The Negroes of the World and the white settlers in Africa demand". The racial constituency of Pan-Africanism must be kept clear at all times, for Pan-Africanism loses its point, its reason for being, its potency, if it loses its black identity.

Lagos, Nigeria
26 January, 1994
II: For a Black World League of Nations*

My plans [for the Pan-African Congress of 1919] as they developed had in them nothing spectacular nor revolutionary. If in decades or a century they resulted in such world organisation of black men as would oppose a united front to European aggression, that certainly would not have been beyond my dream. But on the other hand, in practical reality, I knew the power and guns of Europe and America and what I wanted to do was in the face of this power to sit down hand in hand with coloured groups and across the council table to learn of each other, our condition, our aspirations, our chances for concerted thought and action.

-W. E. B. Du Bois

As far as Negroes are concerned, in America we have the problem of lynching, peonage and disfranchisement. In the West Indies, South and Central America we have the problem of peonage, serfdom, industrial and political governmental inequality. In Africa we have, not only peonage and serfdom, but outright slavery, racial exploitation and alien political monopoly. We cannot allow a continuation of these crimes against our race.

-Marcus Garvey

* First published in The Guardian (Lagos) August 18, 25 and September 1, 985.
What ought to be Nigeria's position on a proposal that has been making the rounds of African capitals for the past year or so, a proposal to create an Organisation of Black African States? I have long held that some such organisation is a geopolitical necessity, is long overdue, and should have been the natural culmination, in Africa, of the world-wide Pan-Africanist movement of the first half of the 20th century. Why that movement petered out by the 1950s, why such an organisation was not created when the black African countries got independence, and why an Afro-Arab forum, the OAU, was deemed an adequate substitute for that organisation, is a case study in African failure to uphold cardinal principles. One joke has it that Nasser slyly gave Nkrumah an Arab wife, and Nkrumah couldn't see straight after that on Pan-Africanism. Up till Manchester,₁ the Pan-African world, for Nkrumah, meant the Black World; after Fathia,₂ it meant the African land mass with its Arab and African dwellers. And with Nkrumah championing it, that has been the reigning version of Pan-Africanism ever since.

I am glad that at last an organisation that would reflect the proper sense of Pan-Africanism is being seriously considered, even if a quarter of a century late. Better late than never. However, now that we seem about to do it, we should take pains to do it correctly. Which is why I would suggest that the objective ought to be a Black World League of Nations embracing all black states in the world, not just those of Africa. Let me explain why.

The context of this discourse is the great and enduring competition between the major races of the human species. Whether some of us want to acknowledge it or not, that competition has been on for thousands of years under various disguises, and has been a decisive factor in international relations ever since the different races of the species came

₁The 5th Pan African Congress, held in Manchester, England, 1945.

₂Nkrumah's wife.
into conflict for land and the earth's resources. Those who ignore that competition-for land, resources, wealth, power and prestige-do so at their own peril: for what chance have they of winning a war who don't know, or choose not to acknowledge, that it is already on and far advanced?

In that long contest, there have been four main teams: the white or Caucasian race, the yellow or Mongolian race, the black or African race and the red or Amerindian race. We may, for now, leave out of account those populations produced by miscegenation between the primary races, such as the brown people of India-who are the result of some 4,000 years of miscegenation between white Aryan invaders from the region of Iran, and the autochthonous Dravidian blacks of the Indian subcontinent. In the four-way contest, the reds have had the worst of it, having been virtually exterminated. The blacks have had it second worst, having been invaded and decimated in their homelands, carted all over the place for enslavement, and dominated by all comers, especially the west-European and the semitic branches of the white race.

The yellows have come off second best, having been able to defend their east Asian homeland from all comers, without being exterminated, without being dispersed for enslavement. Those who have come off best thus far are the whites. From their relatively small homeland in west Eurasia, they have spread out and taken over more than half of the earth's land mass; with their seizure of so much land, their population exploded till they now make up well over one-third of humanity. Furthermore, they have imposed their political, military, economic and cultural power upon the whole earth, to the extent that whites control at least 95 per cent of the earth's known resources, and the two current superpowers are white.

Every white knows of this great, intra-specific competition for survival and advancement, and acts accordingly. In fact, their doctrine of white supremacy has acted as a
morale booster for their team, and as an implicit reminder that there indeed is a contest going on. They are all committed to their side, which is why, whenever the chips are down, all white powers will gang up against non-whites; why Russia and the USA will patch up their allegedly irreconcilable and unto-the-death dispute over ideology, and defuse a Cuban missile crisis which would have wiped out the white powers and left the world to be inherited by the other races; which is why the atom bomb was used on Japan but not on Germany.

In contrast, most blacks seem unaware of the competition, and all too many refuse to accept that if you are black, your team is that of the black race; that the cardinal interest of your team is the survival, sovereignty, dignity and prosperity of blacks, and that any other position would be unnatural. It is this contest between the races which creates the agenda that makes necessary a Black World League of Nations. And the main point on that agenda is the very survival of the black race; and its second point is the condition in which the race shall survive—whether in dignity or degradation, prosperity or poverty, sovereignty or subordination. Which brings us back to Pan-Africanism before the Fathia factor.

The impetus for Pan-Africanism came from the humiliating fact that, by the end of the 19th century, the entire Black World, in the African homeland as well as the diaspora, lay under a blanket of white power. Only two African peoples—in Liberia and Ethiopia—had states of their own. But even these were impoverished satellites to white powers. That, in many ways, was the nadir for the black race. Things had declined from that high point where black Egypt was a beacon of civilisation to the entire world, to the point where the entire Black World had been overrun by white power. The aims of the Pan-Africanism which this terrible situation provoked were to roll white power off the backs of blacks; to create independent and self-governing
black states; and through some unifying organisation, to get these states to create a power and a glory that would restore prosperity and dignity to the black race.

It was the spirit of that movement, as enunciated by Edward Blyden, W. E. B. Du Bois, Marcus Garvey, Claude McKay and others, which prodded on such African freedom fighters as Nkrumah, Kenyatta, Azikiwe and Senghor. They, in turn, galvanised countless Africans of their generation for the initial task of gaining independence for African countries. But alas, on leading their countries to independence, Africa's freedom fighters faltered on many points. They pretty much lost sight of the Pan-Africanist movement itself, and forgot the obligations its larger aims imposed upon them. Instead, the politically self-governing states became petty ends in themselves; the idea of black solidarity was abandoned, and a thorough confusion of identity caused the movement for an organisation of the independent states of the Black World to be diverted into the dead end of an Afro-Arab forum called the OAU. Even Senghor's effort to keep FESTAC all-black was defeated. And even such of those historic tasks as were still pursued-such as the ending of racism and apartheid in South Africa-lacked the clarity and cohesion necessary for their effective execution.

Yet, despite the floundering of the past 25 years, the unfinished agenda is still there, waiting for us. It cannot be willed away for as long as the contest between the races of humanity lasts.

And the outstanding points on that agenda? First, the fostering of a sense of the primacy of black identity, and the historic duties it imposes on all members of the black race; second, the expelling of white conquerors from southern Africa; third, the abolition of black slavery in both South Africa and North Africa, especially in Mauritania; fourth, stopping Arab expansion south of the Sahara, particularly through the defence of the northern frontline states of Ethiopia, Chad, and Sudan against encroachment and dis-
memberment by Arabs and their agents; fifth, the monitoring of the condition of the black diaspora, especially the black minorities in the Americas, Europe and Australasia, and the countering of anti-black racism wherever it occurs; and sixth, fostering black solidarity through the popularisation of the correct version of black history, through official observation of important events on the calendar of the Black World, and through celebrating the heroes of the Black World, from Menes to Mandela, Kamose to Kenyatta, Akhenaton to Azikiwe, Shabaka to Senghor, Nektharehbe to Nkrumah, Taharka to Tambo.3

These are some of the historic tasks which still await a world organisation of black states. What is needed is an organisation through which all black states, regardless of their internal arrangements, regardless of their other external affiliations, can get together, without outsiders, to

3Menes: The unifier (c. 3200 B.C.) and first pharaoh of Egypt.
Mandela, Nelson: (20th century A.D.) Freedom fighter and symbol of Black resistance to white domination in apartheid South Africa.
Kamose: (16th century B.C.) Egyptian noble who raised the revolt that eventually threw out the Asiatic Hyksos invaders and ended their rule.
Kenyatta, Jomo: (20th century A.D.) Freedom fighter and first president of Kenya.
Akhenaton: (14th century A.D.) Egyptian pharaoh and religious revolutionary, inventor of monotheism.
Azikiwe, Nnamdi: (20th century A.D.) Anti-colonialist leader and first president of Nigeria.
Shabaka: (8th century B.C.) Nubian prince who completed the conquest of Egypt, begun by his brother Piankhi, and established
the 25th dynasty of pharaonic Egypt.

Senghor, Leopold Sedar: (20th century A.D.) A leader of the Negritude movement, first president of Senegal, and sponsor of the first World Festival of Negro Arts (1966)

Nekhtharehbe: (4th century B.C.) Last native Egyptian pharaoh during the brief reassertion of Egyptian independence before the second Persian conquest in 343 B.C.


Taharka: (7th century B.C.) 25th dynasty Pharaoh who resisted a determined Assyrian invasion of Egypt.

Tambo, Oliver: (20th century A.D.) Freedom fighter, leader of the African National Congress of South Africa.
work for solutions to the historic problems of the black race. From the foregoing, it should be clear that a Black World League of Nations is a historic necessity, and that setting it up is one of the historic tasks for the rest of the century.

Despite all that, we can expect resistance to the project from all sorts of Africans who are either confused about the implications of their racial identity, or are happily subservient to various anti-African interests. Predictably, some will retort: "Another organisation? Don't we already have the OAU?" Some others will say: "An organisation without our Arab brothers? Must we go it alone?" And yet others will demand: "An all-Black League? Wouldn't that be racist?" So, let me briefly answer some of these objections right away.

About the OAU, it must be candidly stated that it was inadequate from the start, that time has only made it worse, and that its inherent perversions have become manifest. As a coalition of Arab and African states, it perverts the fundamental goals of the very Pan-Africanism which was the impetus to its formation. It does so by including one branch of the white race, the Arabs, which had perpetrated, and still is determined to perpetrate, upon the black race the very atrocities which Pan-Africanism arose to oppose, namely, conquest, expropriation, slavery and racism. Had that principle which excluded a white, racist South Africa been applied with consistency and historical knowledge, it should have also excluded from the OAU all the Arab states of North Africa. But in the confused climate of the 1960s, in the euphoria of anti-European solidarity, Africans lost their bearings, got confused about what Pan-Africanism was really about, and with Nkrumah's help, allowed Pan-Africanism to be hijacked by the Arabs and emasculated within the OAU.

Once that initial perversion is comprehended, much of the OAU's subsequent erratic career becomes explainable. For instance, it is significant just how many of the issues which have bogged it down have been Arab issues, whereas other
issues which ought to have preoccupied it have been left untouched lest Arab sensitivities be offended. Just consider Chad, the SADR, and the Ogaden war.

In Chad, the OAU was bogged down and compelled to squander resources to contain Libya's effort to grab and annex Chad, thus expropriating it for the Arab world. The conflict over the Saharaoui Arab Democratic Republic—which obstructed OAU deliberations on so many occasions and even kept it, for quite a while, from attending to the vital matter of Africa's economic collapse—is in fact a conflict between various Arab interests over which of them should gobble up a slice of Africa abandoned by Spain. And as for the Ogaden war, it became an instrument in the old Arab effort to dismember Ethiopia and Arabise the Horn of Africa when the Somalis were encouraged into it by Saudi promises to help on condition that Somalia join the Arab League. What is worse, this anti-African aspect of the conflict was not highlighted and opposed by the OAU; the premise of its conciliation efforts thus implicitly legitimised an unconscionable act of Arab expansionist brigandage.

Whereas the OAU had been bogged down by such issues, it hasn't found it possible to raise such issues as the enslavement of blacks in Mauritania; the Saudi-led Arab financing of the dismemberment of Ethiopia through muslim factions in Eritrea; or the African-Arab conflict within the Sudan. These topics have been taboo. An OAU where such issues as would top the agenda of a genuinely Pan-Africanist organisation cannot be raised; an OAU that is distracted by dissensions arising from Arab adventures against Africans, cannot claim to be the fulfilment of the Pan-Africanist dream of an organisation for ending the humiliations of the black race.

This perversion of including Arabs aside, the OAU, as is well known, is also under the thumb of the Western powers who still manage to wield more influence in it than all the African members put together. When these facts are taken
into account, one must conclude that the OAU is conceptually and operationally a disaster for Africans. I would even go so far as to urge that that freak organisation be disbanded; for it is an impediment which is masquerading as a channel for African liberation and advancement.

To those who feel uncomfortable at the idea of breaking out of the Arab-African embrace; who think that solidarity with others requires that we sacrifice our separate identity and organisations, a question demands to be put: Don't those Arab 'brothers' of yours have their own separate Arab League? Have they disbanded it? Where is the Black World equivalent of their Arab League?

Whatever the merits and demerits of Afro-Arab solidarity on certain issues, that should not blind us to our need to have an organisation all to ourselves. To refuse to create a separate Pan-African organisation (in the original and proper sense of Pan-African as Black World), would be like sheep insisting that jackals always be present whenever sheep meet. That way, the sheep can never get to discuss how to rid themselves of the menace of sheep-eating jackals.

Objections, even violent objections, to any organisation exclusively for the black race can be expected from those Africans who are victims of the various pseudo-universalist doctrines which make white hegemony acceptable to its victims. For instance, African Christians, with their dream of a universal human brotherhood in Christ, in which all are equal without regard to race, are likely to look with revulsion at the prospect of a Black World organisation whose doors would be barred to their white co-religionists. So too African Muslims with their passionate desire for that Dar el Islam where there is no racial discrimination; so too African Marxists with their preoccupation with that abstract universal working class in which racial considerations are either abolished or taboo. Of course, like deluded people, they mistake their dream world for the real world and, like the mad, behave as if their dream world were already here.
But we need, all the same, to understand such absurd behaviour. Those white-sponsored universalisms have strong appeal for those blacks who are anxious to escape their racial particularity into some alleged universality. They are usually people who, overwhelmed by white supremacist propaganda, have come to accept that the black race is inferior, despicable, and only fit to be escaped from by anyone unfortunate enough to be born into it. And since they cannot remake themselves into whites (though many try by bleaching their skins and brainwashing their minds), the only way of escaping from the despised black race is into some universalist community and identity, created by whites, and left open to all comers who need a sense of proximity to the whites. It is of such people that Marcus Garvey said: "So many of us find excuses to get out of the Negro Race, because we are led to believe that the race is unworthy—that it has not accomplished anything. Cowards that we are! It is we who are unworthy, because we are not contributing to the uplift and up-building of this noble race."

What such Africans will not face up to is that these versions of universal human brotherhood have failed to address the core of the historical problems of the black race; and that their proprietors have also inflicted-or proved unable to stop their racial brothers from inflicting-conquest, slavery and racism upon blacks. What these fake doctrines of universalism succeed in hiding from their African adherents is that their alleged colour blindness is but a gimmick to keep blacks from organising separately to tackle the problems imposed on them across the line of colour.

Those Africans who are so eager to flee into any of these allegedly universal, colour blind communities (Christendom, Dar el Islam, the world proletariat) tend to cower at the thought of being accused of "anti-racist racism" by their white friends. Let it therefore be made clear why such accusations are false.

Pan-Africanism does not claim that the black race is superior to any other and should rule others; *that* would be black racism. Pan-Africanism is simply concerned with the unification and upliftment of the black race, and with the development of its civilisation. Now, that does not constitute racism. Those who accuse Pan-Africanism of racism are actually opposed to the prospect of that black unity which would exclude whites from meddling in matters of vital interest to blacks, and so limit the ability of white racists to infiltrate, disorganise and dominate the Black World. The charge is predicated on the gratuitous error of equating the racial with the racist. To be racial is to be limited to members of a given race; to be racist is to believe in the inherent superiority of a given race. Thus, an organisation can be racial without being racist. This distinction is vital, and any attempt to gloss it over must be resisted. Glossing it over is what allows racists to weaken resistance from victims of their own racism by claiming that any anti-racist organisation must be multi-racial, thus enabling racists to join, undermine and sidetrack it from a determined assault on their cherished racism.

Some of those who accept the need for a separate Black World organisation may still prefer that it be called the African or Pan-African League of Nations. And they may do so from residual unease about using the racial term black. Those who are squeamish about being called black or negro are free to substitute the term African, provided they recognise the equivalence of the terms, and use them correctly. After all, an African is defined as a negro, a member of the black race, a native of Africa. Thus, a white African is a contradiction in terms. In particular, Arabs, being whites native to Asia; and Anglo/Boers, being whites native to Europe, are not Africans, whatever their pretensions, and they cannot legitimately be included in an African or Pan-African organisation. So long as that rule is clearly understood and is not violated (which it has been in the OAU),
there should be no objection to the substitution of "PanAfrican" for "Black World".

By the way, from the definition of African, the term black African is tautologous. Though the redundancy is judged useful for distinguishing Africans from the white settlers in Africa, it is dangerously misleading in so far as it lends credence to the idea that there is such a thing as a white African. Its practical harm, as in the matter of including Arabs in an African organisation, is ample reason for putting it out of use. A black African is simply an African; white settlers in Africa are simply white settlers in Africa.

While on this matter of language, we might as well attend to a misuse of the term black, which is spreading from the USA and Britain, to denote all non-white groups which suffer racial discrimination. Thus, Pakistanis in Britain are suddenly regarded as blacks. This metaphorical use of the term ought to be strictly discouraged before we are told, and find gullible Africans accepting, that Pakistanis, Mexicans, Vietnamese, and even Turks and Arabs, are blacks simply because they are discriminated against in Europe and America; and that they should therefore be admitted into any organisation of the black race.

Furthermore, to use black as a metaphor for victimage and being oppressed is to lend credence to the view that these are the natural lot of the black race. To be oppressed is not our natural lot; it has only been our lot in recent history; all races have suffered oppression at some time or other in history; and we would be stupid to allow black to be seen as the badge of victimage. Besides, the very point of a Black World League of Nations is to end the oppression of blacks, not to perpetuate it, not even in matters of symbolism. Black should therefore cease to be the symbolic colour of victimage, and should become the symbol, if anything, of victory against oppression. In fact, this matter of propagating correct usages of words like African and black, and of ending the racist associations which have accumulated on them,
should be added to the agenda of the Black World League of Nations.

Having indicated at some length why a Black World League of Nations is absolutely necessary, and why objections to it are untenable, it remains simply to emphasise that, in the context of the competition between the races, if you are black or African, your team is the black race; and it is futile to pretend that it is not. It is naive in the extreme to think you can wish away your racial identity, and substitute for it some changeable class identity or an adopted religious identity. Furthermore, a rat doesn't cease being preyed upon just because it dresses up like a cat, and thinks it is a cat. What is done to rats will be done to it, until rats get together and cut off the claws of cats.

Nigeria, with its size and resources, with its pretensions to being the giant nation in the Black World, with its desire to be seen as a champion of black liberation, cannot afford to oppose such an organisation without thereby making it quite clear that it is the giant obstacle to the liberation of the black race. After all, the objectives outlined above for such a league are precisely some of the inescapable steps towards the liberation and rehabilitation of the black race from its centuries of subjugation and humiliation by others.
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Can Muslims Peacefully Coexist with Non-Muslim Neighbours?  
See Sudan, Arabs and Blacks

Written by Chinweizu  
Tuesday, 09 May 2006

Starting on Friday, Feb.17, 2006, several cities in Nigeria were engulfed in riots, arson and mayhem which left more than 200 persons dead, some 50 churches and mosques burnt, as well as hundreds of shops and residences destroyed and looted. It all began in the far north city of Katsina when a public lecture organized to protest the notorious Danish Mohammed Cartoons veered from its declared purpose and began to violently agitate against President Obasanjo’s scheme to perpetuate himself in office through an opportunistic constitution review process to which most Nigerians are opposed.

The next day, Feb. 18, a similar public lecture in the northeastern city of Maiduguri also changed into a violent protest against the Obasanjo third term quest. By the time soldiers were able to restore calm, the mob had destroyed, looted and burned churches, shops, hotels and homes all over Maiduguri. In all, more than 43 churches and 400 shops were burnt and over 60 Christians were killed by the Muslim mobs.

Two days later, in yet another northern city, Bauchi, a different incident sparked rioting. A school teacher seized a copy of the Koran from an inattentive student who was reading it during lessons. That so-called desecration of the Koran sparked a riot in which 50 Christians were killed and thousands were injured or rendered homeless.

These killings in Nigeria’s far north provoked reprisal killings in Onitsha, an Igbo, Christian city in southeastern Nigeria, when the bodies of some of the dead arrived from the north by bus on Feb. 21. By Feb. 23, over 100 Muslims in Onitsha had been killed, several mosques had been burnt down, and some 5000 Muslims of northern Nigerian origin had taken refuge in
army camps.

That week of riots provoked by the Mohammed Cartoons-- in which more people have died in Nigeria than anywhere in the heartlands of Islam-- was the latest in a fifty-year-long tradition of almost yearly riots in which Muslim mobs, on one religious or political pretext or another, kill Christians and burn churches. The tradition began in 1953. After a political crisis in the national legislature in Lagos, between the AG party of the Yoruba of Southwest Nigeria and the NPC party of the Muslim Hausa of the north—a crisis over an AG motion demanding Independence for Nigeria by 1956—riots broke out in Northern Nigeria and targeted principally the Igbo Christians living there.

The next major incident in this tradition was in 1966, when a series of anti-Igbo pogroms was organized in Northern Nigeria as part of the North’s campaign to retake power from an Igbo-led Government that had come to power by a coup on January 15, 1966. Those ethnic cleansing pogroms of 1966 set the stage for the Nigeria-Biafra civil war of 1967-1970.

Since the 1990s, it has been rare for a couple of years to go by without some Muslims rioting over some alleged grievance and destroying the churches and lives of Christians in Northern Nigeria. For example, in 1991, in Bauchi, a long bout of rioting by Muslims occurred, with much loss of Christian lives and property. In Kano, in 1994, an Igbo Christian, following a quarrel with his neighbors, was abducted from police custody by a Muslim mob and decapitated for allegedly desecrating a copy of the Koran. In February 2000, when the Federal Government banned the implementation of the unconstitutional Shariya legal system introduced that year by some of the Muslim states in Northern Nigeria, peaceful anti-Shariya demonstrators, who did not want Shariya in Kaduna state, were attacked by Muslim mobs in Kaduna city. In 2003, riots by Muslims aborted plans to hold the Miss World contest in the partly Muslim city of Kaduna. The bikini-clad beauties, it was alleged, would offend the sensibilities of Muslims.
The reprisal killing of Muslims and burning of mosques in Onitsha marks a departure from the 50-year pattern of Nigerian Muslims killing Christians with impunity. It was swift and serious enough to elicit calls by the leadership of the North for peace and for government compensation to the victims of all the February riots. Despite such noises for peace, conciliation and compensation, many Nigerians, are searching for a lasting solution to this recurrent mayhem. They are starting to acknowledge that a Nigeria composed of Muslims and non-Muslims is not viable, and are beginning to look to ‘Pakistaniisation’ as the lasting solution.

During the 1953 legislative crisis, Sir Ahmadu Bello, the then leader of the Muslim North, had angrily declared that “the mistake of 1914 has come to light”. He was voicing his recognition that Lugard’s amalgamation -- of a Muslim dominated Protectorate of Northern Nigeria with a non-Muslim Protectorate of Southern Nigeria -- had been a profound mistake. And that was even before the first of these murderous Muslim riots had taken place. In 1990, a coup announcement by Southern officers led by Major Orkar summarily excised the Muslim far north from Nigeria. But that coup failed and the excision failed with it.

Over the years, non-Muslim Nigerians have been slowly putting their ordeal into global historical context, and noting the chronic violence of Muslims against non-Muslims in Sudan, Yugoslavia, Cyprus, Kashmir, Indonesia, Egypt etc; They are starting to see that, as Samuel P. Huntington has demonstrated, in his book The Clash of Civilizations: “Wherever one looks along the perimeter of Islam, Muslims have problems living peaceably with their neighbors.”

And the reason for this is not far to seek. It is rooted in the Islamic world view itself which divides the world into two zones, Dar al-Islam [the abode of Peace, i.e. the Islamized lands] and Dar al-harb [the abode of war, i.e. the unIslamized lands doctrinally targeted for conquest and Islamization]. In line with this world-view, Alija Izetbegovic, a 1990s leader
of the Bosnian Muslims of the former Yugoslavia, in his 1970 book, The Islamic Declaration, argues for “the incompatibility of Islam with non-Islamic systems. There can be neither peace nor coexistence between the Islamic religion and non-Islamic social and political institutions.” Hence any country in which Muslims and non-Muslims find themselves together is a warfront waiting for Jihadists to conquer and Islamize it as soon as they can.

Now, looking back in the wake of the February 2006 Mohammed Cartoon riots, many thoughtful Nigerians have come to agree with Ahmadu Bello’s diagnosis and are reluctantly converting to the view that Orkar’s surgical excision of Shariyaland is the only lasting cure for Lugard’s mistake
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**Arabic Culture & the Black Color**

Excerpt from “**The Crisis of Identity in Northern Sudan:**” by Al-Baqir al-Afif Mukhtar

In his *al-shuara’ al-sud wa khsaisuhum fi ‘lishir al-‘arabi* (the Black Poets and their Distinctive Characteristics in 'Arabic Poetry), 'Abduh Badawl tells us the following:

The Arabs hate the black color, and like the white color. They describe anything pleasant (whether material or psychological) as white. Having a white skin is a matter of pride for a man, and a trait of beauty to the woman. Whiteness to them is a sign of honor. A man is praised by being described as the son of a white woman. Indeed they pride themselves of having white women as concubines. - They call the black poets *aghribat alArab*, the ravens of the Arabs, in simile to that
Detestation of the black color stems from the historical experience of the Arabs with African people. The stereotypical image of the black African in the Arabic culture is that he is malodorous, deficient in body and mind, and depraved of passions. The Arabic proverb "the Negro, if he is hungry, steals, and if his stomach is full he commits adultery", 98 sums it all up. The name 'son of a black woman' was the ultimate insult that black people were assaulted with.

**Before Islam**

Before Islam, the children of an Arab father and an African mother were not accepted as full members of the tribe even where the tribe depended on them in its wars, as the story of 'Antra reveals. Badawl shows how the black color represented a great barrier in front of these poets. Calling somebody *ghurab* (a raven) was an insult. Badawl says:

[T]here was a sharp sensitivity over color among the black poets before Islam. This was because they were a depressed and downtrodden group and because they were excluded, sometimes roughly, sometimes gently, from entering the social fabric of the tribe. Thus they lived on the edge of society as a poor and depressed group. They were only acknowledged under conditions of extreme pressure, as we know from the life of 'Antra. Although this poet was the defender of his tribe, and its supreme poetical voice, his own tribe's attitude towards him continued to pain him and to weigh on his mind. The name 'son of a black woman' stuck...
During the Prophet's life

Although Islain preached the unity and equality of human kind despite differences in tongues and colors and that "the most noble of you in the eyes of God is the most pious", the Arabs' attitude towards the blacks never changed. The Prophet has taught that: "no Arab shall enjoy superiority over the non-Arab, nor shall the white ever excel the black, nor the red the yellow, except in piety". Yet this did not prevent Abu Dhar al-Ghiffari, one of the prominent Companions of the Prophet to call his black brother Bilal ibn Rabah, another prominent Companion and muezzin, caller for prayer, of the Prophet, "son of a black woman". The Prophet, when heard about this, reprimanded Abu Dhar so severely that the latter felt that a mere apology to Bilal would not do. So Abu Dhar lied on the ground, put his cheek on dust and asked Bilal to step on it, as a sign of humiliation, and humbleness.'00

The Middle Ages

If this was the situation during the life of the Prophet, who preached the equality of the believers, it is all natural that the Arabs' attitude towards the blacks would worsen after his death. Bernard Lewis mentions this in the following passage:

While the exponents of religion preached a doctrine of equality, albeit in somewhat ambiguous terms, the facts of life determined otherwise. Prevailing attitudes were shaped not by preachers and relaters of tradition but by the conquerors and slave owners who formed the ruling group in Islamic society. The resulting contempt- towards non-Arabs in general and the
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dark skinned in particular- is expressed in a thousand ways in the
documents, literature and art that have come down to us from the
Islamic Middle Ages... This literature, and especially popular literature,
depicts [the black man] in the form of hostile stereotypes- as a demon
in fairy tales, as a savage in the stories of travel and adventure, or
commonly as a lazy stupid, evilsmelling and lecherous slave. The
evidence of literature was confirmed by art. In Arab, Persian and
Turkish paintings, blacks frequently appear, sometimes as
mythological figures of evil, sometimes as primitive or performing
some menial tasks, or as eunuchs in the palace or in the household.

Ibn Khaldun sees the blacks as "characterized by levity and excitability
and great emotionalism" and that "they are everywhere described as
stupid". He offers, an explanation for this stupidity and love of joy by
attributing it to the "expansion and diffusion of the animal spiriC. 102 The
Old Testament myth that the black people are the descendants of Ham, and
that blackness of skin came about as a result of Noah's curse on his son
Ham, was adopted and propounded by some Arab writers such as Ibn Jarir.
103 However, Ibn Khaldun did not accept this prevailing wisdom of his time,
and tried to provide an alternative "scientific explanation for the blackness
of the Africans based on the heat. 104

In his description of the inhabitants of the Equator, al-Dimashqi had to say
the following:

The Equator is inhabited by communities of blacks who may be
numbered among the savage beasts. Their complexion and hair are
burnt and they are physically and morally abnormal. Their brains
almost boil from the sun's heat.""

Ibn al-Faqih al-Hamadhani follows the same line of reasoning. He founded
his opinion on an ancient Greek geographical theory that divides the earth
into seven latitudinal zones where zone 1 and zone 7 represent extreme heat and extreme cold respectively. He postulates that these two extremes produce savages whereas the middle zone, where the climate is moderate,
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people are well civilized. To him, the people of Iraq have "sound minds, commendable passions, balanced nature, and high proficiency in very art, together with well proportioned limbs, and a pale brown color, which the most apt and proper color". But the zanj who inhabitant zone 1 are 11 overdone until they are burned so that the child comes out between black, murky, malodorous, stinking, and crinkly-haired, with uneven limbs, deficient minds, and depraved passions". John Hunwick observes that while al-Hamadani's prejudice against the Slavs is only limited to their "leprous" color, his prejudices regarding the zanj go beyond color to depict their Meformed bodies", "feeble minds", and "stinking smell". Ibn Khaldun believed that the Africans are closer to animals than to humans, and that they are cannibals as well. "Their qualities of character", says Ibn Khaldun, "are close to those of dump animals. .. they dwell in caves, eat herbs, live in savage isolation, and do not congregate and eat each other". 107

Response of the Blacks

With such manifest prejudices, two kinds of reactions are predictable, resistance and internalizing contempt. While some blacks rose up to counter these prejudices, others accepted their ill fate, and saw themselves mirrored through the Arabs'eyes. However, resistance itself took two approaches, one challenged the stereotypical image and declared that black is beautiful, and the other accepted the prevailing prejudice that it is ugly, apologized for it, and celebrated the human moral qualities. 'Abduh Badawi tells us that: The poets saw themselves and their people as downtrodden, and although this sense of being downtrodden varies from century to century, and from poet
to poet, yet the black man could not refrain from being a voice of protest against the life around him and the tragedy of his own situation. Later we see [black poets] exploding in the face of those who allude to their color as may be seen in the poetry of the 'three angry poets' al-
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Hayqutan, Sunayh, &'Akim [of the early 8th century]. For them it was not enough just to defend themselves. We see them taking pride in their blackness and in the history of black people and the lands they came from and attacking the Arabs on points in which they prided themselves. 108

**Internalizing Contempt**

An example of internalizing contempt is Nasib al-Akbar, another poet of Nublan origins. His attitude was similar to that, of Uncle Tom in western culture. He chose not to confront the society and to conform to its prejudices. When his own son proposed to a lady from the family of his former owners, who were willing to accept him, Nasib came and ordered some of his black slaves to drag his son from his legs and to beat him hard. The slaves beat up his son. Then Nasib saw a young man of nobility and said to the lady's uncle "marry your brother's daughter to this man, and I will pay the dowry". 109 Thus he did not find his own son fit to marry a woman of nobility, and beat him in order to know his place. Another story reported that the Unimayyads Caliph, 'Abdel Malik ibn Murwan asked Nasib to Join his drinking group, but the poet apologized that he was too low to deserve such an honor. He said to the caliph:

Oh *Amir al-Muminin* (commander of the faithful) my skin is black, my frame is deformed, and my face is ugly and I am not fit to be in this position (of being the Caliph's drinking partner). 110
Another story reported that he resorted to invisibility. He wanted to conceal his blackness from his audience, when he was asked to read his poetry to some women, in order not to injure their feelings. He said: "Let me perform behind a veil. Why should they see me? My skin is black and my hair is white. Let them listen to me behind a veil."

'Antra, the heroic poet, gives us another example of internalizing contempt. He seemed to resent his Ethiopian mother, Zabiba, as the one who
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was responsible for his blackness. He viewed her as ugliness in incarnation. He called her to a she hyena, and he resembles her legs to those of an ostrich, and her hair to black pepper. 112

**Resistance (1)**

An example of resistance based on the first approach is the work of the great classical writer al-Jahiz who lived in Bagdad in the 3’d century of Islam (9th century A.D.), and who was black himself. He tried to remind the 'Arabs that the black people are the creation of God, and that it cannot be true that God intended to distort His own creation, as the Arabs might have believed. He said:

God did not deform us by creating us black. Our black color came as a result of the country (environment). The evidence is that even among the Arab tribes there are blacks, such as Bani Salim Ibn Mansour who live in al-Harrah. All the inhabitance of al-Harrah are black, even its bears, ostriches, foxes, wolves, donkeys, horses, goats, and birds are black, and even its air is black. 113

AI-Jahiz also wrote *Fakhr al-Sudan ala al-Bidan*, (the boast of the
superiority of the black people over the white people). AI-Jahiz exalts the black complexion comparing it to the sacred black stone of the Ka'ba, as well as to elements of the natural world that are dark-hued, beautiful and strong, dates, ebony, lions, female camels, musk, night and shade"." Three centuries later al-Jawzi, another Bagdadian writer who lived in the end of the 6th century of Islam (13th century A.D.) would rise to defend the blacks. AIJawzi wrote "Tanwir al-Ghabash fi fadl al-Sudan wa al-Habash, The Illumination of the darkness on the Merits of the Blacks and Ethiopians). In this works he also exalts the black color, praised the nobility and morality of the kings and queens of Sudan and Ethiopia, as well as the black Companions of the Prophet.""
sky. My sword and spear are my noble origin, and they are my best friends when fear strikes people". 118

However, the few works of resistance had no effect more than making a point. Prejudicing the black color intensified in Arabic Islamic culture as the empire grew and the Arabs set out to hunt slaves. Eventually an association between slavery and al-Sudan, i.e. the blacks, became instilled. As Akbar Muliammad writes, with the expansion of the empire: "almost the egalitarianism of the Prophet's age crumbled under the heavy weight of urbanism, acculturation, internal ethnic factionalism, and Arab ethnocentrism". 119 Such ethnocentrism and racism is abundantly reflected in the classical Arabic literature.

---AI-Baqir al-Afif MuMar

The Arabs usually did not address black people by their names, but by the word al-Aswad (the black) or al-'abd al-Aswad (the black slave). When a black poet read his poetry in front of an Amir or a Caliph, the usual response was "ahsant ya aswad", (hey black man you have excelled). 120 The Arab poets usually felt bitter whenever a black poet produced excellent poetry. Their usual reaction when they heard an excellent poetry was 1 wished 1 had said that before the black slave". Their favorite way to taunt their black colleagues was to say to them "qul ghagh", i.e. "make the sound of the raven . 121

AI-Mutanabbi's satirical poems on Kaffir al-Ikhshidi, the black ruler of Egypt during the Middle Ages, are another proof of this point. AIMutanabbi is widely recognized as the most talented Arab poet of all times. He approached Kaffir, a freed Nublan slave, who ascended to power through his superior military and administration& skills, hoping for an arnara, i.e. to be appointed ruler of one of the regions. He composed poems that hail praise
on Kaffir. He even praised his black color and considered it the embodiment of beauty. Failing to get the job he was aspiring to, he fell out with his benefactor, sneaked out of Egypt, and started a campaign of defamation against Kaffir. He composed a number of satirical poems, considered the best in artistic terms, against Kaffir, calling him eunuch slave, ugly Nublan, and stinking pig. In all these poems, al-Mutanabbi mocks Kaffir's black color. He says in one of them, "a black slave whose lower lip is half his size, yet people say to him 'you are the full moon in the midnight'. He also mocks the Egyptians, and calls them the world's laughing stock, because they had Kafur as their ruler. In one of his poems he says, "many things in Egypt are funny, but they are the kind of funny things that make you cry". 122 It is remarkable that when Northerners read these poems, they identify themselves with al-Mutanabbi and not with Kaffir, despite the fact that Kaffir was actually a Nublan, i.e. in modern terms, he was a Northern Sudanese.

---AI-Baqir al-Afif Mukhtar

**The Sources of Islam & Color Symbolism**

It has been mentioned that in its symbolic order, Arabic Islamic culture standardizes the white color and prejudices the black color. In pre-Islamic poetry, in the Qur'an, in classical Islamic jurisprudence, *fiqh*, and in classical as well as modern literature, the white color symbolizes beauty, innocence, purity, hope, etc, whereas the black color symbolizes the opposite of these concepts.

The Qur'an contains two types of discourse; one is color conscious and the other is color blind; one standardizes "white" and prejudices "black", and the other is totally neutral. Examples of the first type of discourse are the following verses: "On the Day when some faces will turn white and some faces will turn black, to those whose faces have blackened (we will say) 'Did
you reject the Faith after Accepting it? Do taste then the Penalty of rejecting Faith'. But those whose faces have become white, they are (enjoying) God's Mercy; therein to dwell for ever" (S. 111, Ay. 106 & 107)."" "On the Day of Judgement wilt thou see those who have told lies against God; Their faces will be turned Black, Is there not in Hell an abode for the Arrogant, (S. xxxix, Ay. 60). "When news is brought to one of them of a birth of a female, his face turned black, and he is filled with inward grief'(S.XL111, 17). 124

Examples of the second type of discourse are the following verses: "Among God's signs are the creation of heavens and of the earth and the diversity of your languages and of your colors". (S. XXX, Ay. 22). 125 Q4o people! We have created you from male and female and we have made you into nations and tribes so that you may come to know one another. The

---AI-Baqir al-Arif Mukhtair

noblest among you in the eyes of God is the most pious" (S.XLIX: Ay. 13)". 126 The Prophetic hadiths also have the same characteristic of the parallel levels of discourses. Example of the lower level of discourse is "Listen to and obey your ruler even if he an Ethiopian slave with crinkly hair". The higher level of the prophetic hadiths preaches the unity and equality of the human race despite differences in color, tongues, and customs. Example of this is "all humans are as equal as a teeth of a comb", and "all of you have descended from Adam, and Adam. has descended (or created) from the mud".

In dealing with these two types of discourse I adopt Mahmoud Muhammed Taha's idea of the duality of the Qur'anic discourse. Talia perceived the Qur'an as having two levels of discourse: lower and higher, particular and universal, temporal and eternal. The lower level reflects, to some degree, the seventh century Arabs' particular values, ideology and culture. It is historically bound, and, therefore, it accommodates some of the
Arabs shortcomings and prejudices. The higher level, on the other hand, reflects the universal human values and therefore, aims to elevate the Arabs, and all the Muslims, to these universal values. The lower level abrogated the higher level. 127 The problem of the Muslims is that they think of this abrogation as eternal and irreversible. Talia, on the other hand, preaches that abrogation is neither eternal nor irreversible, and calls Muslims to move from the lower level to the higher level by reversing the process of the abrogation, and to build a new renaissance on its basis. 128

As demonstrated by the above selection of the Qur'anic verses and the Prophetic hadiths, in the lower level of discourse, white and black are used to symbolize good and evil, good omen and bad omen, and happiness and sadness. The transitional level of the Qur'an and the hadiths reflects the

---AI-Baqir al-Afif Mukhtar

Arabs prejudice against the black people, and standardizes the white color. On the basis of the foregoing one can say that there are visible elements that show that the mainstream Arabic Islamic culture sees itself as a white culture.
TO BE OR NOT TO BE: SUDAN AT CROSSROADS

My hands will burst the galling chain
My people will be free again
For them a thousand hopes remain

1. Sudan: the Name:

The name of the Sudan has more or less been the same all through history. It has been associated with the colour of blackness (such as Kush, Karma, Ethiopia, al-Salta al-Zarqa’ and lastly al-Sudan) which was- and is still- the colour of its people, since the early times of the ancient civilizations of the Nile valley up to the present. The same name seems like evolving by translation from language to another in the course of time. This puts Sudan in the heart of African identity which is rightly called the Black Continent. It is to our honour that we are black Africans bearing the stamp of Africa both in our colour and national name. What seems to be difference of colour among us is nothing more than the shades of blackness.

The significance of the name “Sudan” is crucially important, because it bears very strong identity implication. The Arabized people of middle Sudan do not recognize themselves as black Africans. As the State ideologically and historically belongs to this group, Sudan has come to identify with the Arabs more than black Africa. This issue is deemed central in our contemporary problem of self-actualization in particular and national integration in general.
It is either we bear a name which is not fit for us, or otherwise we do not deserve it. It is a doomed person that who bears a name that does not satisfy one’s self-esteem. Since Independence, the State has evasively dealt with the realistic connotations and implications of the name “Sudan” without ever trying to ground it in the consciousness of the Sudanese youngsters in educational curricula. Ironically, an Arabic poem by a modern Arab poet that deplores blackness and considers starting one’s day by meeting a black person as a bad omen, used to be taught in our schools. Some of the gruesome racist novels about Africa written by racist Western writers were also among the books of English literature in our schools.

No wonder in their western diasporas, the particular Sudanese who fell victim of this self-alienation chose the category “Others” in identifying themselves instead of any of the following categories: “Whites”, “Arabs”, “Asians” or “Blacks”. The last category includes the sub-category “Africans”; by not recognizing themselves as blacks, they not only deprived themselves of the honour of being Africans, but also contradicted the simple truths of reality. At the same time they could not dare call themselves Arabs while living in the West, an identity they always boast of while they are inside the Sudan. By neither opting to be ‘Africans’ nor ‘Arabs’, they ended into the obscurity of the non-identity of ‘Otherness’.

2. The State:

In what roughly constitutes the geography of present day Sudan, the State has prevailed all through history. Archaeologically the State can be traced back to seven thousand years at least. Like in other parts of Africa, the State functioned in a kind of federal autonomy where the ethno-cultural entities were its political nucleuses. The vast geographical space necessitated that justice was the key for any ruler to reign for longer. Seeking a better place to live in was handy and convenient for every ethnic group thus leaving back any tyrant to rule either the desert or the jungle. Using today’s modern language, a typical traditional African ‘democracy’
prevailed where both the supremacy of the ruler and the autonomy of the ruled groups were acknowledged. The ancient civilizations of the Sudan were characterized by this just equilibrium of freedom and sovereignty.

Comparatively, it was the opposite in the sisterly civilization of ancient Egypt where the ruler was of absolute power on his/her subjects. As the people there were confined to the narrow strip of the Nile by the hedging desert, they became vulnerable to the supremacy of the rulers. Since then unpaid compulsory work was introduced to only be abolished by the mid 20th century. This is how the building of hugely monumental pyramids was made available. In the ancient Sudan the ruler could not compel his subjects into such a compulsory work and this might well be the reason why they satisfied themselves with relatively humble pyramids.

Today’s demand for self-determination by different marginalized groups is the modern manifestation and formulation of the history-long practice to pull out from any State that does not answer equally the longing of its different subject-groups to Freedom, Justice and Peace.

At no time was there any kind of political vacuum in the Sudan. The traditional tribal federacy of ancient Sudan was maintained in the Christian era to also prevail later in the Funj Sultanate. The Egyptian-Turkish colonial rule is wrongly thought to have introduced the policy of decentralization in ruling the Sudan; that was the same system applied in the Funj Sultanate being reinstated. The realities of pluralism in Sudan have always been pushing the State toward adopting decentral and federal policies. It is a continuum that goes back to thousands of years.

3. The People:

Virtuously all the people of present day Sudan contributed in making the ancient civilization of Sudan. Although sometimes this civilization is called ‘Nubian’ but this should be understood in the way of ‘naming the part while meaning the whole’. Even the people who call themselves ‘Arab’ have their
rightly recognizable share in building that civilization as far as they are mixture of Arabs and indigenous people. In fact the weaving of the ethno-linguistic fabric in Sudan, which is taken for granted to be heterogeneous, reflects homogeneity as well. Amazingly people living on the Sudan-Uganda borders (e.g. the Baria) are related in a cousin-way manner to people living on the Sudan-Egypt borders (Nubians) and both people are related to others living on the Sudan-Ethiopia borders in the Funj region (e.g. Ingassana) and all of them are related in the same way to other groups living on the Sudan-Chad borders (e.g. Daju). We must bear in mind that before the Arabization of middle Sudan those people were in a dynamic contact with each other. This is an ancient land with ancient people and ancient civilization; the most to be expected is that they are interrelated ethno-linguistically.

The peoples of Africa can generally be classified ethno-linguistically into four big groups (phyla), namely: Afro-Asiatic, Niger-Kordofanian, Nilo-Saharan, and Khoi-San, of which only the last is not represented by any ethno-linguistic group as it is confined to the southern tail of the continent. Each phylum is divided into sub-groups and smaller groups until it reaches the level of the sisterly ethno-linguistic entities or families in a way almost similar to the kinship trees of the people themselves. For instance, within the Nilo-Saharan we have the sub-group of Eastern Sudanic etc.

The above mentioned classification has come to us through a long way of racial bigotry and prejudice that characterized Western academia when dealing with Africa. Furthermore, as it is usually the case in social sciences, most of the premises and criteria for classification are controversial. This is why the African scientists in their UNESCO’s General History of Africa came into sharp disagreement with the Western scholars regarding the issue of classification. For instance, ancient Egyptians were classified by the Westerners as Afro-Asiatic (thus relating them to the Semitic people), but re-classified by the African scientists as Niger-Kordofanian. Some of the Africans even went far to argue that what is called Nilo-Saharan could
constitute one bigger group with the so-called Niger-Kordofanian.

Bearing the above mentioned controversy in mind, below we are going to show how the peoples of the Sudan are related to each other in an intrinsic way. The ethno-linguistic groups will be mentioned according to their principal regional habitats which comprise the following: Equatoria, Bahr al-Ghazal, Upper Nile, Nuba Mountains, Dar Fur, Funj and Ingassana, Eastern Sudan, Northern Sudan, and Middle Sudan. The languages spoken by the people in these areas will be used as an indicator of the ethnic groups. Presently with the intensification of marginalization people have moved away from their historical habitats to other areas, mainly the centre. This will not be strictly considered in all cases. Although Arabic, being the lingua franca of the Sudan, is spoken all over the country, it will be related to the Middle of Sudan where it claims supremacy. ‘Northern Sudan’ indicates here the ethno-linguistically distinguishable group of Nubians only. Both Meroitic and Old Nubian and other extinct languages will be mentioned for historical significance only. The Nuba Mountains represent the whole of Kordufan as, aside from Arabic, there is only one language that falls outside Nuba Mountains i.e. the Harāza extinct language. The ethno-linguistic affiliation will be marked by the following characters which are randomly applied: Afro-Asiatic (☺), Niger-Kordofanian (☾), and Nilo-Saharan (☼) with its sub-group of Eastern Sudanic as (♀). This symbol (●) indicates that almost all the languages are spoken in the given area. We shall try to mention all ethnic entities, but we cannot claim that the list will be inclusive; we apologize to those who may slip from record. The alphabetic order will be adopted.
3.1. Middle Sudan:

- Arabic Colloquial
- Arabic Standard
- Meroitic
- Old Nubian

3.2. Eastern Sudan:

- Arabic
- Bedaweyit
- Fulani
- Fur
- Hausa
- Meroitic
- Nobiin
- Old Nubian
- Tigre
- Tigrinya

3.3. Northern Sudan:

- Arabic
- Dongolese
- Kunūz
- Meroitic
- Nobiin
- Old Nubian

3.4. The Nuba Mountains and Kordofan:

- Affiti
- Aka
- Ama
- Arabic
- Dagik
- Dair
- Daju
- Delenj
- Dinka
- Eliri
- Fulani
- Garme
- Hugairat
- Ghulfān
- H araza
- Hausa
- Heiban
- kadaru
- Kanga
- Karko
- Katcha
- kadugli
- Katla
- Keiga
- Kawalib
- Kau
- Korongo
- Lafofa
- Laru
- Liguri
- Logol
- Lumun
- Meroitic
- Moro
- Ngile
- Old Nubian
- Shatt
- Shuway
- Tagoi
- Talodi
- Tese
- Temain
- Tima
- Tingal
- Tocho
- Togole
- Torona
- Tulishi
- Tumma
- Utoro
- Wali
- Warnag
- Yulu

3.5. Dar Fur:

- Arabic
- Bargo
- Baygo
- Berti
- Birgid
- Berno
- Daju
- Fongoro
- Fulani
- Fur
- Hausa
- kanuri
- Masalit
- Meroitic
- Midob
- Old Nubian
- Sungor
- Zaghawa

3.6. Bah r al-Ghazāl:

- Ajja
- Arabic
- Daju
- Dinka
- Feroge
- Fulani
- Gula
- Hausa
- Mangayat
- Meroitic
- Mittu
- Njalgulgule
- Old Nubian
- Sinyar
3.7. Equatoria:

☼Abukeia ☃Acholi ☘Arabic Std. ☘Arabic Juba ☀Bai ☈Baka ☕Banda ☃Baria ☈Belanda Bor ☘Belanda Viri ☘Bongo ☘Dongotono ☃Homa ☀Indri ☘Jur ☘Kachipo ☕Kakwa ☘Kaliko ☘Kresh ☘lango ☘Lokoya ☃Lopit ☘Luluba ☘Luwo ☘Ma´adi ☘Mundari ☘Meroitic ☘Mo´da ☘Morokodo ☘Moro ☘Mundo ☘Ndogo ☘Njamusa ☘Molo ☘Old Nubian

♀Otuho ♀Shilluk ♀Suri ♀Tennet ♀Thuri ♀Togoyo ♀Toposa ♀Zande

3.8. Upper Nile:

♀Anuak ☘Arabic ☘Atuot ☘Beli ☘Didinga ☘Dinka ☘Jumjum ☘Lokoro ☘Longarim ☘Mabaan ☘Meroitic ☘Murle ☘Nuer ☘Old Nubian ☘Tumtum ☘Uduk

3.9. Blue Nile, Funj and Ingassana:

☼Arabic ☘Berta ♀Burun ☘Fulani ☘Funj ☘Gumuz ☘Hausa ☘Ingassana ☘Kelo ☘Komo ☘Meroitic ☘Molo ☘Old Nubian ☘Opuuo

3.10. The North-South Stereotype:

The above-mentioned relationships which reflect today’s reality stand as an evidence that the Sudanese people are united in their diversity. How can one draw a line and say that this is the South and this is the North? Or even this is the East and this is the West? All the groups cut across the Country from Halfa to Nimuli and from Kurmuk to Jineena. The Nilo-Saharan Group (☼), of which the Eastern Sudanic (♀) is a sub-group, constitutes 64% of the total identities of the Sudan; the Eastern Sudanic sub-group (♀) alone constitutes 44%. The Niger-Kordofanian Group (☼) constitutes 32%, where the Afro-Asiatic Group (☼) constitutes only 04%. Although the populations of these ethnic identities are proportionately reversed, the issue of Human Rights, however, is not a question of ‘how many?’ All ethnic groups should be entitled to equal rights in matters pertaining to culture and development
regardless of whether their population number is small or big.

4. The Boundary:

The historical boundaries of ancient Sudan are thought to have been much bigger than today’s boundaries. Section (3) shows that all areas share the Meroitic and Old Nubian languages, consequently their culture and civilization. There are archaeological evidences to this effect. Excavations proved that there are both Kushitic/Meroitic and post-Meroitic settlements in Southern, Western and Eastern regions. The linguistic evidence is proving that languages as far as Equaroria (the Baria (♀) for instance) can potentially help in deciphering the Meroitic language (♀). Archaeological evidence has supported the stories of ancient historians about the tall and very black cattle herdsmen who used to roam the area of today’s Butâna up to the Red Sea hills. This is also supported by oral traditions of Nilotic tribes, the Dinka’s in particular. The meaning of the place-name ‘Khartoum’, which is traditionally pronounced as ‘khērtūm’ is offered in Dinka language as ‘kēr tom’, i.e. the ‘the river confluence’. Just 250 years ago the White Nile region above Jabal Aulia was Shillukland. The Arab thrust into the centre of Sudan caused Nilotic people and other groups to shrink back deep into the Savannah and Equatorial zones and thus cut off from the milieu of their lingo-cultural setting of Nilo-Saharan and Niger-Kordofanian region which has been in fact disrupted altogether by this factor. The natural territories of this region are the Equator in the South and the cataract of Asuan in the North.

Westward the boundaries of ancient Sudan are much bigger as natural topographical features doe not obstruct the movement of people. Recent researches have shown that the iron industry of Meroe is to be associated with the industry of iron smelting in Central Bilād al-Sūdān. Some Sudanese tribes (al-Daju in particular) show cultural attachment to hills with rich iron
ore. The West-East routes between the Red Sea and the Atlantic Ocean witnessed continuous movements of migration to and from. The Nubians who are scattered in Dar Fur, Kordofan, and the Nile are believed by many scholars to have migrated originally from a place North-West of Dar Fur. The Hausa and Fulani people have been taking these routes in their eastward movement since ancient times. These are the same routes the Arabs took in their migration into the Sudan from *Bilād al-Maghrib*. This is why the area that lies between the Red Sea and the Atlantic Ocean is rightly called *Bilād al-Sūdān*, which really constitutes the strategic depth of the Sudan. This is why also such countries like Chad bore the name ‘Sūdān’; ironically the government of Sudan officially complained when the newly independent Republic of Mali expressed intention to adopt the name ‘Sūdān’; one would expect of such a government to also piously reverence the semantic connotation and implication of the name.

5. Religion:

In this regard two things have characterized Sudan all through history; it has always been multi-religious and religiously tolerant. Ancient polytheism accommodated other deities survived in today’s traditional religions. Recent studies in Nubiology and Egyptolology trace monotheism back to Nubia; Akhenaton developed monotheism while he was in Nubia (presumably his mother’s homeland) in his youth before being called to Egypt to assume the throne. Tolerant Nubia availed the development of Akhenaton’s monotheism; intolerant Egypt availed its demise.

The treasurer of the Candace of Meroe was a Jew who converted to Christianity in its early days apparently without fearing the slightest persecution. Christianity did not invade the Sudan; it was the Sudanese who asked for it. In Christian Dongola there was a Mosque of which the Christian State was responsible. In Soba, where there were about 300 Churches, there was also a Mosque within a hamlet assigned for the Muslims.
In the 19th century Christianity will catch up again as a result of intensive missionary work. The biggest Christian communities are in the South and Nuba Mountains and the big urban centres. In the face of the rise of Islamization and Arabization as vehicles for facilitating the central State domination, Christianity will get involved and eventually it will become, along with Africanism, the ideological backbone in countering Islamo-Arabization.

5.1. Islam:

Islam broke the encapsulation of Sudan and opened it to the outer world of that time. The transformation from Christianity to Islam took a gradual process thus giving way for a distinctive mix of Sudanese cosmoLOGY and culture of tolerance. A Sudanese Islam was in the making that finally took its shape in the Sufi sects that flourished in post-Christian Sudan thus representing an effective acculturation of indigenous practices and Islamic teachings. The local people transformed from the traditional and Christian choirs to the Sufi chanting smoothly.

The conversion to Islam culminated in the Funj Sultanate which retained many ancient features in regard of administration and cultural symbols. The traditional system of tribal federacy, with its inherent democratic practices, was maintained. Other ancient practices such as the ritual killing of the king and the Christian headgear and regalia were also retained. At the beginning the Sufi Islam assumed supremacy in reflecting the ideology of the State. A little later a rival came into the scene represented in scholastic Islam that could only be acquired through classroom teaching at such religious centres like al-Azhar in Cairo. Where the Sufi Islam interacts with the local society, the scholastic Islam challenges it in its persistent endeavours to properly reshape it. Where the former does not give heed to the penal code of the Shari’a as literally stated in the scriptures, the latter only pays attention to the scriptures without giving any heed to the realities of setting and context. At the beginning many scholastic Shaykhs took to denouncing their
jurisprudence by throwing away their symbolic scholastic graduation robes and declare themselves as Sufi. At the end of the game this will be reversed.

The Sufi Islam could have won the rivalry if it were not for the Egyptian-Turkish colonial rule which introduced the State culture of official Muslim clergymen who were appointed and paid by the State and who adhered to scholastic Islam as they were mostly graduates of al-Azhar Mosque-University. That rule also introduced the modern educational system where the classrooms were also made available for this kind of Islam to flourish. It will take the whole reign of this colonial rule for this battle to be fought out.

The Mahdia represents the ultimate victory of the scholastic Islam over the Sufi Islam. The Mahdi was a Sufi man who revolted against what he took to be leniency on behalf of the Sufi Shaykhs towards the traditions of people which—according to his own views—were not following the book of Shari’a. The Sufi amulet was thrown away, the scholastic robe put on. The Mahdia State understandably followed a strict scholastic Islam. Thenceforward the Sufi Islam will gradually identify with the scholastic Islam so as to catch up in the long run. By the late decades of the 20th century the two can hardly be distinguished from each other. Both were invariably responsible of the two fanatical States in the second half of the 20th century. However, there were always exceptional cases as usual.

The British-Egyptian colonial rule resumed the same system of the Egyptian-Turkish rule in regard of the government-sponsored education and the culture of the official Muslim clergymen. By the time the Sudan achieved Independence the educated class was mostly orientated with the scholastic Islam. This showed in the rising tide of the Islamic fundamentalist movements among the students of higher educational institutions.

5.2. The Muslims Frustration:

In the struggle of most of the Muslim nations for independence the tide of the Islamic movements was not high enough to go over the shore. But
they will excel themselves in mobilizing the people against the national
governments which took over from the colonial rule and which proved to be
greatly inept. The intelligenca that formed those governments was the class
supposed to launch modernism in the traditional Islamic cultures.
Superficially they ended up dressing and speaking like their colonial masters,
but behaving like the same patriarchal despots they only knew of. Lacking
any progressive vision pertaining to both their tradition in which Islam is
central and to modernism in which democracy is central, their rule was
marked with corruption, dictatorship and shallow secularism that simply
overlooked religion out of ignorance. Thus they made themselves an easy
target for the equally superficial Muslim fundamentalists.

The post-colonial Muslim societies were eager for progress, a matter
that could only be achieved in accompaniment of the whole system of values
and thought. Neither their fake secular intellectuals nor their fanatical
Islamic fundamentalists were equipped with any applicable vision for that.
By the end of the 20th century the Muslims will enter a phase where they
shall be abused in the name of Caesar as well as in the name of God. The
Sudanese people have had their big share of this misfortune.

**5.3. The Fanatical Islamists’ Failure:**

It took the Muslim Brothers of Sudan half a century of relentless activity
and meticulous organization to only assume power by a *coup d’etat* that
lacked public support to the extent they kept for so long denying that they
were behind it. Propelled with the vigour of fanaticism, they immediately
took to the sublime mission of reshaping the people according to what they
believed to be the right way ordained by God. From their side, the people
either expectantly or resignedly waited for the knowledge from on high to
pour on them. But to the dismay of everybody -foe or friend alike- they
turned after half a century of struggle to be so poorly equipped for such
sublime a mission; they were only equipped with a whip to flog the people
Administratively they made favouritism, nepotism and preferential treatment the rule and impartiality an exception that can only take place as a result of negligence. As if fearing that that would be their last time in power they frantically and shamelessly began appropriating wealth from public fund of education, health, food, housing and other utilities which they repealed. For the first time since the Egyptian-Turkish colonial rule the institution of the State has completely been utilized against the benefit of the tax payer with nothing spent on public utilities. This regime will merit lasting memory among the Sudanese people by its lasting blunders which seemed to be their way to score a record.

Faced by the truth that they lacked any vision or programme to follow for reshaping the people and lulled by the swivel chairs of power they either resigned to laxity or consumed themselves in dissension. And that was the moment when their own time to be reshaped by the Sudanese culture began. At first they showed a self-conscious tolerance toward certain cultural aspects of Sudanese life such as singing, dancing etc. which they used to dismiss indignantly in the past. Eventually they began practising them. Presently a huge number of them have regained their sensibility and have abandoned fanaticism for good. It is good that generally they have kept to being Islamist, because just now they can hopefully develop into sensibly thoughtful Islamists instead of romantic fanatics.

It took the Muslim Brothers half a century to learn this basic lesson of dealing with Islamic conceptual issues as matters of daily-life realism rather than retrospective idealism. Is it going to take a similar long time for the other Islamic movements to learn this basic lesson, or are they wise enough to take the lesson introspectively? The important question is that: why should the Sudanese people become subjected to such arbitrary experiments with the entire blunder they claim in their course? The cultural rehabilitation
of religious fanaticism may prove to be too much expensive.

5.4. Islam and the New World Order:

Today in the 21st century, with America being the sole super power, Islam potentially poses to be a counter power- that is unless Europe will rise up to challenge America. The Muslims all over the world are nurturing a deep resentment toward the West in general and America in particular for what rightly seems to be double standard of measures in dealing with issues that concern the Third World in general and the Muslim World in particular. In case Europe stands up to challenge America that may bring her closer to the Islamic world, seeking an ally in it. That may relax the tension a little. The problem of the Islamic world is that America is being challenged Islamically in a gangster way or a guerrilla warfare at its best. The Islamic think-tank for such a huge battle is so thin that fanaticism has become the spearhead of the fight against the West. Backed with its own experience in dealing with Christian fanaticism of the dark ages which was far worse than Islamic fanaticism, the West is well-prepared to win this battle.

From now on it will be extremely difficult for any political movement to flourish among Muslims if it does not have its own Islamic discourse; to overlook Islam will only give boost to fanaticism, and fanaticism can effectively destroy, but it cannot construct. For any modern Islamic thought to be forwarded to people two basic issues are to be thoughtfully considered: Democracy (not necessarily liberalism) and Human Rights. Only then can the battle with the West be won, not because these are the same values of the West -a matter highly controversial- as the West seems to hate nothing more than to see these two things properly applied outside its frontiers, but rather because, generally speaking, democracy and human rights find their aesthetic values in the oneness of human nature. There is no need to mention that the West is mostly responsible for toppling the
infant democratic governments all over the Third World. Paradoxically under the pretext of defending these two things from being violated the West also militarily intervenes in the Third World countries and occupies them.

6. Slavery:

Slavery is a history-long human vice. It began by putting fighters captured at war times into compulsory work. Later it also turned into abducting vulnerable people while travelling or wandering alone or in small groups. Lastly it developed into organizing highly armed raids against peaceful human settlements in order to enslave free people either for work, military, sex or all. All the nations were involved in slavery and all of their members were virtually subject to slavery if it chanced them.

6.1. The West and Slavery:

Long before the Christianization of the Roman Empire the institution of slavery in the West has accommodated another human vice, which is racism. The Slavic people of Eastern Europe were extensively targeted by slavery to the extent that any one of them would be taken for granted as a slave, and hence the word *slave* in European languages. But then that was a secondary racism as the factor of colour difference was not acute; it was a kind of cultural prejudice as the slaver and the slave were almost of the same colour but with different cultures and different languages. Until this time slavery was not yet associated with blackness. The moors, i.e. the ancient people of North Africa were black just like the Pharaohs of ancient Egypt and Nubia, but that had nothing to do with the high social statuses they assumed. It is worth mentioning that the first two Roman viceroys in England were black Africans.

6.2. The Arabs and Slavery:

A little later with the rise of the Arabs just before Islam, slavery will take another swing of colour connotation which will prove to be of very lasting
racial effect, that is the association of slavery with the black colour. Thenceforward slavery will be more and more associated with the black coloured people thus making Africa its prime target. Away from Arabia the infection of racial slavery will also be witnessed in Byzantium. Gradually it will move westward to infec the whole of Europe. Until a certain Pope ordered that Jesus Christ be reproduced in the Raphaelian white man images, the paintings variably revealed a dark-skinned Jesus. As Nubia was the corridor to black Africa, so we find in classical English dictionaries that the word ‘nubian’ collocates with ‘slave’.

The Arabs, a dark-skinned people themselves, began showing in their culture a strong orientation toward light-skin colour. Their pre-Islamic and Islamic poetry is abundant with racial and derogatory themes about black colour. A famous pre-Islamic poet whose mother was a black African with fuzzy hair painfully suffered from discrimination; his people did not recognize him until he proved his ultimate knighthood in tribal wars. Prophet Muhammad addressed to this problem many a time in his traditions. A close companion of him who was a black of African origin suffered a lot from colour derogatory remarks made by other Muslim brethrens. Late in the Abbasid era the blacks of Arabia lead a revolt against discrimination; they marauded the cities they captured one after the other, and put every one they chanced to the sword.

By the end of the Abbasid Caliphate the Arabic word for ‘black’ has become synonymous with the word ‘slave’, just like the word ‘nigger’ became synonymous to ‘slave’ in Western languages. However enslaving white people did not stop. Slavery for hard labour was almost restricted to black Africans; Children from non-black communities, especially from the Caucasian regions in Central Asia, were abducted in order to be sold either for soldiery in the case of the males, or as harem in the case of the females. Even so they were not called slaves; the former was called ‘mamlūk’, literally means ‘owned’, and the latter was called ‘jāriya’, i.e. ‘mistress’. They
were saved the derogatory word ‘slave’ simply because they were not black. In Egypt those white slaves managed to assume the rule of the country for centuries to be removed only by Muhammad Ali Pasha in the early 19th century. One of those mamlūk, however, was a black African thought by some scholars to be enslaved from the Nuba Mountains in Sudan. He managed to usurp the power from his master who was the governor and became the ruler of Egypt. His name was Kāfūr, a typical name for a black slave. He was highly cultured to the extent of being called ‘al-Ustāz’ i.e. the teacher. In one of the most famous Arab derogatory poems he was bluntly called ‘abd’ i.e. slave and further mocked by the advice that no slave should be bought without a stick to straighten him/her up with. (Ironically, for years this particular piece of poem was taught in Sudanese schools). Thus by the middle ages any black was subject to be called slave in the Arab and Islamic world.

6.3. The Western Mass Enslavement of Africans:

With the coming of the age of geographical explorations and industrialization the West frantically scrambled on Africa from all directions in pursuit of slaves, showing evilness unprecedented in the history of mankind. Populous Africa was depopulated in a few decades. When slavery was abandoned, it was a matter of achieving equilibrium in production means and modes; paid-labour production could not compete with unpaid-slave-labour production. The ethical value of human freedom was just exploited in the same way the helpless slave was. In their public speeches, the so called slave-liberators put it very clearly that the ethical value had nothing to do with them, nor did they believe that the Blacks are equal to the Whites. Africa has come out of this with an eternal wound; the West with an eternal shame. To add to its historical shame the West, generally speaking, has not shown any remorse or at least thankfulness for the blacks; for instance the British monarchy has persistently refused to apologize for slavery. The West all through the 20th century tolerated
Apartheid, which is the legitimate child of the marriage of slavery and racism.

6.4. Al-Jallāba: the Slave Procurers:

Slavery was practised in Sudan since ancient times. The Arabs in the Paqt treaty demanded from the Nubians slaves whom were brought from hinterlands. The slaves were not yet cash commodity, nor were they wage-free labour in a capitalist system as they will develop a little later. It was still African traditional slavery resulting from petty tribal feuds and wars.

It kept on like that in the early time of the Funj Sultanate until the Europeans began making incursions into the continent to procure slaves. It was the Egyptian-Turkish colonial rule that launched the era of mass slavery in the Sudan. They made it a State policy with the whole weight of Arab cultural stigmatization of the blacks. The local Arabized centre which was growing fast took after them. They played the role of the intermediary who organizes the raids, captures the blacks and then sells them. The term al-Jallāba is a plural adjective in Sudanese colloquial Arabic literally meaning the procurers. The singular is jallābi. The term originated in referring to the intermediary slavers who were mostly Arabized Sudanese. The culture of al-Jallāba had a big impact in consolidating the establishment of the centre. When the Egyptian-Turkish colonial rule was compelled to abolish slavery, al-Jallāba defied that and boldly continued to practice it. By that time they had developed their raiding squads into formidable armies. As their top slavers forced their way and became governors of some parts of the Sudan, they were just one step from becoming the rulers of the country. The prestigimate title of ‘Pasha’ was bestowed on the most conspicuous slaver when his de facto governorship of one of the districts was recognized. The al-Jallāba cherished the prospects of inheriting the faltering Egyptian-Turkish rule. If it were not for the Mahdia revolution, that might have happened.
The Mahdia State, strictly following the scripture of Islam where there is no direct verse from either the Qur’ān or the Prophet traditions abolishing slavery, indulged itself in reinstating the institution of slavery. However it strongly abolished tobacco and snuff whether chewed or smoked although there is no direct verse either from the Qur’ān or the Prophet traditions to that effect. Understandably the pragmatic and Machiavellian Jallāba were among the first to declare their allegiance to the Mahdia. They put their huge military resources and expertise at the service of the revolution. That is one of the factors that how the Mahdia State came to belong ideologically to the Arabized centre.

Being colonialist in nature, the British-Egyptian rule was very pragmatic in its alliance with the Arabized centre. Although officially declared abolished, slavery was tolerated as a practice and culture. It was not in the interest of either the British or the Egyptians to enlighten, for instance, the Sudanese youngsters in schools about the vice of slavery and the fallacy of associating it with a certain colour, especially blackness as it is the colour of the whole Sudanese people. To both of them the whole Sudanese people were blacks. Such an approach could have shaken the stability of the centre and thus threatening the colonial rule itself.

The national rule clearly showed its stance in this regard by naming a street in Khartoum after the Pasha slaver, the most notorious slaver in Sudan’s modern history. To say the truth, the culture of slavery was behind the bad treatment of the Southerners by the successive national governments under the pretext of curbing the war. The civil war will always give vent for the culture of slavery to express itself.

7. The Arabization of Sudan:

With the weakening of the Christian kingdoms, between the 14th and 16th centuries, new Islamic Arabized kinglets began appearing and eventually succeeded in replacing the old regime. The first was the Kunūz
(Bani al-Kanz) kingdom around Asuan area in present-day Egyptian Nubia, to be followed a little later by the Rabī‘a-Beja Islamic kinglet of Hajar. In the late 15th century the Islamic kinglet of Tegali (Togole) in Nuba Mountains came into existence. A century later the Ottoman Sultan Selim the Second made a thrust deep in Nubia in the aftermath of which appeared the Northern Nubian Islamic kinglets of the Kushshāf, al-Mahṣas, and Argo. Two centuries later the Fur kingdom of Kunjāra was established upon the fall of the Tunjur kinglet. But the most important was the Funj Sultanate which came into existence in the early 16th century and which succeeded in spreading its influence over most of these kinglets. In fact the unification of these kinglets along with many other tribal kinglets is what has constituted the State in ancient and present-day Sudan.

The Funj Sultanate came into existence with slavery looming in the background and with the black colour fully stigmatized by being synonym to ‘slave’. By the turn of the 15th century, Soba, the Capital of the last Christian kingdom of Allodia, fell at the hands of the Arabized Nubians (known in Sudan as the Arabs) led by ‘Abdu Allah Jammā‘ al-Gireenāti (‘Jammā‘’, an adjective literally meaning the ‘gatherer’ for unifying the divided Arabs; ‘Gireenāti’, a diminutive adjective literally meaning ‘of the horns’ in reference to the royal horned headgear as was the case in the Christian Kingdoms). Immediately after the fall of Soba, a black African people called the Funj appeared led by ‘Amāra Dungus; he achieved a treaty with the Arabs after defeating them according to which the Funj Sultanate was established. As the founders of it were virtually blacks, it was also called “al-Salt ana al-Zarqā‘”, i.e. the ‘Black Sultanate’. As it came in response to the growing influence of the Islamo-Arabized Sudanese it explicitly showed an Arab and Islamic orientation. The new formations of Arabized tribes began claiming Arab descent supported with traditionally authenticated genealogies. The transformation from African identity to Arab identity is reflected in the ideological cliché of dropping the ‘matrilineal system’ where descent through the mother is only recognized, and adopting the ‘patrilineal
system’ where descent through the father is only considered. The small family units compensated for their vulnerability by claiming the noble ‘sharīf’ descent, i.e. descendants of Prophet Muhammad; eventually in the name of this descent they will appropriate both wealth and power, something the immediate descendants were not ordained to have while Prophet Muhammad was still alive. To be on an equal footing with these tribes in matters pertaining to power and authority, the Funj also claimed an Umayyad descent. Scholars in Arabic and Islamic sciences from other parts of the Islamic world were encouraged to settle in the Sudan.

7.1. The Paradox of Colour: the Black Arab who is Anti-Black:

Thenceforward the Arabized Africans of middle Sudan will pose as non-black Arabs. Intermarriage with light-skinned people will always be consciously sought as a process of cleansing blood from blackness. A long process of identity change began; in order to have access to power and to be at least accepted as free humans, African people tended to drop both their identities and languages and replace them with Arabic language and Arab identity. The first step to play the game is to overtly deplore the blacks and dub them as slaves while you yourself are a black. A new ideological consciousness of race and colour came into being. The shades of the colour of blackness were perceived as authentic racial differentiations. A Sudanese-bound criterion for racial colour was formed by which the light black was seen as an Arab (wad ‘Arab and wad balad), i.e. white or at least non-black. The jet-black Sudanese was seen as an African, i.e. slave (‘ab- or ‘abd).

Then an endless list of derogatory terms was generated in Sudanese culture and colloquial Arabic of central Sudan which dehumanize the black Africans, such as farikh, gargūr etc. In this context the properly white and light colour is also discredited; it is given the derogatory name of ‘h alab’ i.e. gypsy. A Sudanese Arab proverb says that ‘the slaves, i.e. black people, are second class, but the h alab are third class’.
7.2. **Stigma vs. Prestigma:**

Right there the seeds of Sudanese ideology of Arab dominance over the African were sown. It works through two mechanisms: 1) the *stigma* of slavery, blackness and Africans, who constitute the margin and surrounding periphery and 2) the *prestigma* (coined from prestige, purposely for this essay) of the free, non-black and Arab, who constitute the centre. This ideology, in its drive to achieve self-actualization, underlines a process of alienation and domination; those are black African people who do not recognize themselves as black Africans. While posing to be whites, they do not hold proper white people in high esteem. Practically they tend to savagely dominate the Africans by enslaving them and then they largely indulge themselves in stigmatizing the Africans and prestigmatizing the Arabs with whom they identify. This ideology of alienation has prevailed for the last five centuries up to the moment. It has been consolidated by the successive political regimes whether Egyptian-Turkish or Egyptian-British or national rule. It finds its roots in the vice of slavery. No wonder slavery was once again in full swing by the late 20th century as a result of extremely intensifying the processes of prestigmatic Islamo-Arabism by the State. By sublimating the Arab as a model for them through this erroneously confused concept of race, the Arabized people of Sudan have made themselves a second-class Arabs. The repercussions of this will not only affect them, but their whole country which will be split up between Arabism and Africanism. It has never dawned on them that speaking a language does not necessarily presuppose adopting the nationality engendering the language. In fact what the so-called Arabs are different people with different cultures but one language; they are Arabophone. The Sudanese people are Arabophone Africans just as there are Francophone and Anglophone Africans.

7.3. **A Belated Self-Discovery?**

The weak fabrics of this colour concept will be turned into tatters when the Sudanese who are prestigmatized according to it came in contact with
the Arabs Proper in the mid 1970s when they worked as expatriates in the rich petroleum States of Arabia. There, at the historical milieu of this racial bigotry, they mounted to nothing more than black Africans, i.e. *slaves*. It caused a turmoil that triggered a slow process of self-discovery as a result of which the ideology of domination eventually got cracked. By the mid 1990s the image of the rebel leader of SPLM/SPLA, John Garang, who is a jet-black African from Southern Sudan was much more acceptable to a great number of the Arabized Sudanese as the real leader of the whole movement of the political opposition to the Islamic regime of Khartoum. The military weight of SPLM/SPLA would have never mattered in making that acceptance possible if the ideology of domination was still intact.

8. The Centro-Marginalization:

Although roughly situated in the middle of Sudan, the centre is not only geographical. Rather it is a centre of culture that comprises both power and wealth. People from the periphery are always encouraged and tempted to join the centre by renouncing their African cultures, languages and becoming Arabized. This complex process is made to look as a natural cultural interaction that takes place out of the necessity of leaving one’s home village and coming to live in a town dominated by Arabs. The cultural relegation of the periphery will eventually end up into developmental relegation. Within the Arabized centre itself there are different circular castes. As the centre is basically made up of Arabized Africans, a racially proper Arab would not merit any prestige; hence the purely Arab tribe of Rashāyda occupies a marginal stratification circle of the centre.

Where the process of prestigmatization is cultural, the process of stigmatization is racial however. Swung upon this paradoxical axis, the ideology of domination is characterized with high manoeuvrability; if accused of being anti-African/pro Arab, the case of the Rashāyda and Baggāra will be brought forward. On the other hand the accusations of being anti Arab will
be balanced with the accusations of being anti African, and so on.

8.1. The “Melting Pot” Perspective:

A discourse of unity will opportunely come into shape; as different ethnic groups from the periphery are being culturally re-produced in the centre, the mash is hailed to be the real Sudanese make. Hence we have the perspective of the “Melting Pot” as a backbone of the discourse of national unity, i.e. the process of assimilation. But being based originally on the processes of stigmatization vs. prestigmatization it will always fall short of achieving integral unity right at the moment when the assimilation is complete. The jet-blacks of Sudan who have been completely assimilated in the Islamo-Arab culture and religion are not only being racially discriminated, but are still stuck with the stigma of slavery and consequently being dehumanized. This is so because the whole process is built on contradiction and paradox; where the process of prestigma would waive the people toward pro Arab culture and Islam, the process of stigma would keep dismissing them on racial grounds. One can acquire a new culture in a relatively short time, but one can hardly change his/her colour. So, blackness is always taken as a stigmatic clue to slavery. It is very usual to hear a dark-skinned Sudanese assuring others that there are members of light-skinned colour in the family.

9. The Circular vs. the Linear Polarization:

It is clear that the model of ideological polarization is a circular one represented in a centre working hard to assimilate the margin, and a margin fighting hard to dismantle the centre. It tries to manipulate the realities of pluralism represented in both the middle and periphery; where the middle can be called *Sudano-Arab* as it consists of the Arabized Sudanese, the periphery can be called *Sudano-African* as it also consists of those who have their African languages and who have their homelands either in the North, South, East or West. Although it seems to be reduced into dual form, but the
circular polarization is rather pluralistic and not dualistic. The social arenas of the middle/centre and periphery/margin have their respective internal differentiations and strata. This makes the circular model of polarization qualified to manage situations of multiculturalism as in the case of the periphery/middle and the margin/centre alike. In the natural context of periphery vs. middle, the circular polarization is manifested in a dynamic and dialectical process of alliances between the individual entities of the periphery from one side and their countering entities of the middle and vice-versa. The cultural interrelations and the linguistic and ethnic boundaries will be the tools for this healthy ideological interplay and acculturation. In the unnatural case of centre vs. margin, it is the only mechanism that can effectively bring the different entities of the margin together against the already unified centre.

The process of centro-marginalization targets this reality through the mechanisms of stigmatization and prestigmatization. The centre poses to represent the middle and make it attractive by the processes of prestigmatization. On the other hand it lures the people from the periphery to join the membership of its high club through cultural re-production, and to rid them of the stigma of the relegated margin. The middle and periphery, Sudano-Arabism, and Sudano-Africanism, are living realities and there is nothing wrong with them. The bad side of the game is the process of centro-marginalization, where the middle will be turned into the centre of power and wealth, and the periphery turned into the margin which becomes more and more relegated everyday. In no way would the people of the middle be beneficiary of the process of centro-marginalization whose circles will get narrowing infinitively to end up with a handful of people who represent no body but themselves.

One may wonder how come that the people of Sudan have been living under the yoke of centro-marginalization for so long? The answer is that by being subject to the operating vehicles of stigma and stigma. The centre
has never posed as being a centre of wealth and power facing a margin; it is, rather, a bloc of free and noble people of Arab origin linearly divided from another bloc of slaves and degenerate people of African origin. By this tactic it not only neutralizes the people of the middle but also turns them into accomplice. When it comes to the people of the margin it neutralizes them by further linearly stratifying their stigmatization. According to the process of the stigma, the people of the margin are not equally stigmatized. It goes as follows below.

9.1. The Degree of Stigma:

The more black you are and the more African you are, the more stigmatized you become. The levels of stigma go from high to low degree like follows: African features (thick and broad nose and lips, and fuzzy short hair) - blackness – an African language- and lastly being a non-Muslim. The most stigmatized are those who combine the three degrees of stigma, like the majority of Southerners. The Africans of Nuba Mountains and Ingassana come immediately after the Southerners. Then come the peoples of Western Sudan regardless of their different tribal affiliations, and of whom the most stigmatized people are those who are originally from either Central or Western Bilād al-Sūdān, like the Fulani and Hausa etc. Then comes the Beja people of Eastern Sudan who, although light-skinned, have their own non-Arabic language and are very low-educated and can hardly speak fluently either standard or colloquial Arabic; furthermore, they are bedouins leading a life that is -according to the unjust evaluation of the centre- very backward at its best. The last to come are the Nubians in the North who are the least stigmatized for one main reason. The people of the Middle, generally speaking, are nothing but Arabized Nubians, with some survivals of Christian customs still manifested in their cultures. Nothing is wrong with the Nubians of the North except their twisted tongue, i.e. their language, which clearly betrays their African origin. In fact all the people under the stigma have their non-Arabic languages, or rut āna, i.e. the equally infamous,
colonial derogatory term ‘vernacular’. In Arabic the word *rut*āna means the language of the birds, and this shows how Sudanese African people are being dehumanized. The last of the Nubians to be completely Arabized, i.e. the Mahas of middle Sudan, now vehemently deny to have been of any *rut āna* ever; they claim to be of Aws and Khazraj, two antagonistically neighbouring tribes in ancient Arabia. One may wonder how come both of them? The fact is that only 100 years ago their elders used to speak the *rut āna*.

**9.1.1. The South: First Degree:**

The linear polarization works in a certain way so as to secure the neutralization of the less stigmatized groups by making them identify with the centre in its offensive against the most stigmatized, here the African Sudanese of the South. A line will be drawn so that the whole Sudanese people will be grouped on a side against the people of Southern Sudan who will be grouped on the other side. This is the linear demarcation of the North vs. the South which will eventually give way for the stereotype that all the people of the North are homogeneity ethnically, culturally, linguistically and religiously, which is not true. All the affinities that pull the people of the margin together, especially with those of the South, will be obliterated officially and unofficially whether in mass media or education. The word ‘slave’ will be synonymous with ‘southerner’. Deluded by the false prestigma thus bestowed on them, people from other areas of the margin will flamboyantly adopt the racial bigotry of the centre against the Southerners. Ironically some of them later shall be the spearheads of the movement of Arab nationalism in the Sudan.

**9.1.2. The Nuba and Ingassana: Via Media Second Class:**

Next in the stigma come the people of Nuba Mountains and Ingassana, or Funj region. The historical, ethnic and linguistic evidences that relate people of Nuba Mountains to their brethrens in the far North, i.e. the
Nubians are either obliterated or meekly mentioned when passed by. The argument goes that they are differentiated by the virtue of having different names that may confusingly sound similar: Nuba vs. Nubians, in Arabic: نُبَّاُي vs. نُبِي. The information pertaining to the ethno-linguistic relationship that ties them together can only be learnt in Post-Graduate studies and textbooks in some of the Sudanese University. To linearly relegate them even more, their region is never recognized in official documents as ‘Nuba Mountains’ all through the Egyptian-Turkish, Egyptian-British or national rule; it is dubbed as ‘South Kordofan’. To recognize the toponym, which is drawn from the ethnonym, might give a boost to the consciousness of their Nubian identity. Being blacks, with their own rutṣānas, legacy of slavery, paganism and Christianity, and finally being southerners of some northern Kordofan… that is enough to qualify them for the stigma along with the people of the South.

Just like the case of the Nuba, the people of the Funj region are also dubbed ‘Southern Blue Nile’ without ever recognising the real toponym which clearly relates them to the Funj Sultanate. The first tactic is to strip them from the truthful prestigma of being the people who founded the first Islamic State in the Sudan. Another derogatory name is to call them hamaj, literally meaning the barbarous. Being like the Nuba Mountains regarding the above-mentioned qualifications, i.e. being true Africans, they end up with the same degree of stigma. As they live in the background of the highly Islamized and Arabized middle area, hedged by their mountains and engulfed by almost 99% illiteracy, they have always maintained a low profile. Part of the tactic of relegation has been to leave them unbothered so as to be enveloped by oblivion. That was the case until they took to arms. Both regions of Nuba and Funj will be linearly relegated as via media regions to other greater regions of the stigma; the Funj with the South, and the Nuba with the West which will be dealt with below.
9.1.3. Al-Gharrāba: Third Degree:

A linear demarcation that discriminates the African peoples of Western Sudan is conveniently made when there is need to target them with the process of the stigma. They are labelled ‘al-Gharrāba’, i.e. the ‘Westerners’. But the ‘Westerners’ are not linearly countered by the ‘Easterners’; they are rather countered by ‘awlād al-bah ar’ i.e. the ‘riverain people’ which equates with another term heavily loaded with the ideology of power that is ‘awlād al-balad’, i.e. the ‘people or masters of the country’, which is also equated with ‘awlād al-‘Arab’, i.e. the ‘Arab people’. Although living on the banks of the Nile, the Shilluk, Nuer, Dinka and Funj have not merited the description of ‘awlād al-bah ar’; the term is a prestigma, and they are stigma. The Gharrāba themselves are linearly demarcated: the Gharrāba who are indigenous Sudanese like the Fur, Daju etc.; and the Gharrāba who are not indigenous Sudanese, i.e. those who have originally migrated from Central and or Western Bilād al-Sūdān, such as the Fulani, Hausa etc. The latter group are the most stigmatized, simply because originally they are immigrants, as if the Arabs are indigenous Sudanese. Historically, the Fulani began settling in the Sudan before the Arabs.

9.1.4. The Beja and Nubians: not yet prestigma:

The people of the East (the Beja) and the North (the Nubians) come last as they, colour-wise, do not look different from the prestigmatized people of the middle. As the battle against the most stigmatized groups mentioned above has not been completely won yet, the grilling escalation of the stigma against the Beja and the Nubians is at bay, at least for the moment. Their relegation is confined to only two aspects, the language (rut āna or twisted tongue, or more derisively ‘lisān aghlaf’ i.e. ‘uncircumcised tongue’) and development. The chain of derogatory names is also endless, such as ‘barābra’ i.e. barbarous, for the Nubians.
In a situation similar to that of the Funj, the Beja will be left to perish unnoticeably from poverty and disease in their secluded hills. To add to their misery and stigma, a considerable migration of the *Gharrāba*- indigenous and non-indigenous as well- came and settled with them. Hedged by the Sahara at their Nile strip, the underdeveloped Nubians underwent regular migrations to the urban areas of the centre where they would have greatly been identified with the stigma if it were not for their *twisted* tongue. The ones who have succeeded in ridding themselves of this stigma were assimilated in the prestige. As they are the least to be stigmatized, they are also the last to be disillusioned.

10. Obscurantism and Deception:

The centre has so far managed to manipulate the margin by the tactic of obscurantism and deception. The reality of centro-marginalization was obscured by the linear polarization lest that the marginalized groups identify with each other and achieve unity in their struggle against it. Such identification would have been characterized with circular polarization: the marginalized groups in the North, South, West and East united together in a circle against the centre. (A besieged castle, however strongly fortified, is doomed). Each of the marginalized groups has led a noble struggle against this diabolical machine of relegation within its own realm, but, thanks to the tactic of obscurantism and deception, the possibility of orchestrating their efforts has dawned on them very late, but not too late, however. In this linear way of dividing people, the centre has managed to keep the only force that could have caused its own demise under control, i.e. the circularly unified margin. But what for? To achieve what at the end? To achieve the ‘big failure’ of relegating the whole Sudan into a marginal Arab State. This is the ultimate goal that centro-marginalization can achieve as it will unfold later.
10.1. The Funj Sultanate:

The process of centro-marginalization has been going on for the last 500 years without ever claiming ultimate success. Since the Funj Sultanate, all through the successive regimes up the present, Sudan has been run in accordance with this process. The Funj people who stuck to their African identity have ended into marginalization and total dereliction; The Funj people who surrendered themselves to the process of cultural re-production have ended in the ‘nothingness’ of assimilation. We know nothing about them. In all cases they have not come out the same like their apical father, ‘Amāra Dungus, who was a black African with a non-Arabic language.

10.2. The Egyptian-Turkish Colonial Rule:

The infamous Egyptian-Turkish colonial rule invaded the Sudan with its shamelessly declared objective of enslaving its people and robbing what was available of its wealth. Nothing could have fitted more perfectly in the grooves of centro-marginalization with its processes of the stigma vs. prestige. In all contemporary Sudanese educational curricula, this rule has never been dubbed as ‘colonial’. The fact that this infamous rule committed in its slavery raids the worst crimes in all our history against peaceful Sudanese people is taught in a manner-of-fact way without any sense of national hurt. The lines are drawn very clearly: those who identify with the slaver are not expected to feel hurt; those who identify with the slave will have their stomach churned with agony, and their pride hurt with humiliation. The question: where does the State stand here? This shows how that infamous rule did follow the channelled groove of centro-marginalization.

10.3. The Mahdia Revolution:

The Mahdia, in essence, was a revolution of the marginalized people of Sudan against the centre which was occupied by the Egyptian-Turkish colonial rule and its accomplices of Arabized Sudanese. Furthermore, it was
a revolution where the marginalized forces were brought together with people of the middle. In this respect it was a national revolution and Muh$ammad Ah$mad al-Mahdi was a forerunner of Sudanese nationalism which will take its shape a few decades later. Facing a foreign ruler was the catalyst for the orchestration of national struggle. However, being entrapped in an Islamic discourse of fantasy that proved to be very useful in mobilizing people to revolt, the Mahdia State had no choice but to run in the same groove of centro-marginalization. Where the revolution was national, the State came to be of extremely central nature; it tried to physically push the people of the margin into the centre by enforcing migration from the country to the Capital, Umdorman, under different pretexts. The perspective for national integration or ‘nationalism’ consequently came to be the “melting pot”. The Mahdi’s Khalīfa, himself of a Fulani origin co-opted by Baqqāra Arabs according to certain sources, showed a Turkish kind of ruthlessness in ruling his subjects; not only did the Sudano-Africans moaned under the yoke of his despotism, but also other strata of Sudano-Arabs, especially the historically privileged riverain Arabized stratum. Slavery was once again a State-supported practice. The Mahdia’s tragic scenario of fanaticism, despotism and slavery will be repeated in Sudan a century later with its impact proportionate according to the level and degree of stigma.

10.4. The British-Egyptian Colonial Rule:

The British-Egyptian Colonial rule came with its motto being “divide to rule”, which properly fits in the linear polarization model. Where it showed a relative leniency in dealing with the resistance made by the centre, especially the riverain Arabized Sudanese, it was extremely savage and merciless in crushing the resistance of the peoples of the margin, especially in Nuba Mountains and Southern Sudan in what is known as the Pacification Wars. We still know very little of the crimes committed there as no one dared raise the issue. In the national rule time no one bothered. The heroic resistance of the people of Southern Sudan, Nuba Mountains and Dar Fur
have always been absent in our national education curricula. The British-Egyptian rule manipulated two virtues and almost turned them into vices; academia and Christianity. In its pretension to protect the Southerners from being enslaved by the Northerners, it fell fittingly in the groove of centromarginalization and its model of linear polarization.

The first linear division they applied was to separate Dar Fur from the rest of the Sudan. In the Mahdia time the riverain prestigma was relegated in favour of the Arabized people of Western Sudan in general and the Baggāra Arabs in particular whose migration to the middle Sudan was a State policy. Against such an invasion the prestigma engendered a host of highly discursive and prestigmatic terms such as ‘awlād al-bah ar’ who are ‘awlād al-‘Arab’ who are also ‘awlād al-balad’, i.e. masters of the country. On the other hand the people from Western Sudan, regardless of whether they are Baggāra or Fur, were derogatorily dubbed in a wholesale manner as ‘awlād al-Gharib’. However, those people or ‘awlād al-Gharib’, have succeeded in enforcing themselves into the high club of the prestigma. Thenceforward it will be a model followed on an individual scale by people from Western Sudan to penetrate the prestigma of the centre by various tactics such as co-opting and marriage. This tension has not yet come at bay. It was this tension that colonial British wanted to manipulate. By then al-Sult ān ‘Ali Dīnār had succeeded in restoring the kingdom of the Kunjāra. The British plan was to let him keep his self-assumed monarchy in order to render him into a puppet. They will prove to be greatly mistaken in that.

Failing in that, they turned their attention to the South. The British infamous policy of the “Closed Districts” was a linear demarcation that consolidated the stereotype of South vs. North. It pretended of abolishing slavery, but could tolerate it in what it depicted as the North. That was in the aftermath of the disillusion of the British regarding the stance of the Southern Sudanese in their army. In tune with the processes of the stigma and prestigma, the British began a decade ago dismantling what was known
as the Sudanese Battalions which consisted mainly of black Southern Sudanese with ex-slave backgrounds, and slowly replaced them with what was believed by the prestige of the centre as people of ‘noble’ origin. By the time the British left, the soldiers were still mostly jet-black Sudanese, but not the officers; they were replaced by recruits from ‘awlād al-gabāyil’ or ‘awlād al-balad’, the same officers who will lead another ‘Pacification War’ in Southern Sudan and ravage it. If the black Sudanese officers were kept, the future of the Sudan would have been different. Completely detribalized from their respective black peoples but still keeping their jet-black colour, they were let down by the British and Egyptians alike to be stigmatized by the centre. The British and Egyptians could not pretend to be unaware of what had become of those people who helped them in their victory over the State of the Khalīfa. To make them utterly vulnerable, they were gradually and systematically stripped from the only prestige and power left to them, i.e. their percentage in the Army officers. They have kept bearing the cross of the stigma, even though they were completely assimilated in the Islamo-Arab culture of the centre. Assimilation by nature means that some thing held as inferior is accepted into what is held as superior. The function of this process is not in any way an exercise of social equality. On the contrary it means to facilitate the superiority and stigma by providing it with what can be held as inferior and stigma.

11. Independence: Who is Sudanese?

The national rule will not only run smoothly in the groove of linear polarization, but will institutionalize it by law. The law held any Sudanese as a suspect foreigner until he/she proves that he/she is a Sudanese. The Sudanese people will be the first people in the world to hold inside their own country official documents to prove that they are Sudanese and not foreigners. The States all over the World take the population in its generality as to be nationals, and then tend to control the foreigners who are relatively very few. This is common sense: if you have a bushel of peas mixed up in a
sack of broad beans, you sort them out by picking up the peas from the broad beans. The successive governments of post-Independence did exactly the opposite; they began picking up the Sudanese inside the country and leaving back the foreigners. Until now, it is far less than 10 millions who have proved that they are Sudanese in this linear demarcation way of nationality. This strange nationality law is nothing but a tactic of obscurantism and a tool of deception and alienation. What is the criterion adopted by the successive governments for nationality in the censuses undertaken since Independence? According to the last one undertaken in the 1990s, a figure of at least 26 million is given for the total population of Sudan. These are two systems that defeat each other, but simultaneously adopted for a reason. According to this law, all the marginalized Sudanese are officially not considered as Sudanese until they prove otherwise.

The linear significance of the law in classifying the people as stigma vs. prestigma becomes clearer as its first victims are always those whose ancestors were immigrants, but not the so called Arabs. In the mid 1970s a Libyan-backed movement of armed Sudanese opposition broke into Khartoum with the intention of toppling the Regime. After being routed out, it was dubbed by the Regime as the movement of the “Mercenary Foreigners”. Sudan TV made live interviews with people in the streets of Khartoum to show to the World that they were really mercenaries and foreigners from the public’s point of view. The standard question was as follows: “How did you know that they were foreigners?” The average answer was that: “They were blacks and did not speak Arabic”. The people were not saying this because of siding with the Regime. By simply belonging to the centre culturally and socially, they were telling the truth as they perceive of it. On the other hand the government was well aware of this situation and was making use of it.
11.1. The *Mondukuru* Intellectuals:

With the rise of the movement of the Graduates of Intermediary schools and Gordon Memorial College (later Khartoum University), an intellectual movement also came into being. Until long after Independence, the intellectuals of that time did not show in their writings an awareness of any African depth regarding their own Sudanese identity. There are very few exceptions which are related in a way or another with the margin. The multi-ethnic, multi-linguistic and multi-cultural Sudan of today, which is very ancient, does not show in the writings of those intellectuals who will come later to take over from the colonial rule.

The Sudan is reflected in the anthem of the Graduates Congress, which is composed in standard Arabic by a Nubian who actually began learning the language in school, in a verse that reads: “We are a nation whose origin goes back to the Arabs”. They took for granted the Arabized middle as representing the whole of Sudan. They would have been honoured with fairness, if they had limited the frontiers of their Sudan to that only. But they also took it for granted to rule the Arabized middle Sudan and the Africanized peripheral Sudan as well without acknowledging Africanism as the counter component in Sudanese identity. Leave the West, leave the East, and forget about the North whose intellectuals excelled themselves in the art of complicity, what about the South? How did they plan to deal with the South?

A few years before Independence, the leaders of the South, collected in a conference in Juba, decided with profound African wisdom that they did not want separation; they did that knowing that it is the *Mondukuru* (the Arabized Sudanese) who was going to rule them. Where they came to Independence clean of any grievances of the past, the *Mondukuru* did not reflect for a moment on what they are going to do. The *Mondukuru* simply operated the machine of stigma, prestigma, and linear polarization into full throttle. First the linear demarcation was set between the North (the bloc of
the free and noble Arab people) and the South (the bloc of the slaves and degenerate African people).

The people from the margin other than the South were left to make their choice between these two categories only. Subject to centuries of relegation and to a biased educational system for more than 100 years, the intellectuals of other marginalized people were left in fact with only one option if they were ordained to fare well in that unjust time: ideological complicity with the centre. The game was very simple: regardless of your marginal ethnic background, which in other linear demarcations may fall into the stigma, if you identify with today’s polarization which only stigmatizes the people of the South, and if you are ready to loyally serve the cause of hegemony which may alienate you from your own people, then you shall be rewarded culturally by being recognized as part of the prestigma, and materially by wealth and power.

This is how all those who have ruled modern Sudan are originally from marginalized groups, with many of them ironically of Fulani background, one of the most stigmatized groups. Such people will be used as tools of obscurantism, deception and oppression: in certain contexts their true backgrounds will be revealed as a proof that the claimed pro-Arab bias is not true; in other contexts of clashes they are used as cat’s paw by assigning to them the mission of subduing their own people. Thus posing as representing the prestigma, they excel themselves and the others in crushing the stigmatized margin. In this diabolical game, Islam is being manipulated as the legal ticket for crossing the bridge. Where does this leave the Non-Muslim Southerners? Not fit even for ideological complicity, there is only one venue of vice left for them to follow when dealing with the Mondukuru: corruption.
11.2. The Emergence of Sudanese Political Right:

Out of the centre in general and this intellectual class in particular have come the political parties that are generally active in the whole Sudan with varying degrees, but not in the South. We classify them here as the real Sudanese Political Right as they all belong ideologically to the centre, though they are classically taken to be either Right or Left. It is this Political Right that has ruled the Sudan since Independence up to the present; it is this Political Right which should be held responsible for the failure in managing the crisis of national integration and progress. Their rule of the country will shift alternately from elected governments to military regimes. In a reality of multi-culturalism they will have only one programme which is mono-culturalism: Islamo-Arabization. The Sudanese political Right consists of Islamic organizations, whether sectarian or fundamentalist, Arab nationalist movement organizations and the Arabized Sudanese in general; the latter group feels very awkward when identified as African merely for speaking Arabic language as a mother tongue. Most of the Sudanese Marxists fall in the last-mentioned category. The racial equality, which is vehemently adhered to in Islam, and the appeal of Marxism of being above culture and race are manipulated by the stigma in the process of assimilation.

In the short democratic periods the low profile endeavours of the margin to fight peacefully for their rights are manipulated by the stigma machine for counter-mobilization by portraying these endeavours as targetting the existence of Islam and Arabism in Sudan. In democratic times monoculturalism becomes appallingly indefensible; the governments that follow it usually become laughing stock with a Guinness record of failure. The propaganda machine of the stigma, including Radio and TV which are owned by the State, nurtures a hateful grudge against the growing voice of the margin. When it is time for the elected government to go, the military regime will come to push back the margin into the status of stigma under gun point. The military regime will carry out the programme of mono-
culturalism to its extreme thus accomplishing the dirty part of the job. Furthermore, it relieves the prestigma from accountability for the failure of its elected government; the same prestigma which will immediately assume the role of opposition to the military regime. When the season of democracy comes the same politicians of the prestigma will come back as heroes- not failures- to carry out the failing and oppressive programme of mono-culturalism from where the military regime left it ... and so on. The democratic/military alternation is in fact a process for exorcising the failure on one side and realizing achievement with heavy-handedness on the other side.

In a context of centro-marginalization and mono-culturalism democracy is reduced to a matter of technical procedure that lacks in essence the representation of people. Elections have never been conceived by the people as their own power exercised on a higher level of delegation. It has been taken by them as a political game where the prestigmatic politicians assume low profile posture until they are elected whereby they resume their aloof and high profiles.

11.3. The Mondukuru Governments of the Right:

Since Independence, Islamization and Arabicization have been shared in common by the successive governments as State-dictated policies. Taking the middle of Sudan as representing the whole country prompted this. The Post-Independence governments dealt with the Sudan as consisting of (a) the noble Arabs of the middle, (b) the Muslim Africans [with possible Arab blood] in the periphery who are supposed to undergo very quickly the process of Arabization so as to be honoured with Arabism, and (c) the slaves [those who have not yet undone their black Africanism with Islam and a drop of noble Arab blood] who have no place so far in the bench of power. If allowed, the prestigma would have created an institutional apartheid State.

Being the first Sub-Saharan country (i.e. black African) to achieve
independence, Sudan was thought by many African liberation movements to lead the struggle against colonialism. Its flag of independence which consisted of the three horizontal colours of yellow (desert), green (jungle) and blue (Nile) will be reverenced by black peoples as the flag of freedom; later when they respectively achieve independence all their flags will more or less be composed of these colours. But Sudan turned its back to black Africa and ran to the Arabs so as to be recognized as an Arab nation. Declined by some Arab States, its membership might have not been accepted if it were not for Egypt to which Sudan is the strategic backyard. This prompted an African liberation movement veteran to say: “Instead of being the best Africans, the Sudanese people have chosen with their own free will to be the worst Arabs”. Later, under May Regime (led by an Arab nationalist Nubian sic) Sudan dropped the flag of freedom for a typical Arab-design flag. And this shows how the ultimate goal of the processes of centro-marginalization is to marginalize Sudan, and Sudanese people, as an Arab State.

The successive national governments have taken to the tactic of corrupting the Southern politicians by first preferring to deal with the corrupt ones, and later by explicitly encouraging others to follow suit by closing the official eyes on what has come to be known in Sudanese politics as Southern-style corruption: a convoy of 200 brand-new government vehicles assigned to the South will mysteriously vanish en route. The Southern intellectuals were so vulnerable to temptation. In the whole tribe only one or two were to be found of high education, and those usually live in the centre as there is no place for them in the village and as the government to which they want to represent their people is centrally limited to the Capital. Having some of its sons as ministers, Parliament member or big government official is considered as a great honour for all the tribes of Sudan; the more marginalized the tribe, the more important this becomes.

In the case of Southern intellectuals it is understandably much more important. The residential compound of a Southern intellectual in Khartoum
might be housing most of the tribe people who happen to be in the Capital for medical treatment, education or any other service. People of the prestigma in Khartoum occasionally express their astonishment of how the Southerners cram in one house like that, as if it is to their liking they are living in that way. It is the intellectual’s responsibility to have them all fed, clothed and looked after. With what? His salary? It begins by going to his government seniors complaining about difficulties of life like any other government official, and there the Mondukuru Government is waiting for him with the bait to get him hooked. Those who have already been hooked may lose their bashfulness in the course of time and become bolder as to bargain a price. A famous Mondukuru Statesman, who originally belonged to a marginalized group, commented upon such a case by saying: “Would he [the Southern intellectual] merit this price if a bell was rung on him?” And this is how we have the so called ‘Southern politicians of all governments’, bought with money. Isn’t it slavery?

12. **A Linear Civil War and a Linear Peace:**

In the three years of Self-Rule that preceded independence, the Southern politicians made it clear that they wanted the South to be ruled by its own people in whatever way possible, whether federacy, confederacy or self-rule. Too excited to reflect on what they were saying in their eagerness to take over from the colonial ruler, the North-Mondukuru politicians generously made promises to this effect. Holding the Southerners generally in the status of slaves, they naturally took the Southern politicians lightly with an evil intention of flatly dishonouring these promises. Overnight the Southerners discovered that independence meant to them, at least, a change from master to another, from foreign master to an indigenous master. But then it is too much for a slave to have his fellow-slave freed and then made master on him. The conflict will be triggered by what was then called the Sudanization of government senior posts in which the Southerners were not only generally disqualified, but even the few ones qualified were
conspiratorially removed away from the milieu of their influence, i.e. the South. To further strip the South from any potential power, the Mondukuru came up with a plot to disperse the Southern soldiers in the Army in different parts of the country away from the South. To enter the phase of independence with such weakness meant that the Southerners will be doomed for ever. One year before independence they took to arms; having their just demand of self-rule declined by the Mondukuru, now they will fight for the separation of the South from the North. The Mondukuru civilians living in the South were chased out and a mass killing of the unfortunate who could not make it took place, something the Mondukuru intellectuals will never forgive. Whenever the killings of the South, which are in millions, are mentioned, the unjust killing of those handful Mondukuru civilians will also be mentioned as a balance.

12.1. Separatism and the Emergence of Sudanese Political Left:

By fighting for the separation of the South from the historical Sudan, the separatist Southerners emerged as representing the real Sudanese Political Left. From now on the struggle of the marginalized groups will always be triggered off with the extreme leftist goal of separation clearly expressed in their slogans and manifestos. Although naturally borne of the conflicting ideologies of Africanism vs. Arabism and the processes of centro-marginalization, the formations of the Political Left and the Political Right were enhance by the linear polarization. It will take a few years for the Political Middle to emerge and a long time to be recognized as so.

For many factors beyond the control of the Southerners the civil war came out based on the same linear polarization, South vs. North. The colonial rule did not only obscure the processes of centro-marginalization, but further it reinforced it by adopting the linear polarization in its policies. For instance, in what it took to be the North, the educational system was
designed in a way that would only enhance the Islamo-Arab ideology of dominance and assimilation. Where it delayed the peripheral Sudano-African people of raising their consciousness of their respective identities regarding the imminently looming marginalization, it accelerated the rate of their assimilation in the dominant culture. This has made their intellectuals, who were supposed to represent their people, take side with the centre, thus alienating themselves from their own people. Betrayed by both the colonial British who boasted of protecting them and by the Mondukuru politicians of Khartoum who dishonoured their promises, and having the rest of the Sudan menacingly posing as an Arab entity, the Southerners were left with no choice but to mobilize the Africanism of the South to linearly counter the Arabism of the North.

The Sudanese army, the same army that the colonial British began centralizing three decades ago, will systematically ravage the South. Alternately, either elected governments or military regimes will run Sudan with one goal regarding the South: to subjugate it. Where the role of the former is to deceptively kiss the South on one cheek to lure it into a peace that does not solve its problems, the role of the latter is to heavy-handedly slab it on the other cheek. It is very rare for any one of us not to have come across an ex-soldier who has stories to tell about the nasty atrocities committed by the army in the South in the period 1956-1970. We may never know all of them as the victims are long since dead and the culprits have kept silent. The Sudanese army must come clean on this issue. As said above, centrist scholars always mention the mass killings of Mondukuru with which the rebellions initiated their civil war as a balance of the atrocities committed by the army of Khartoum governments. Without condoning with their killing, this can be true by only rationalizing that the handful casualties of Mondukuru are equal to limitless casualties of Southerners.
12.2. A Peace to take a Breath:

In 1972 simply granting the South the self-rule they demanded 17 years ago successfully brokered a peace. A year later a peace accord was signed according to which the Southerners put down their arms and came with a clean heart to only find the old system of stigma waiting for them. What amazes in the history of racial bigotry, prejudice and intimidation in Sudan is how the victim is whole-heartedly ready to forgive, and how the aloof culprit is indignantly rejecting to be forgiven. At last the guerrilla fighters joined the same army they were fighting and their leaders enjoyed the high echelon of government posts they had been declined. A few years later a President whose day deeds never honoured his night speech will dishonour the peace accord.

Administratively the South was divided into three districts with Supreme Council. By establishing the whole peace process of rehabilitation of the South on the linear polarization of the Sudan, with its parameters of centro-marginalization and the vehicles of stigma vs. prestigma, the Southerners came out to be completely identified with the North. The South began forming its own prestigma which was represented in the biggest and strongest tribe, i.e. the Dinka. This consequently led to the formation of a Southern centre with its own margin. The Southerners who fought the dominance of the Mondukuru for 17 years could have not tolerated the dominance of their Dinka Brethrens. A tendency to pull out from this Dinka centre surfaced to be immediately picked up by the big centre in Khartoum with the evil intention of scrapping the whole peace accord. The three districts were nominally promoted into fully autonomous regions which practically turned the peace accord into redundancy. These regions did not survive for long; otherwise they would have infinitively undergone further linear segmentations. This is because the linear polarization can only manage dualistic situations but not pluralistic situations. The South is a pluralistic chromosome of Sudan, and Sudan is a pluralistic chromosome of
Africa. If applied in a pluralistic context, the linear polarization will push it into dualism in order to deal with it.

12.4. Al-D i‘een: the Massacre, Holocaust and Slavery:

The ideological polarization of centro-marginalization will reach its zenith when people who have a lot to share together would come after each other; when the prestigma would no more tolerate the stigma and therefore would manipulate its own prestigmatic periphery as cat’s paw to do the dirty job of physically eliminating the stigma. And that is how the Baggāra Arabs came to commit the worst bunch of crimes in Sudan’s contemporary history.

The Baggāra tribes in Kordufan and Dar Fur are nomadic Arabs who have been greatly influenced by the Nilotic tribes, especially the Dinka, from whom they have taken the cows for livestock and the colour of blackness. The word “Baggāra” is a plural adjective in Sudanese colloquial Arabic derived from the word “cow”. On the other hand, they have also influenced the Nilotics. Highly conscious of their Arab identity they are naturally susceptible to prestigmatic orientations, but they are not in any way prestigma. A bedouin Arab is never considered a prestigma even in pre-Islamic Arabia. However such orientations were triggered off in an anti-Dinka direction for the first time during the Egyptian-Turkish rule and the Mahdia as the Baggāra were drawn into the vice of slavery. Although the rift between the Baggāra and the Dinka had already happened during the British-Egyptian rule, they were, however, kept at bay by the infamous policy of pacification, i.e. crushing the people in order to impose stability. By the time the prestigma assumed the national rule immediately before independence, the Southerners declared their first civil war. The manipulation of the Baggāra Arabs by the prestigma as cat’s paw has also begun. The dirtiest and most gruesome part of the game will be assigned to them to undertake; later prestigmatic intellectuals can easily furnish excuses by portraying them as savage and wildly uncontrollable bedouins. With the intensification of the civil war, the Dinka and Baggāra Arabs, like Kane and
Able, found themselves going after each other.

By 1987 the prestigmatic elected government engendered the infamous Popular Defence Forces as a pretext for officially arming the Baggāra Arabs to fight the Southerners, in this case the Dinka who were taken for granted to be SPLM/SPLA. The defence minister was an army general from the Baggāra Arabs. Until then the hostility between the two sides was weakened by the history-long interrelationship. Thousands of Dinka who fled the war zone came and lived with the Baggāra. It is very rare for a Dinka family not to have an inter-marriage relation with another Baggāra family and vice-versa. In a certain village called al-D i’een in Southern Dar fur more than 6,000 Dinka people were peacefully taking refuge and living with the Baggāra.

Armed in this way, the marauding Baggāra squads of PDF began making incursions into the south raiding the Dinka villages that naturally sought help from SPLM/SPLA. The latter came to the rescue with a vendetta. In all aspects the Baggāra Arabs were not an equal to SPLA. They began licking defeat after defeat. This was good news to the prestige as it meant that the Baggāra are getting too deeply involved in the conflict that reconciliation with the Dinka (the Southerners i.e. SPLM/SPLA) is becoming far-reaching. The prestige was driven too far away with its own vanity to sensibly feel the incumbency of saving the Baggāra the degradation of this manipulation. The fact was that not only were the Dinka being victimized but also the chivalrous Baggāra as well. With the increase of their defeats, the Baggāra began nursing deep hatred towards the Dinka in general. A certain bitter defeat that befell them at the moment when they thought themselves victorious led the Baggāra to direct their attention to the peaceful Dinka who were living with them at al-D i’een on whom they sought to take revenge, pouring the venom of their hatred.

In one day at least 1,000 Dinka were massacred, 4,000 were burned alive, and the survivors- around 1,000- were enslaved. The massacre began
early in the day. At first the bewildered Dinka did not believe what was going on. When the reality dawned on them, they fled into the houses of their hosts who were their attackers at the same time. They were dragged from their feet like animals to be butchered outside the houses. The Dinka took refuge in the Church; there they were killed along with the priest. They ran and took refuge inside the Police station which was part of the railway station, but, alas, the Police turned to be an accomplice. They were killed there also. Whether in good or bad faith- as it does not matter- they were ill-advised to take refuge in the empty carriages of a standing freight train so they can be taken away from al-D i’een. With the trustfulness of totally vulnerable and helpless people they hurriedly obeyed. Once crammed inside, they were locked from outside. Caged in like animals they saw with their own eyes barrels full of diesel being rolled toward them. They were burnt alive, all of them. Only then, with the barbecue smell of that holocaust, did the Baggāra come to their senses. The survivals were so fortunate that they were only enslaved. Slavery was the common sense of that doomed day.

A booklet hurriedly prepared by two brave scholars who pumped on al-D i’een by accident the day next to the massacre, appeared with understandably many academic loopholes. The first reaction of the government was condemning the booklet and meekly denying the incident, especially the part relating to slavery. The prestigmatic intellectuals, the enlightened ones particularly, accepted the fact that that was slavery, but they classified it as African traditional slavery confined to tribalism. Then they turned their full attention to the academic misfit of the booklet in order to disqualify the credibility of the whole case. Where the massacre merited their noble attention, the least to be discussed, however, was the holocaust. The atmosphere became very tense with the outside world awakening to the shocking realities in Sudan. While snarling at any one who dared discuss the massacre, holocaust or the enslaving of the survivals from a point of view that did not agree with its own, the government declared the formation of fact-gathering committee. In Sudan it is known that if you want to kill out a
case, form a committee for it. Discussing the events was discouraged as far as the committee was doing its work. Fortunately the coup of June 1989 took place. The elected government was spared the day of reckoning. The junta took from where the elected government left; recruitment for Popular Defence Forces was generalized in an attempt to militarize the whole society in order to get it stuck with the war in the same way as the Baggāra so they can also nurture hatred against SPLM/SPLA. Islam and Arabism were abused as never before. Militarizing children was adopted in the repercussions of PDF. In the period 1989-1999 only God knows how many D i’eens took place.

In its reaction to the deterioration of the conditions of human rights in the Sudan, and the reinstatement of the institution of slavery, the West showed an equal evilness; as if drawn to its past, it joined in trafficking in slaves, with hard currency of course. A British woman with a prestigmatic title and colonial experience in slavery began buying slaves from Baggāra Arabs with the naïve intention of freeing them. With the prices of slaves rocketing up in hard currency, trafficking increased as slavery -thanks to the British prestigma- proved to be more lucrative than many other businesses. Far from being concerned with the problem and the ways to solve it or at least help the victims, the West was keen on demonizing the Arabs, defaming Islam and feeding its ever scandal-monger press. The self-interested West was settling its own accounts with the Arabs and Islam. Both the West and the Arabs have really ravaged Sudan, the former by its manipulation of democracy, and the latter by its manipulation of Islam.

After committing the massacre of al-D i’een, the Baggāra Arabs expected that atrocity to be considered as sanguinary rites of initiation for their acceptance into the institution of the prestigma. Contrarily they were even more stigmatized by the centre and were dubbed as representing a barbarous Arab stock; if you accept to do a dirty job, then of dirtiness you smell and like a dirty thing you are thrown away by the same people for
whom you did the dirty job. Desperately trying to stick with the prestigma, and as a last resort, the Baggāra desperadoes went to the extremity of declaring an extremely right organization named Quraysh, after the tribe of Prophet Muhammad. Highly anti-African releases, fortunately not more than three, were dispatched bearing the numbering “Quraysh One”, “Quraysh Two” etc. The only way that would have qualified the Baggāra to assume a prestigmatic leading role was to drag the prestigma into this kind of horrible massacres and holocaust. Their paradox is that the Baggāra Arabs generally speaking are descendants of the tribes of Juhayna and/or Rabī‘a, but not in any way of the prestigmatic tribe of Quraysh.

For such a vanity a chivalrous African-Arab tribe has turned itself into a laughing-stock ... to whom, but to the same prestigma.

13. Sudanese Nationalism: A Consciousness in the Making:

Being multi-ethnic, multi-cultural and multi-religious, Sudan has posed a challenge regarding nation-building and national integration. Until the 20th century, the question of national integration was answered by assimilation. Although the Declaration of the Human Rights goes back to time of the French revolution, the right to preserve one’s language and identity as part of the package of human rights has been recognized very late. Immediately after the French revolution minority languages had been systematically turned into extinct by the State in its pursuit to assimilate the whole population into French language and culture.

The ancient Sudan was multi-lingual, although various languages in different periods were presumably supported by the State and probably held as lingua franca. As shown above, the languages, consequently their speakers, are much related to each other. The ethno-linguistic pluralism has prevailed up to the present. The spirit of this age is cultural and linguistic rights, the violation of which will raise more problems than might be thought
to solve. In this regard a consciousness of Sudanese nationalism has come into shape but has not yet crystallized in a well-defined concept; so far the public and scholars use the term ‘Sudanese Nationalism’ in a loose manner. Arab nationalists do not tolerate the term used in this sense as it contradicts with the Arabism of Sudan. Officially Sudan is an Arab State, but only culturally are its Arabized people recognized as Arabs.

13.1. The Emergence of Modern Sudan:

The Funj Sultanate dates the modern Sudan, which is characterized by Islam and Arabic language along with its very old cultural pluralism. What characterizes that Sultanate is the fact that it was a secular State even though it strongly propagated Islam and Arabism. The religious institution represented by the Sufi sects was an ally of the State but not incorporated in it. As the case in African civilizations, there was no division between the State and religion in ancient Sudan. The monarch was a principal figure in the religious institution. In Christian Nubia many kings were bishops and vice-versa. But in the Funj Sultanate the two institutions are distinctly separate.

The Funj Sultanate appeared in the time when the Ottoman Empire was expanding. Besides being the language of the State and science, Arabic was more or less the lingua franca in many parts of the Islamic world. Considering the encapsulation of the faltering Christian kingdoms, the pro-Arabic, pro-Islamic sultanate was a breakthrough; it opened the country to outside world and maintained the history-long continuum of traditional federacy of the ethnic groups. Islam and Arabism were the new tools of the ideology of the State. ‘Abdu Allah Jammā‘ and ‘Amāra Dungus were the founders of modern day Sudan. They are also the forerunners of the “Melting Pot” model of Sudanese nationalism, i.e. the process of assimilation. That was the only way perceived of nation making, so far.
13.2. Anti-Colonial Traditional Nationalism:

The Sudanese people nurtured a deep resentment toward the Egyptian-Turkish colonial rule. Beside the ruthless savageness that characterized it, the Sudanese prestigma mainly resented that rule because it had turned them into a kind of second class within the strata of the prestigma. The people of the margin resented it not only for slavery and savageness, but because it showed the same values of the prestigma as a result of adopting the centro-marginalization process. Following the African model of anti-colonial revolution where religious mobilization is vitally involved, the Sudanese revolution also came with an appealing Islamic discourse represented in the Mahdia. Being nationalist in nature, the fact that both the Egyptians and the Turks were Muslims did not raise any contradiction regarding the religious mobilization; the employment of non-Muslims as governors’ aides was practically used as a catalyst. Although basically rallied by people from the margin, the revolution succeeded in bringing together both the prestigma and the stigma as they were both mobilized against the foreign colonial rule. However, the Mahdia State will end up siding completely with the prestigma, thus jeopardizing the nationalist potentials of the revolution to the brink of disintegrating the country. Later this will cause many people to vindictively ally with the invading army of British-Egyptian colonialism.

Where the revolution was nationalist, the State came out to be prestigmatically central. However, the Mahdi is rightfully a forerunner of Sudanese nationalism. From then on the Mahdia revolution will be an aspiration for Islamo-Arab movements in the Sudan.

Losing the whole Sudan to the Mahdia revolution, the Egyptian-Turkish colonial rule managed to keep the Red Sea port of Suakin. It could have easily maintained the whole Eastern region if it were not for ‘Uthmān Digna, one of the greatest national heroes in Sudanese history. Led by him, the chivalrous Beja people have succeeded in keeping their region as part of this
country as it has always been. If it were not for them, that region could have been turned into an Ottoman littoral state. After the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire, such a state with such a strategic position could have changed the picture of the Red Sea region. The European colonial forces could have not missed that opportunity. The Beja people would have been the first victims of this state. All through their history they have been related and involved in hinterland geopolitics. Although having the entire Red Sea coast as part of their region, they have never been known as marine-cultured.

After the fall of the Meroitic kingdom in the 5th century AD, and before the emergence of the Christian Nubian Kingdoms, many kinglets prevailed in the Nile strip from Meroe down to Asuan. Military lords or generals who were Beja ruled them. The colloquial Sudanese Arabic is greatly influenced by Bedaweyit, the Beja language. As it is expected from the Beja to be nationalist, it is also expected from the prestigma not to give them this credit. The role of ‘Uthmān Digna is confined to his position as a Mahdia general only, and not without hints of his failure to capture Suakin. It does not make sense for the Beja who are historically known as Khatmiyya followers to relentlessly fight for the Mahdia state while the Khatmiyya leading Shaykh escaped the country to live in exile as a result of his relentless opposition to the Mahdia. The Beja dealt with the Mahdia from a nationalist perspective.

‘Uthmān Digna will be let down by the prestigma in an ungraceful manner. Captured and tried by the British-Egyptian colonial rule, he spent 28 years in prison until he died in 1926. At that time the prestigma were fighting each other in rivalry to show their allegiance to the colonial rule. A few years ago they signed a Magna Carta (of allegiance to the King of England) to support the British in their war against the Ottoman Empire. In educational curricula, ‘Uthmān Digna is taught as a brave and strategist Mahdia general, but never as one of the founders of Sudanese nationalism and as one who directly
contributed in making present day Sudan. The fact is that many people who defiantly resisted the colonial rule perished in prison. In educational curricula you do not find passing and scanty information about them. They are forgotten because the prestigma has got its own version of compliant nationalism to sell out.

13.3. Anti-Colonial Nationalism and Islamo-Arab Ideology:

After the fall of Mahdia State the resistance against the new colonial rule continued. Following the African model, it was still characterized with religion. In many parts of the country Islamic movements of the Mahdia-style declared themselves to be easily contained by the colonial rule. But the strongest national resistance of religious nature to face the colonial rule was the ones raised by the Nilotic tribes in Southern Sudan. Local prophets of African traditional religions led these movements. (What is mentioned of these movements in national educational curricula is also very scanty). The colonial rule took unprecedented measures of brutality to contain the situation, or to pacify the Southerners, as it put it.

Immediately after the defeat of the Mahdia State, the British, the strong partner of the colonial rule, accepted the de facto monarchy of al-Sultân ‘Ali Dinâr who had already restored his ancestor’s rule. In the repercussions of the Mahdia, the clear linear demarcation –as mentioned above- was awlād al-bah ar vs. awlād al-gharîb, i.e. a longitudinal line between the riverain people and the westerners. The West from where the Mahdi drew his main support was to be separated from the Arabized centre. Furthermore, France was encroaching eastwards from West Africa; a buffer state that can easily be mobilized at the suitable moment to fight the French on behalf of the British was deemed necessary. Lastly but not least, an Islamic State was needed by the British in preparation for their war against the Islamic Caliphate in Constantinople.

From the other side, al-Sultân ‘Ali Dinâr had different plans in his mind.
Although lacking the worldwide vision with which his enemy was provided, he was very committed to the Muslim peoples. Declaring himself custodian of the holy mosques in Mecca and Medina, he took to the duty of sending aid caravans every season of pilgrimage. When the First World War was declared the British managed to bring the Arabs of the peninsula along with them against the Turks. Until now the Arabs are paying with blood and tear the cost of believing Britain. They promised the Arabs self-rule after defeating Turkey when they had already agreed with their allies on how to divide the area between them and on creating Israel. Inside Sudan the riverain prestigma was never so eager to show their allegiance to the British Master against Turkey which was then, according to their own belief, the Islamic Caliphate. But to the dismay of the British, al-Sultan ‘Ali Dinār turned to be either too dumb or too clever to swallow the bait. The British dubbed him as too dumb, and that is what has prevailed until the independence of Sudan. In the national rule the complicity with the British view shows in relegating the history of al-Sultan ‘Ali Dinār into obscurity. Systematic obliteration marred the notion that a man committing himself for Mecca, Medina and Constantinople would have never let down his own countrymen, if only he fared. Since time immemorial, the milieu of Dar Fur has always been eastward rather than westward. All through history, Sudan has been nothing but the Nile flanked by the west region on its left side and the east region on its right side. In fact al-Sultan ‘Ali Dinār was let down by the prestigma long before the British confronted him. From thenceforward, the British will turn their attention to the centre to seek an ally in the riverain prestigma.

After the First World War the Colonial rule continued adopting the establishment of centro-marginalization and consequently sided with the prestigma. Middle Sudan will be the milieu for anti-colonial national movements which are generally characterized with Islamo-Arab ideologies. As the Sufi sects are the parameters of Sudanese Muslims, they will shape the national political movement. In order to cope with this situation, the
religio-political organization of al-Ans ār, formed from the Mahdi’s followers, took also the shape of a Sufi sect. The biggest anti-Mahdist Sufi sect of al-Khatmiyya along with al-Ans ār will be the spearheads of anti-colonial nationalism with its Islamo-Arab ideology and the perspective of “the Melting Pot” as its model for national integration. The urban centres will be the chemo-cultural laboratories for culturally re-producing the people of the margin. Umdorman, the newest town to be established in central Sudan, was sublimated to the status of nationalist model, not only because it was the Capital of the Mahdia State, but because it truly represents a model of assimilation, i.e. a melting pot. Later the intellectuals of the centre, in their eagerness to identify with the genre of town literature in the cultures of other countries, will manufacture their own genres of town-folklore and literature for Umdorman by intensively focussing the State-owned propaganda machine on it. By the late 20th century, when it was almost 100 years old only, Umdorman will pose as the most historically ancient town in the Sudan.

Taking the colonial rule as de facto, the point of departure for this national movement was first to befriend the colonial rule and then, secondly, to develop a lenient way of struggle. Where the Khatmiyya sided with the Egyptian colonial partner, the Ans ār sided with the British colonial partner. The former developed a convenient ideology represented in the unity of the Nile valley, i.e. Egypt and Sudan. The latter developed the concept of “the Sudan for the Sudanese” thus aiming at independence without uniting with Egypt and having the British as prime friends. However, both ideologies were the brainchildren of a certain Sudanese nationalist who will colour the whole future of Sudan. The growing intellectual class generally fell into the channels of either the former or the latter, but not before getting an early injection of secularism which will prove to be very essential in achieving independence. The same man referred to above has also made this injection.
13.4. Anti-Colonial Secular Nationalism:

By the early 1920s, with the growing of the infant intellectual class, a secret political organization was formed by a tiny group of intellectuals in Umdorman. Called “the Sudanese Union Society”, it was mainly founded by people who belonged to the prestigma. Then an ex-army officer who was black of Dinka origin and whose parents were both slaves joined the Society. Dismissed from the army for his anti-British and anti-colonial views and behaviour, ‘Ali ‘Abdu al-Latif was held in high esteem by the Sudanese society of Umdorman. Being a black of Dinka origin and having the stigma of slavery hanging on him, he was left to rely ultimately on his well-developed views and charismatic personality. It turned that the founding figures of the Society were relying on the prestigma in their nationalist views and leadership assumptions. In a short time the charismatic leadership and nationalist views of ‘Ali began showing and attracting followers within the Society and outside it, something that did not merit the appreciation of the founding clique simply because these views were neither based nor did they acknowledge the prestigma. Eventually a split took place that ended in the actual demise of the Sudanese Union Society and the emergence of a new society led by ‘Ali and based on his views of nationalism; it was named the White Flag Society. It quickly began spreading among trusted groups of intellectuals in urban towns.

Two factors characterized the White Flag Society in this respect; the first was the secular nature of the movement; and the second was the role of the people from the margin in creating the society. Both al-Ansār and al-Khatmiyya organizations were religious in nature with their internal ranks based on religious excellence which is essential in qualifying any member of them in this capacity to assume public posts. As families that claim the ashrāf descent led both of them, their religious discourse was deeply rooted in the institution of the prestigma. On the other hand, the White Flag Society came with very clear view in regards of the secular approach it
followed. From thenceforward, thanks to the White Flag Society, the Sudanese political movement will be put on the track of secularism to the disadvantage of the religious political movements that to come in the future. Later with the growing influence of the graduates of Gordon Memorial College, the two religious organizations were not deemed eligible in their religious capacity to form political parties. The only way for them to attract allegiance was to allow their respective intellectual affiliates to create secular political organizations parallel to the religious ones. The tension between them has not come to an end yet.

The pioneers of the White Flag Society were mainly people belonging to groups from the margin. But the major backing of marginalized people came from the blacks of the urban areas who represented the stigma by mostly being descendents of ex-slaves like ‘Ali ‘Abdu al-Latīf himself. As they were also the majority in the Sudanese armed forces under the colonial rule, soldiers and officers alike, the White Flag was in a very strong position in regards of mobilizing the masses against the colonial rule. Therefore the uprising of 1924 is rightly associated with it. Some recent scholars may argue against this, but the fact that the backbone of the uprising was the military black descendents of ex-slaves should be read in the light of the fact that ‘Ali ‘Abdu al-Latīf himself was a military black with the same background.

The anti-colonial nationalist orientations of those black Sudanese, who were taken as a stigma in the Sudanese society of middle Sudan, will make the British reconsider their situation in the military as well as in the society. The prestigma of middle Sudan was frightened by the leading role this stigmatized group assumed; they felt that their status was being undermined. The crackdown on the Whit Flag and the uprising took three measures. The first was to brutally and unjustly eliminate the leaders either physically or psychologically. Some of those who socially belonged to the prestigma were spared at the last moment when facing the firing squad.
Secondly by stripping the military from its component of black officers and gradually replacing them by people who belong socially to the prestigma which proved to be more manageable. The third was to render those blacks, according to the criteria of the prestigma, to their right status by intensifying the mechanisms of stigmatization, starting from Umdorman, Khartoum, and Khartoum North after which the other urban areas will follow suit. The cultural activities, such as music, singing etc, of which the blacks were known to have been the pioneers were being encouraged by the prestigma with the intention that they become led by their own youth. (A conspicuous member of the prestigma, who flogged in his youth women who tried to crack out joyful shrieks in his marriage, ended up in his late years inviting singers in his own house in Umdorman to sing for his big family). The most famous cultural activity of home-library and reading-discussion groups was especially targeted; the old ones established by the blacks were abandoned to newly established ones associated with the prestigma. The White Flag Society along with the 1924 uprising will be systematically obscured. This is how the Sudanese people, aside from the main outlines, have come to know very little about it.

The British-Egyptian colonial rule, with the total complicity of the prestigma, gave ‘Ali ‘Abdu al-Latif a special treat: personality assassination. He was imprisoned after his trial to be declared a few years later as being insane. They did not eliminate him physically lest he became a national martyr and an inspiration for the whole Sudanese people in their fight for liberation. The prestigma, while knowing that he was fully sane, contended in rendering him into the obscurity of madness when it failed in stigmatizing him. Years later, after his release, and finding it too difficult to waive away the vindictively spread umbrella of madness that hung over him, he decided to go to Egypt. It was like running from the lion to only fall in the hands of the crocodile. There he was immediately taken to jail under the pretext of insanity to remain there until he passed away. To add insult to neglect, in the mid 1970s the State decided to reconsider to pay his suspended pension
to his widow. After half a century of shameful neglect, the redemption is figured out in terms of money only. Despite the systematic stigmatization and personality assassination, ‘Ali ‘Abdu al-Latīf has compelled his presence in national memory. Finding it impossible to erase him, the institution of prestigma has obscured him into an abstracted figure of patriotism. Some TV national historical drama has even dared to portray him as not a jet black Sudanese of Dinka type.

13.4.1. Pluralism and Nationalism:

After being dismissed from the army, ‘Ali ‘Abdu al-Latīf addressed the colonial administration demanding freedom and self-rule for the “Sudanese Nation”, in Arabic “al-Umma al-Sūdāniyya” as comprising all the people regardless of their different tribes. That was the first time in history for the term “Sudanese Nation” to be employed with such a political significance. In response to ‘Ali’s letter, the prestigma also addressed the colonial administration mocking ‘Ali ‘Abdu al-Latīf and his view and disqualifying him from posing to speak on behalf of the Sudanese people. The prestigma did not only allude to the slavery past of ‘Ali, but clearly stated that only people of noble and honourable origin can pose to speak for such sublime a mission.

That was the launch of the concept of “Sudanese Nationalism” which will start to develop from the level of the “melting pot” perspective up to the level of the “unity in diversity” perspective. From thenceforward the term “Sudanese Nationalism” has been taken for granted by politicians and scholars to signify the perspective of the “melting pot” which represents the cultural project of assimilation and re-production of the marginalized people in the centre. The concept, hijacked in this way, has proved to be very abortive to the view of ‘Ali ‘Abdu al-Latīf. Later in the 1980s the term “Sudanese Nation” will be used in reference to the perspective of “unity in diversity” where no culture is supposed to be marginalized. What distinguishes ‘Ali ‘Abdu al-Latīf is not only that he was the first to use the term in a political context, but the fact that he used the term referring to
what has come to be known half a century later as the perspective of “unity in diversity”. All we know of ‘Ali ‘Abdu al-Latīf is from what he said or did in approximately four years of his early youth; even though, he was at least half a century ahead of his generation. A period of 10 years in the 20th century may equal more than a whole century in past time.

13.4.2. The Path to Independence: the Tactic:

The White Flag Society adopted the slogan of the unity of the Nile valley, i.e. Egypt and Sudan, like its predecessor the Sudanese Unity Society. Nonetheless, no Egyptian was allowed to be a member of the White Flag Society. By this the Society renders the slogan to a matter of convenience and tactics; rather than only neutralizing the weak colonial partner, i.e. Egypt, it turned it into an ally of the movement of liberation. Unity of Nile valley will be propagated along with the newly launched concept of “Sudanese Nationalism”. Later the Ansār Organization and Khatmiyya Sect will divide between them the ideological legacy of the White Flag; the former adopted the core concept of “Sudanese Nationalism” as title for its parallel secular organization, i.e. Ḥizb al-Umma (the Nation Party), thus making the independence of the Sudanese nation their goal. The latter adopted for its secular parallel party the project of the unity of the Nile valley; hence its adherents are called the Unionists.

Later in the elections for the parliament that declared independence, the Khatmiyya-backed Unionist Party won the majority against the Ansār-backed independentist Umma Party. Egypt was very pleased with that result taking it to mean the imminent unification of the two countries. It was very clear if that unity was declared, Sudan would have been the weak partner just as Egypt was the weak partner in the colonial Condominium Rule. But the Unionists declined the unity of the Nile valley and, instead of it, declared Sudan as an independent Republic. Once again the nationalist views of ‘Ali
'Abdu al-Latif (independence as a national ideology and Nile valley unity as a political tactic) have proved to be crucially decisive for the destiny of Sudan. Although younger, the leading figures of the great generation that managed the battle for independence were both contemporaries and hamlet-kids (awlād h illa) of ‘Ali ‘Abdu al-Latif; bearing his charisma in mind, there was no way for them to miss his nationalist and political views. They all followed him without giving him the credit for that, but, then, a prophet commands no prestige among his own people.

13.5. The Trend towards the Balance of Identity:

The national consciousness of the centre emerged in the 20th century to be wholly Islamo-Arab. There was no reflection of the existence of non-Arabs in the cultural discourse of the centre. In the literature they produced, the infant class of intellectuals of the centre identified completely with ancient Arabia. Those who were related to pastoralist nomads marvelled themselves in the bedouin style itineraries they had taken to occasionally make. This led a certain intellectual who belonged to a marginalized ethnic group and who practically began learning and speaking Arabic when he went to school, to make a call to Sudanize literature by grounding it on Sudanese soil.

Independence brought the intellectuals of the centre to face the realities of Sudanese multiculturalism; election campaigns put them face to face with non-Arabic speakers. To tell such people that they are Arabs will surely create laughter but not political support. The parliament brought non-Arabized intellectuals, especially those of jet-black colour, who were very aware that they could only be accommodated in a multi-cultural, not a mono-cultural, Sudan. Data pertaining to ethno-linguistic pluralism resulted from social sciences and particularly anthropology, a science greatly indebted for its existence to studies made on Sudan, were too much and too compelling to ignore. Independence also brought the consciousness of Arabism of the centre in contact with what posed to be proper Arabism consciousness. All these factors have contributed in the emergence of Afro-
13.5.1. Afro-Arabism: the Intellectual Discourse:

With the British-Egyptian colonial army, the Sudanese battalions also came back home. They consisted mainly of black Sudanese the majority of whom were either freed slaves or descendents of slaves. After abolition of slavery, the Turkish-Egyptian Colonial Rule adopted the policy of tempting the black tribal leaders to freely submit a certain number of their subjects for soldiery along with the above-mentioned group. Their battalions were then known as jihādiyya, from jihad, meaning in this context devoted or professional soldiers. Although the jihādiyya joined the Mahdia revolution in its early days, they were the first to pull out however. Living in Egypt during the Mahdia, they were exposed to, and consequently influenced by, the civilization and modern ways of the time. Back in Sudan they were rightly the spearhead of modernization. Genres associated with modernism such as eating on table with chairs, bread and today’s traditional dishes of middle Sudan which were considered as fancy food at the time, music, monograph and later radio, home libraries, and more importantly women freedom in regards of education and work, were introduced by those jet-black people. At that time the society of middle Sudan -taking Umdorman as an example- was extremely conservative; women were confined to the house, vocal music was considered -since the Funj time- as kind of hooliganism. Although still considered as stigma, the blacks of the Sudanese battalions had compelled their presence as being the most enlightened and modernized class in the society; people were taking after their ways of life without giving them credit for that. This created an embarrassing crisis for the prestigma as the master was put in the position of imitating his slave. In this socio-cultural setting it was natural for people like ‘Ali ‘Abdu al-Latif to lead that society, and it was also expected from the prestigma of that society to obliterate his leading position in the following years.

The movement of balancing the Sudanese identity between Africanism
and Arabism began with this class and particularly with ‘Ali ‘Abdu al-Lat īf. In the course of time it was weakened by the intensive stigmatization launched by the prestigma. Some Arabized intellectuals took Africanism for a fashion in their early youth. With independence in 1950s, the voice of African Sudan became loud enough in academic corridors to be merited with pioneering studies that began probing the African identity of Sudan in general and middle Sudan in particular. In the early 1960s it became clear to the intellectual class that Arabism alone does not answer the quest for Sudanese identity. Where some of them went far back to the Meroitic civilization in search of their identity (the Apedemak group), another pragmatic group just crossed the desert into the jungle. As a result a literary discourse called the “Jungle and Desert group” advocating Afro-Arabism came into existence.

However the newly launched Afro-Arabism turned to be an Islamo-Arab project designed meticulously to assimilate the growing voice of Africanism. The “Jungle and Desert” discourse has declared the Funj Sultanate as their model for national integration, i.e. the process of cultural re-production and centro-marginalization, prestigma, etc. They came riding their camels in their venture to penetrate the jungle. That is not to say in any way that the true identity of the Sudan is not Afro-Arab. But an Afro-Arab identity where the mechanism of Arabization is in full throttle in all aspects of life will render Africanism to nothing more than a lip service. The institution of State will very soon pick up this fake Afro-Arabism purposely for political manipulation. By the decade of 1965-1975 the scientific publications pertaining to the Afro-Arabism of Sudan appeared to only be undermined by the political manipulation of the term.

3.5.1. Afro-Arabism: the Political Discourse:

The signing of Addis Ababa Accord in 1973 marks a turning point in the identity of Sudan as officially recognized by the State. Afro-Arabism was hailed in official statements as the true and indisputable identity of the Sudan. Recognizing them as black Africans was the only way to
accommodate the returning Southerners. If Sudan is also their country, then Sudan has to do with Africanism. For the first time in the history of Sudan the prestigma has chanced to be bossed in many government key posts by Southerners, i.e. jet-black Africans, i.e. the stigma. This caused an upheaval in many aspects of Sudanese social and cultural life. The prestigma nurtured a strong dislike to the peace that had shaken their establishment. On the other hand the African dimension in Sudanese identity was pushed up the stage, eventually giving way to the breakthrough of pluralistic approach and perspective of “Unity in Diversity” against the assimilatory perspective of the “Melting Pot” adopted then by the Regime.

The Addis Ababa Accord took place in a context of political contradictions; backed by Communists at its outset, the military coup of May immediately committed Sudan to the cause of Arab Nationalism, patronized then by Egypt. In 1970 both Sudan and Libya posed as the toddling cubs of Arab nationalist Egypt. In the course of its lifetime, the May regime will keep jumping from ideology to another like a monkey without ever admitting that; accused of communism at its outset, it ended 16 years later with Islamic fanaticism. However it had had its constant and that was Arabism which was kept all through while dragging the legacy of contradictions. In such a context of clashing winds Afro-Arabism was endorsed out of convenience rather than self-discovery. This is how the perspective of the “Melting Pot” was maintained as a constant model for national integration.

Regionally, Afro-Arabism proved to be very convenient to the Sudan. The Arabism of Sudan and other marginalized States such as Somalia, Djibouti, was either dismissed indignantly in proper Arab circles or tolerated as a stigma. There was only one way left for the centre of Sudan to fight out its jihad of Arabism internally and externally: internally it had to make a compromise lest the growing consciousness of Africanism claim supremacy. In this regards the tactic was to neutralize Africanism by compromising it with Arabism. Externally the centre was so keen to have its doubtful Arabism
recognized by proper Arab countries. In this regards Sudan was portrayed as a corridor through which the Arabs can penetrate black Africa as they did in the past. It was a sell-out deal in essence, and that was their way of proving that they belong to Arabia more than they belong to Africa. Hence we have Afro-Arabism which will prove to be nothing but a tactical retreat from the openness of the desert to the cover-up of the jungle.

But it will be almost impossible for the State to drop Afro-Arabism in its official discourse; however it might be extremely Islamist and Arabist. By the end of 1970s two contradictory intellectual discourses began showing; the first was the discourse of pluralistic Sudan, and the second was the purely Islamo-Arab Sudan. The first which was launched by the Addis Ababa Accord and in which the intensive presence of the Southerners served as catalyst, achieved its crystallization in the perspective of “Unity in Diversity”. The second was based upon the perspective of the “Melting Pot”. It gained momentum as a backlash against the Peace Accord where the resentment of the prestigma served as a catalyst. It achieved its final goal in the Islamo-Arab fanaticization of the State. By the early 1980s, instead of progressively leaping forward, Sudan back-warded 100 years to be ruled by an extremely fanatical and centralized State equal to that of the Mahdi’s Khalīfa: a false Imam, abuse of the whip and sword of Islam, extreme impoverishment of marginalized areas, intensive migration from the margin to the relatively privileged centre, drought and starvation, neighbour bilateral relations severed, civil wars and national disintegration and slavery. Once again Sudan will need a new national leader of the Dinka type of ‘Ali ‘Abdu al-Latif if to sort out the mess theoretically and practically.

14. The Perspective of “Unity in Diversity”:

By the signing of Addis Ababa Accord Sudan was officially baptised as an Afro-Arab. The intellectual pioneers of Afro-Arabism will be given key posts in cultural institutions along with the returning Southerners. So far the State and the intellectual pioneers of Afro-Arabism were still stuck with the
“Melting Pot” perspective. Nonetheless the intensive presence of the Southerners in every aspect of Sudanese life, political and socio-cultural as well, opened new venues for further probing the identity of Sudan. Debates flared up among intellectuals (1975-1980) where the Islamo-Arab parameters of the State-adopted Afro-Arabism were eventually discerned thus paving the way for the emergence of the perspective of “Unity in Diversity” as the proper perspective to potentially ground true Afro-Arabism. A new movement with a new vision of Sudanese nationalism was prospectively in the making.

As the symptoms of fanatic fever began showing on the face of the Head of State, the prestigma institution worked hard to hamper the rising consciousness of pluralistic Sudan by manipulating both the glamour of Islam and the clamour of Arabism in tune with the delirious visions of the new Imam. By that time certain powerful dissident factions historically belonging to the prestigma joined the Regime in what was called the National Reconciliation. The most powerful organizations among them were the Ans ār and Muslim Brothers, with their heavy weight in many parts of Sudan- in the case of the former- and the highly organized capability of mobilizing and mustering students of higher education institutions in the case of the latter. The student unions, which had been abolished for years, were reinstated by the government to be eventually won by the State-supported Muslim Brothers. The faltering May Regime could have dreamt of nothing more than that.

Against this background a new student movement appeared in the late 1970s. Called the Congress of Independents, it declared itself as ‘a healthy alternative’ for all other political organizations: the sectarians (Ans ār and Khatmiyya), Muslim Brothers, Arab Nationalists (Nasserite and Ba’thist) and the Communists. Recognizing itself as the true political Middle, its political programme centred on toppling the May Regime and the restoration of democracy. On the other hand, the core of its treatise of thought centred on
Sudanese nationalism as revived and constructed from the variety of genres of Sudanese heritage and folklore. Cruelly grilled by other political organizations on what looked to be a vague view, the new movement very soon caught up with the then heated debates of intellectuals regarding Afro-Arabism and its wavering between the perspective of the “Melting Pot” and the other of “Unity in Diversity”. By 1983 a view of thought of highly theorization that can only be defined by Sudanese premises and that can only be referred to this movement was developed with its core being democracy and Sudanese nationalism as based upon the perspective of “Unity in Diversity”. It branched conceptually to critically and analytically condemn centro-marginalization, cultural re-production, and Islamo-Arabism- a term coined by it with purely ideological bearing in contrast to honourable Islamic and Arabic cultures. Since then the Congress of Independent Students has been preaching this doctrine of Sudanese Nationalism as opposed to the doctrine of Arab nationalism officially preached by the successive governments.

The Movement of Independent Students played a decisive and crucial role in toppling May Regime. Immediately after its inception in 1979, it succeeded in mustering the various political organizations and led a coalition against the State-supported Muslim Brothers in the elections of Khartoum University Student Union (KUSU), the strongest political arm in post independent Sudan. By 1984 it led a similar coalition that ousted the Muslim Brothers again. Next year the May Regime will be toppled by a people revolution led by a broad coalition of political parties and trade unions spearheaded and mobilized in the first place by KUSU along with other university student unions headed by the Congress of Independent Students.

Since 1985, while the Congress of Independent Students began dwindling and diminishing as a political organization, paradoxically its intellectual discourse of Sudanese Nationalism has steadily built up momentum. By the turn of the century, while its young but invalid mother is
barely surviving especially in the big universities, the discourse of Sudanese Nationalism as represented in the perspective of “Unity in Diversity”, criticism of centro-marginalization and the call for the unity of marginalized groups has not only gained supremacy all over the Sudanese student movement, but has also become the core ideology of the “New Sudan” and thus completely identifying with the views of SPLM/SPLA. All roads have truly led to Rome.

15. The Madness of State and Holy Martyrdom:

By 1982 the State in Sudan was plunging in an abyss of extreme religious fanaticism; a secular sanguinary despot feigned sainthood and put on the regalia of Islam as a camouflage. The inquisition type State of the Khalīfa was reinstated once again. Islam was abused by reducing it into a harsh penal code arbitrarily applied. The machine of the prestigma /stigma was operated in full throttle thus targeting the people of the margin; the blacker you are the more targeted you become. In an unprecedented measure, Khartoum was declared a free-stigma Capital; it was decided that people from the margin to be evacuated from the Tri-Capital (Khartoum, Umdorman and Khartoum North) under the pretext of eradicating vagrancy and loitering. In daylight and under the cynical and mocking laughter of the prestigma, they were hunted and herded like animals to be loaded in trucks that took them back to their home regions which were too impoverished by the process of centro-marginalization to sustain them. Simple Sudanese people did not understand what was going on; it seemed to them that leaders at the top had lost their common sense. As the targeting was proportionate with the degree of stigma, the Southerners, by the virtue of their true Sudanese complexions, were the most to moan under the yoke of that Apartheid State. Their intellectual leaders, who were all Christians, were made under the point of gun to undergo the humiliation of declaring their [sic] Islamic allegiance (al-bay’a) to the fake Imam. Being already abrogated some years ago, Addis Ababa Accord was long since forgotten by the
delirious Imam.

That was the moment when the Sudanese people needed a Christ-like saviour who will take their sins and fears and die on the cross. A humble, old Sudanese man of formidable intellectuality and holiness stood up and faced the delirious Imam and then courageously took the blunt of his madness. That was the martyr Mahmūd Muhammad Tāha who was executed in 1985 by that fake Imam; his insightful Islamic thought and saintly courage will be a source of both enlightenment and patriotism. At the moment of execution his face was uncovered for his judges so that they become sure that was him; vindictively they were expecting to see fear and remorse on his face. To the fright of his pharisaic judges, there was a divine smile, a smile of absolute peace and understanding.

That was the example of courageous leadership the Sudanese people were waiting for so as to follow. That was the sublime bravery that revealed to the Sudanese people the vanity of fear. Less than four months later they took to the streets and that was the end of a mad era. But its end has not come before it had triggered off another civil war. In the years that followed his saintly death, the thought of Mahmūd Muhammad Tāha will be adopted by piecemeal by many Muslim intellectuals worldwide and the Sudanese intellectuals in particular without ever acknowledging this. The absurdity is that this piracy has been practised mostly by those who spent their lives fighting his thought; ironically, some of the judges who condemned him to death were among those intellectual scavengers.

15.1. SPLM/SPLA: the Civil War of the Margin:

By 1983 a group of Southern military soldiers rebelled and took to the jungle: the second civil war has begun. It will prove to be the longest civil war in modern history, claiming the lives of millions of Southern civilians who perished unnoticed either by the marauding government army or
caught in between fires.

The rebellion was engineered by three different groups and was very soon joined by veterans of the first civil war. The scenario of civilians’ tragedies and legacy of that war with its demand of separation of Southern Sudan loomed up in the minds of Sudanese people. Of the three factions that were behind the rebellion at least one of them was wholly committed to the separation of the South. Then a highly educated senior army officer, who was also a veteran of the first civil war, joined the rebellion to emerge very soon as its paramount military commander and intellectual thinker. This is Dr. Col. John Garang De Mabior who will make Sudan take its most sharp turn in history since the establishment of the Funj Sultanate in 1505.

According to its Manifesto, the rebellious body was called “the Sudan People Liberation Movement” (SPLM) with its military arm called “the Sudan People Liberation Army” (SPLA). Although greatly and understandably overshadowed by the South, the movement declared itself as concerned with the whole Sudan. It declared that the war was not a war of the South against the North, but rather it was the war of marginalized people in the South, the Funj and Ingassana, the Nuba Mountains, the West, the East and the North against the centre which is represented by the government of Khartoum, which is not in any way the virtuous government of the whole Sudan. The dominance of the centre on and its exploitation of the marginalized people was deeply rooted in the system that only an armed liberation movement could undo it. That is to say to transcend the linear polarization model (South vs. North) to the circular polarization model (margin vs. centre); that is to say to transcend the “Melting Pot” model of nationalism to the “Unity in Diversity” model of nationalism. The true version of Afro-Arabism as an identity of Sudan has been declared where the plural components of Africanism and Arabism shall be honoured on an equal footing without violating the rights of any party. All this was concluded in the banner of the “New Sudan”.
While calling people from marginalized areas to join the liberation movement, it has also called intelligent people who belong to the Arabic-orientated Middle to join it. All people of Sudan, whether in the middle or periphery, are in need to liberate themselves from the vicious entanglement of centro-marginalization. The process of centro-marginalization victimizes the Sudanese Muslims in general and the Sudanese Arabs in particular by creating the false impression that it works in their interest whereas it uses them as cat’s paw.

It took Sudan five centuries to reach this point of national maturity. Assimilation and the “Melting Pot” model of nationalism inaugurated by ‘Abdu Allah Jammā’ and ‘Amāra Dungus had served Sudan well in the aftermath of the fall of the Christian Kingdoms. For 4 centuries it had been working for that effect until the Mahdia revolution. Since then it has outlived its virtue. In one century Sudan has made huge leaps toward national maturity. It was triggered off by Muh ammad Ah mad al-Mahdi in his revolution, to only crumble down under the weight of the central State of the Khalīfa and the British-Egyptian colonial rule. This leap was consolidated by the patriotism of both ‘Uthmān Digna and later al-Sultān ‘Ali Dinār. Then followed the movement led by ‘Ali ‘Abdu al-Latīf in theory and practice to be aborted by the system of prestigma and colonialism. The honourable life and death of the martyr Mahmūd Muh ammad Tāha symbolizes the sacrificial readiness and nobility of the Sudanese people. Furthermore, he has shown how thought is much stronger than arms, and how thought defeats death. Lastly but not least is the movement presently led by John Garang De Mabior also in theory and practice. Those are the eight pillars of Sudanese nationalism. By then the core theoretical homework had already been done by the Sudanese intellectuals who bravely fought their way through racial bigotry and religious fanaticism, from subjective to objective reasoning. In fact, every Sudanese intellectual –regardless of being pro or contra- is honoured by virtually being engaged in the argument in concern; it started from the level of the “Melting Pot” and steadily developed to the level of
“Unity in Diversity”.

16. The Emergence of the Political Middle:

At the beginning, very few people took the words of SPLM/SPLA seriously. The people from the margin began slowly taking the movement for its words; after so many centuries of subjugation and intimidation, it was so difficult for them to believe in freedom at its face value. Then they began adhering to the movement. The people of the margin joined the call of the movement in accordance with their degree of stigma: the more stigmatized the people the more enthusiastic they were in taking to arms (1) the South, (2) Ingassana and Nuba Mountains, (3) the West, (4) the East and (5) last but not least the North). A considerable number of people who were socially supposed to belong to the prestigma showed their national far-sightedness by joining the movement as soldiers and politicians.

Being the most stigmatized, the Southerners were the core of the movement and its army. As the case in the first civil war, they took it also to be their own war. The national nature of the movement will not dawn on them until later when joiners from outside the South began showing among their ranks. Given the relatively small number of joiners, it was extremely distressful for the Southerners to fight and die on behalf of other people who do not support them even sentimentally. Nevertheless they kept fighting under the banner of liberating the whole Sudan. The increase of joiners with whole areas (such as 2nd degree and 3rd degree areas) taking to arms soothed their hurt feelings and boosted up their morale.

By declining separatism and declaring that the fight is for the whole of Sudan, the margin has achieved a consciousness of high level of maturity and bravery; it has come up to the truth that the so called Sudan is the historical homeland of them, the Africans. If the Arabs have come to live with them, they are welcome; there is enough room for every body. But if the Arabs have come to be the masters of the land and relegate them, then
they have to fight for it. That was the historical moment when the Sudanese political Middle was born. Coming from the columns of the political Left, they are, truly speaking, the Left Middle or the Sudano-African Middle.

But where is the Right-Middle or the Sudano-Arab Middle? Its maturity depends on the intelligence and transparency of the enlightened groups who have socially been brought up as belonging to the prestigma and the centre whether they are from the middle of Sudan or from its periphery. They need to discover that they belong to the truly honourable Arab culture and Islam, not to the prestigma or the centre. Sudan will make it through if only the factions of this political Middle have developed a progressive national consciousness of true Afro-Arabism.

The movement of the Congress of Independents can be the spearhead of Sudano-Arab Middle as it is ideologically fitting the position. Although the Southern students did not contribute in making it as they had had their own political organization, however the movement was shouldered in its early days by students from all parts of the Sudan. Contrarily to the thought it advocated, the strong winds of the prestigma blew the sails of the movement. Gradually students from marginalized areas dropped out; it was very awkward for them with their twisted tongues to remain with people who speak the highly idiomatic colloquial Arabic of middle Sudan. On the other hand it was also awkward for other students to talk in the presence of marginalized students about racial discrimination or cultural persecution, something they do not suffer from; it is a situation where the marginalized student becomes more advantageous to matters pertaining to leadership. Furthermore with the intensification of marginalization students from marginalized areas withdrew deep into their ethnic boundaries. The marginalized groups did not yet identify with each other, let alone with enlightened people from the centre. By the late 1990s, with the rise of the intellectual discourse of the movement, the organizational body shrank to a countable number of students mostly from the centre.
The large number of the graduates of the movement has remained organizationally inactive as they do not have any body to join; the majority of this group are politically active on an intellectual basis, which is likely to materialize in a kind of political body any moment. The remainder are divided between two political organizations, a civilian political party established in 1986, and an armed opposition organization established in 1994. The former (the National Congress Party) did not fare well during the democratic period to the extent that the present military regime vindictively has usurped the name when it decided to have its own political party. All this time the National Congress Party (Opposition) - as it has come to distinguish itself- has consumed whatever energy it has in this futile feud. The armed organization (Sudan Allied Forces) came into existence timidly admitting that it is committed in a way to the Islamic and Arabic culture of the middle Sudan. Not bothering to explain why it did not join SPLM/SPLA from the beginning, this is deemed the reason behind that. Lately a merge was negotiated to only be tampered by external pressure as such a move would complicate the peace initiative presently being brokered by Western forces.

The movement of the Congress of Independents has so far exerted relentless efforts to muster its dispersed forces and potentials with no avail. Since 1979, thousands and thousands of members of this movement graduated from their respective universities inside and outside Sudan. With no inclusive political body to sustain them, they have amazingly managed to kindle the fire in their hearts and keep it ablaze. While the only two political organizations that emerged from this movement (NCP and SAF) have not succeeded in recruiting those graduates, no other political party can claim to have siphoned them into its ranks. The reason behind this is that those people can only be politically organized in accompaniment of their new and distinguished intellectual discourse of Sudanese nationalism of which they are very proud, something both NCP and SAF have dismissed out of miscalculated pragmatism.
The development of this movement in an inclusive political body is crucially important at this critical moment of Sudanese history. The Left Middle cannot do the job alone; one palm does not clap. It can easily be targeted by Islamo-Arabism as an anti-Islamic, anti-Arab movement as it really includes non-Muslim and non-Arab people. Such accusations can hardly be levelled on the Right Middle which is wholly Muslim and Arab. Bearing the cross of stigma on their back, it is very natural for marginalized people to fight against the prestigma for **Freedom, Justice, and Peace**. But to fight against the prestigma aiming to dismantle it and reinstate in its place a New Sudan based on the principles of **Freedom, Justice, and Peace**, while you are assumed at the same time to be belonging to the prestigma, is a great mission that can only be shouldered by great people.

**17. The Undoing of the Stigma: the South leading the Sudan:**

As expected, the establishment of the prestigma took the declaration of SPLM/SPLA lightly at first. Then when the seriousness of the movement showed clearly and practically, the prestigma gave vent to its venom: it took it as an appallingly repulsive for a slave to boast of freeing his masters. Sarcastic jokes were bitterly cracked picturing John Garang having at his table the prestigious girls and women of the centre as servants at his table handing food and drinks. The joke lies in reversing the picture of the prestigmatic slaver. The machine of stigma/prestigma was never in such frenzy.

By the turn of the century, with the semi-circle spread of the civil war in the West, Nuba Mountains, the South, Ingassana Mountains and the East, the movement succeeded in securing the allegiance and moral support of the people of the circular margin, i.e. including the Nubians in the North who were the last to join and the least to take to arms. By this time the
movement has fought against three political systems: two military dictatorships and an elected government in between with the programme of mono-culturalism, Arabicization and centro-marginalization shared in common by the three of them. From this point of view, as far as the movement was concerned, there was no difference whether the ruling system is totalitarian or democratic. The ideological parameters for both of them are the same.

During the May dictatorship the opposition parties of the centre had allied covertly with the movement with its military victories being applauded out of vindictiveness toward the regime. By the fall of May Regime and restoration of democracy the majority of the centre thought that there was no reason for the movement to fight; they sincerely waited and then urged John Garang to put down arms and peacefully join the democratic procession. That was because they did not take him seriously right from the beginning. They thought that he was just doing like them when he used the word ‘liberation’; playing with words while his ultimate goal was to have the May Regime toppled so he can be a prime minister, or minister at least. It took them the period of democratic rule to come up to the conclusion that the man is dead serious, but not before cursing him enough.

By the coming of the present military regime, the opposition parties of the centre overtly declared its alliance with the movement. They did this without bothering to exercise any self-criticism, especially from the parties which were assuming the government that escalated the war to the extent of severing any contacts with the movement. Shortly before the coup a group of intellectuals venturing an attempt of brokering peace talks contacted John Garang. Immediately at their coming back the minister of Interior put them in prison. Days after the military coup the same minister slipped out of the Country to only put his hands with John Garang to fight the junta. The farce went to its limit when the junta freed the intellectuals imprisoned by this same minister. Although civilian by nature, the political
opposition parties- out of total ineptitude- fled their civilian battlefield which is inside the country, and feigned a boastful military posture. With a fake epaulett they joined the movement in the armed struggle to topple the military regime. Part of their plan was to co-opt the movement by *assimilating* it in a bigger body. All in all, the trick was that they do the political leadership and leave to the movement to do the military homework, i.e. the fighting. The master thinks of what to grow, but it is the slave who toils the land. This time they got it wrong.

The only positive thing that resulted from that alliance is the normalization of the nation-wide leadership of John Garang by undoing the machine of stigma frenziedly operated by the prestigma. Both vices are conjoined like siamese twins; undoing any one of them consequently results in dismantling the other. Moaning under the yoke of Muslim Brothers, the Sudanese people could only look with hope at John Garang. After all he is the only one who stood firmly for them and who defeated them. The Muslim Brothers came with the aim of annihilating his army, but ended with him liberating the whole South and making it have its own flag and its own coin and various governmental institutions. The Muslim Brothers, on the other hand, has ended with dissension and split up. The *head-thinker* has also come to join John Garang, whereas the *head-ruler* has clung to the gun while retreating. This situation has kept on reversing occasionally ... a peace is supposed to be achieved. But how?

**18. The Selling out of Sudan:**

Never has the prestigma been faced with such a problem in its long history. There is only one way left in order to get out of this dilemma half victorious: to strip this John Garang De Mabior from the capacity of a national leader and reduce him into a Southerner once again even if this is going to cost the Sudan the loss of the whole South. This will give the prestigma an injection of life by simply keeping other degrees of stigma tethered a little longer to the prestigmatic centre. To do this successfully
they need the ethically unrestricted force of a superpower; America’s think-tank is always ready for such evil missions; this time old British Empire comes behind as a colonial expertise.

When the war kept going on and on without any prospect of solution, the Southerners have begun losing faith in the nationalist approach of SPLM/SPLA. By 1990 the war reached an extreme degree of intensification. The Government fought it as an Islamic jihad, a matter that has alienated the Southerners more than ever. People and villages were razed to the ground under the marauding advance of the fighting parties. A human being standing on earth claimed no more dignity than a shrivelled tree. The Southerners outside the war zone, especially in exile could stand that no more. The call for separating the South was once again revived. The setback of the Southerners from the ranks of the Left Middle to the ranks of the separatist Left has begun. It took them two decades of frustration: 1973-1993. Meanwhile the extreme Right has never abandoned the idea and possibility of separating the South. The junta in their early days in 1989 made that offer, but backed down under the strong public condemnation; it was also declined by SPLM/SPLA as was expected according to its nationalist approach, i.e. by being Left Middle. This time the institution of prestigma tacitly endorsed the call for separation made then by some Southern intellectuals. America and Britain dashed into the scene when they smelt oil. The scenario of the present brokered peace initiative was put forward.

With the prospects of Sudan becoming an oil country it was a matter of time until America pushes its way with heavy-handed diplomacy. It is like a splash of blood in the Red Sea, in no time sharks will smell it. And after all it was Chevron, an American company, which discovered that oil in the first place, before selling out the concession. More opportunely, the richest fields are in the South, where, fortunately to the Americans, there is a civil war against a dictatorial regime. A dictatorial regime is the best thing America can dream of for a Third World country. If it accepts the manipulating
friendship of America, then long life is guaranteed; if it does not, nothing is easier and ethically acceptable than to target a Third World dictatorship by the biggest democracy in the world. The West in general and America in particular hate nothing more than to see democracy flourish in the Third World.

Separating the South will leave the North in status quo where the privileged ruling class, i.e. the prestigma will keep going on. Adopting the battered Islamic regime of Sudan will not only do that, but will also make the Americans put their hands on virgin fields rich with oil. In the independent State of what will become of the South of Sudan, a despotic government is probably the kind of rule America will support. An interim period is vitally important as the central government in Khartoum can generously give the Americans concessions in the south that cannot be repealed by the later independent Southern government. Furthermore, a new Islamic fundamentalist government in the Northern State of Sudan is needed by the Americans to accomplish another job. Instead of reconsidering their policies towards the Muslims, the Americans are unwittingly trying hard to bring the Islamic fundamentalist movements back to the harness. A new breed of well-domesticated Islamic fundamentalism remotely controlled by America- not like the one that wildly went out of control in Afghanistan- is needed and is possible to be engineered. This is how America is going to reconcile with Islam, by robbing and subjugating Muslims. And this is how America is going to support black Africa, by robbing and subjugating Africans.

In the past America was not that interested in the Sudan as it was considered to be one of the poorest countries in the world. Now, counting the huge resources it has with oil, America will do any thing but help this gigantic to rise up. This is our time, we the Sudanese people, to prove to the Third World that the battle against evil America can be won without war; by civilization which can only be realized by making freedom, justice,
peace prevail in Sudan.

19. A Circular Civil War but a Linear Peace:

By claiming that it came to liberate Sudan from the hegemony of the centre which relegates the whole country into marginalization, especially the periphery, SPLM/SPLA has become very attractive to people from the margin. Now it includes among its fighters people from Nuba Mountains, Ingassana, Beja, Dar Fur and representative figures from all over the country. Presently the civil war is not only in the South, it has spread to these other parts. The war has become circular, i.e. it can only be described in terms of the margin vs. the centre. If there is any peace to be brokered, it should be inclusive in respect of all marginalized groups fighting along with SPLM/SPLA. However, the peace initiative which is brokered by America and Britain, and which is being presently negotiated is concerned only with the civil war in the South. Like the rest of the West, America and Britain have persistently decided to deal with the civil war in Sudan as between the black African and Christian South against the Muslim Arab North.

There is no meaning in putting out the fire in part of the house while other parts are aflame. There no sense in deciding to put an end to the war in the South and leave it to flare up in the Ingassana, Dar Fur, Nuba Mountains or Beja, especially when the causes of the war are the same and the fighting groups have achieved a kind of unifying body. It just does not make sense. There is something fishy here. It is much easier to deal with the unifying body which can help settle the whole thing in one stroke than to have many parties to deal with. Even in this case, what is the wisdom behind telling the other parties to wait until the fight in the South comes to an end. It is like telling them to keep on fighting until you reach a deal with the biggest fighting group? Is it that they have not yet claimed enough importance or that the wars they are engaged in have not yet claimed enough lives?
The way to rationalize this approach is to assume that the war is between the *South* and the *North*, a matter that will take us back to the stereotype of Arab-Muslim North vs. Christian-African South, i.e. the linear polarization with its conceptual entourage of centro-marginalization, cultural re-production and the whole system of stigma. One can expect such a peace to be brokered by the institution of prestigma. But this peace is being brokered by America and Britain! Even the Western mass media and academia, generally speaking, vehemently stick to the linear polarization. Is it simply complicity, or the short-sightedness of stereotype? How can the fighters of Nuba Mountains, Ingassana and the Beja be disengaged from SPLM/SPLA? The simplistic answer is that because they are Northerners. But what about the Dinka of Southern Kordufan? The *linear* shallowness which is accommodated simply because of complicity shows in the answer that boundaries can be adjusted a little to include them in the South. If this is possible, why not to adjust it a little further to include e.g. the Nuba Mountains as they are also from Southern Kordufan? Why not to push the *line* a little northward to include the Ingassana? This seems to be a Byzantine argument because of the *linear* basis of demarcation. This longitudinal line can be pushed northward as well as southward. It can also be a latitudinal with the Nile at least serving as a meridian. In this way Dar Fur can be cut off, and the same can be said eastward to have the Beja cut off. Within any entity of them new lines will eventually appear.

As this scenario is the one likely to happen in the *South* it will be far damaging as it may trigger off a Rwanda/Burundi style of ethnic genocide, because the linear polarization stops at nothing. The linear peace of Addis Ababa Accord showed the signs of this. Sudan is said to be a chromosome of Africa in its diversity. In fact each part of it is also a chromosome of the whole Country; diversity is everywhere in Sudan. If the Southerners (as a bloc) have decided to pull out of united Sudan because they have come to the conclusion that diversity (represented in regional blocs) is not manageable, what makes them sure that they can manage the diversity
within the South bloc when cashed down in its smallest coins? A watchmaker who fails to fix a grandfather clock can hardly be expected to repair a wristwatch.

Bearing in mind that America—like a puppeteer—will have them all dancing at the end of a string, one will not be surprised if the linear segmentation continues on to end up with Vatican-sized States run by the Americans, with two or three of them filthy rich with oil. The Arab shaykhdom-monarchies will be set as a model to follow for the Southerners. Once again Sudan will have a version of black Arabs, the black *mondukuru* of independent Southern Sudan or whatever.

Having the South, West and East cut off from the historical State of Sudan, with each of them going into internal linear polarizations, there is no guarantee that the so called remaining North will be intact. Taking Sudan as its backyard, Egypt will threateningly be furious about this disintegration unless she is given a big share of the booty. Under the pretext of protecting its national water security, nothing will stop her from annexing the Nubian region just below the Shāygiyya land. Egypt has already been occupying the two triangles of Serra, north of H alfa, and H alāyib, on the Red Sea, for decades. The Nubian triangle basin of H alfa-Dongola-’Uweenāt will also be annexed to the so called Toshka agricultural scheme. Presently, news are leaking out revealing that negotiations on highest levels with the Egyptian government are being made so as to facilitate the settlement of millions of Egyptian peasants along with their families in the fertile deltas of Tōkar and al-Gāsh, and the Nubian triangle basin. The aim of this move is said to safeguard the Arab identity of Sudan against the growing consciousness—sic—of Africanism.

What will be left of present-day Sudan will amount to no more than the Nile strip of the 100% Arabized Sudan, i.e. the centre. Failing to assimilate the different parts of Sudan by the strategy of centro-marginalizatio and the tactic of linear polarization, cultural re-production, prestigma and stigma,
the centre will finally be ready to do without them. “Thins fall apart; the centre cannot hold”. Multi-culturalism cannot be managed by mono-culturalism; the bite is too much to chew. In relying on cultural homogeneity, the Nile strip remainder of Sudan should not be hopeful of any peaceful prosperity. A look at Somalia will show that cultural and ethnic homogeneity is not a guarantee of national unity. The middle of Sudan is nothing than the people of the margin being re-produced into Islamo-Arab culture. Based in essence on centro-marginalization, it will eventually come out having its own linear stratification with its prestigma and stigma. Centro-marginalization is like a black hole in the sky; it siphons cosmos and itself into absolute nothingness.

**20. The True Peace:**

True peace in Sudan is a matter of common sense, long since lost as a result of cultural and racial prejudices. Prejudice is like snow, it melts out slowly; in a context where prejudice reigns, common sense becomes like breeze, it vanishes with the weakest wave of heat. Losing our common sense, we may not be lunatic but we are not fully sane either. The dilemma is that without common sense, the vanity of prejudice cannot be discerned; with prejudice there is no common sense. When there is no breakthrough of this vicious circle, the only way out is to wear off prejudice by maximizing it: by war until people has had enough of it. And we do have had enough of it. Isn’t it time we regain our common sense?

People of the margin should come together. On the civilian political level they should have an alliance that represents their think-tank. Before coordinating or uniting their military organs they need to have their civilian organizations united in a big alliance. The battle against the centre has had to fronts: military and civilian. So far they have been faring very well on the military front with nothing done on the civilian level. The two kinds of bodies are not to be necessarily conditioned by each other; although driving at one aim, the civilian battle is virtually different than the military battle however.
The Sudanese political Middle should develop into its two wings: Left Middle and Right-Middle. The Right-Middle should not mistake its position; it is part of the margin by the virtue of fighting the institution of prestigma and centro-marginalization. This alliance of the forces of the margin is fundamental in peace and war. If it is war, then war should be fought out properly; if it is peace, then peace should be well-guarded.

The paper homework of this alliance has already been done in what has come to be known as the Congress of United Sudan Homeland (CUSH). In the mid 1990s a group of Sudanese intellectuals representing almost all marginalized areas began in Khartoum, under very difficult security situations, to formulate a manifesto that can serve as a political platform of wide alliance for the marginalized groups. The draft -initially written by a young man from the Nuba Mountains- was revised and revised many times. The process of revision was in fact governed by successive consultations with representatives of marginalized groups. Still no one claims that it has taken its final shape.

In 1999 a body called the Coordination Board was formed in which the marginalized areas were also reasonably represented. In its first meeting three land-marking points were decided: the name and principles of the alliance, the types of organizations eligible to membership, and democratization.

The name of the proposed organization which was (the Congress of the United Sudan Homeland {CUSH}) was unanimously endorsed. “Congress” was taken to represent democracy; “United” was taken to indicate the commitment of the movement to the unity of Sudan; “Sudan” was taken to show how this country has been associated with the blacks all through history, a matter that stands for both identity and continuity; “Homeland” was to represent the unshakeable belief of the movement in citizenship regardless of race or religion. The principles agreed upon were: freedom, justice, and peace. There is no peace where there is no justice, and there is
no justice if Man is not free. These principles connote the relentless struggle of Sudanese people for dignity, progress and prosperity.

Three types of organization were decided to be eligible to join CUSH. They are as follows: a/ “Regionally-defined” organizations, such as “Ittih ād Nahd at Dār Fūr” or “Ittih ād Jibāl al-Nūba” which respectively represented two different regions that contain various ethnic groups with legitimate demands in regards of development, identity and welfare. Such organizations were agreed to bear the name of “Ittih ād” i.e. “Union” in honour of the above pioneering organizations which, against all bigotry and prejudice, have normalized regionally-defined movements; b/ “Culturally-defined” organizations such as “Mu’tamar al-Bija” which represents an ethno-cultural group with its legitimate demands in regards of development, identity and welfare. Such organizations were agreed to bear the name of “Mu’tamar” i.e. “Congress” in honour of such movements which have normalized culturally-defined organizations against all the accusations leveled on them; c/ “None-defined” organizations such as the Communist Party or The Muslem Brothers which cannot be referred to or posited on definite socio-cultural or regional settings, taking what they say of themselves by face value. No particular naming was suggested for such organizations.

It was believed that the cultural pluralism of Sudan can only be recognized practically when the unalienable right to form smaller organizational units to express the geopolitical and ethno-cultural peculiarities of this pluralism is also recognized. Belonging to more than one political organization is permissible as far as they are CUSH signatories.

“Grounded democracy” has been deemed basic. It means democratizing the basic processes of decision-making within CUSH, i.e. between the signatory organizations and within the organizations themselves. For instance, in cases of constituencies where there are more than one CUSH signatory organization, the candidate to represent CUSH should be chosen
by internal elections confined to CUSH affiliates in the concerned constituency. This grounded democracy will teach the smaller organizations how to build up coalitions within CUSH to have their voices heard. So instead of hypocritically denying differences, grounded democracy developmentally organizes and manages them; those who do not tolerate this democratic game disqualify themselves from CUSH. In this way CUSH will go down to the people through their local organizations, while going up nationally; a rally organized to protest against slavery or massacres such as that of al-D$i’een, would bring people from all over the margin, whereas elections in Nūba Mountains will concern only the local organizations affiliated to CUSH. It is this democratic and procedural dynamism that really distinguishes CUSH from other traditional and classical political organizations.

The Manifesto is considered to be the most comprehensive treatise of its kind. It is written in a straightforward way that would allow only those who really belong to it to come together. There is no way of either mistaking or confusing it with trends that do not belong to it. It bravely faces the crisis of centro-marginalization by naming and shaming. No marginalized group has so far claimed that its demands are not properly addressed by it or missing. Reference was made in the Manifesto to certain marginalized groups usually passed by unmentioned by politicians as they cause a lot of embarrassment and sensitivities, such as the Copts, Armenians, Chamese, Indians, Rashāyda, Fulani, Hausa, and Berno etc., to say nothing of the so-called refugees from the neighbouring countries who have been living in the Sudan for decades and who rightly deserve citizenship.

Such a strong alliance can positively lead the negotiations with the government that represents the prestigma. Peace can be achieved in one stroke and can be well-guarded against any relapse. Eventually the Right will be pushed by events to build up its own alliance; in such context the prestigmatic Right will never fare well. In the long run both the Right and Left will regain their common sense, a matter that will end up in having
them absorbed in the Right-Middle and the Left-Middle respectively. Not flanked anymore by its extreme extensions, the Middle will split up into proper Right and Left, and that is the moment when Sudan will have its healthy Right and Left; a new Middle whose identity is very hard to forecast will eventually come into shape.

\textbf{20.1. Self-Determination:}

The war, any war, lived from outside is news whether good or bad; the war lived from within is a tragedy of bereavement. For four decades the Southerners have been living through continual bereavement incurred by the civil war in Sudan. No one but God knows how the Southerners are coping with their eternal bereavement and noble sorrows that has no equal in history but the one incurred by slavery. More than 3 million lives of peaceful civilians lost. They have become a figure, 3 million, but no names or official records, let alone photos. The least solace we can have is that each one of them was missed and mourned by a relation, at least. The infinite horror of this war could have been well conceived if it were possible to collect the tears shed by the Southerners in barrels. As if this is not enough the war has spread to other parts of the Sudan. The real solace we can have is to honour the survivals with true peace. By the turn of the century peace looked too far than ever. This is how the Southerners have come to welcome the call for the separation of the South. Enough is enough!

One of the tactics employed by the successive governments of Khartoum in this war is the manipulation of ethnicity to disintegrate the unity of the Southerners. Many ethnic groups were used as cat’s paw to fight in agency for the government. Total vulnerability on behalf of these ethnic groups was the major factor behind it. SPLA has handled such cases with ruthlessness equivalent to that of the other party. This will never be forgiven by a considerable number of Southerners who will pose as the true representatives of the South. Those are the spearhead of the call for separating the South. It is unfair to say that they are ultimately the outcome
of the manipulation of ethnicity by the government. They have always been there lurking behind the nationalist banners of Addis Ababa Accord and the manifesto of SPLM/SPLA. They came on the centre of stage when the West directed its attention to the Islamic fundamentalist government in Khartoum with its infamous and fake jihad in the South. The separatists began working hard to have their demand recognized by the West. On the western part, it was considered as too bold to put in the agenda of Sudan the separation of the South in a straightforward way. Such a move is against the ordinance of the African Unity Organization.

By that time the war began spreading to other marginalized parts of Sudan with SPLM/SPLA being either a convenient body to merge in and join or taken as a model to follow. That is the time when the prestigma began working hard to contain the growing influence and leadership of the Southerners, especially John Garang whose formidable national image was becoming too much threatening. The prestigma were not necessarily people affiliated to the Islamic regime, they were among the opposition also. Influential, non-partisan people among the intellectuals were also active to curb the nationally growing picture of John Garang. Self-determination for the South was timely put forward; it does not mean separation, but it will definitely lead to it. It is always expressed through the discourse and context of separation.

In no time it has become very appealing to the Southerners. For many of them it caused euphoria. The history-long grudges and grievances were projected on the dismissive arguments of many Southerners regarding any prospects of national unity. Adamantly and sometimes vindictively they argued for the separation while talking about self-determination as if they are synonyms. To them separation was like an achievement replacement of the lasting and humiliating victory they have so far failed to inflict on the so called North. On the other hand it has also settled an account they have with John Garang. It is either he complies with the new trend and behaves
himself as a Southerner, or he will lose the backing of the Southern public to whom John Garang will look like a warmonger who takes Southern soldiers to die in a war that does not concern them. This was meant to bring the high national esteem of John Garang back to the curb as nothing more than a Southerner, just like them.

So far John Garang has stood firm against the plots of Khartoum successive governments to make him come for negotiations as a Southerner fighting for the South only. Ruthlessly he has also eradicated separatists from the ranks of SPLM/SPLA. He has also managed to evasively manoeuvre around the pressure of America and Britain to make him fight for the separation of the South with assured promises of backing. But this time it looks like he has got hooked. John Garang cannot afford to lose the Southern public which supplies him with more than 85% of his soldiers. This is the paradox of his nationalist project; he is fighting with soldiers mainly from the South a war for the welfare of the whole of Sudan. The stigma is fighting and dying for the welfare of the prestigma without meriting its gratefulness. This is too much for the Southerners however great people they may be. Like ‘Ali ‘Abdu al-Latif, John Garang has been let down by the enlightened class of Sudanese who while admiring him and believing in him have lacked the courage to bring themselves under his leadership. There is no reason for that other than a last surviving trace of the vanity of prestige the roots of which go back to slavery.

Self-determination is a legitimate demand raised in bad faith. If it is only about separation, then it is referendum that all we need. All marginalized areas are entitled to self-determination. But the question is to determine what? The answer is to determine their rightful positions in the united Sudan in the first place. This presupposes that you must have a clear vision on what kind of position you claim that you are entitled to occupy. These are the basic agenda to negotiate with the centre your project of self-determination through. An interim period is required as a test of credibility.
on behalf of the centre and a test of capability on behalf of the margin. If this fails then a referendum is made as part of the self-determination package in which the concerned people should decide whether to keep on or to pull out ... but to pull out from what? From the federal State. This means that federalism should be the basis for this self-determination.

The Southerners should know that in their noble fighting and dying they are not doing this for the prestigmatic centre. They are rather fighting to occupy the rightful position they are entitled to in the socio-economical realities of Sudan. They are fighting against the institution of centro-marginalization in order to bring an end to the so called stigma. It is a battle ordained to be won. After victory Sudan will be run by a governmentality that owes its existence to the struggle of the marginalized people of whom the Southerners will emerge as the leading group. Opting for separation may imply succumbing by fleeing the battlefield. What does not make sense is that separation does not guarantee peace; fighting and dying will continue with only one difference. This time fighting and dying will be for the benefits of America. What a shame! History will never forgive us for that.

20.2. Federalism: the Dismantlement of Centro-Marginalization:

Autonomy is the essence of federalism. The different parts of Sudan has enjoyed autonomous rule since time immemorial. In the Funj era the tribal kinglets were autonomous. During the Egyptian-Turkish rule a policy of decentralization was adopted. During the British-Egyptian rule the tribal and local administrations was a continuum of what prevailed before. So federalism has a deep-rooted legacy. During May Regime regional government (a different appellation of the same product) was introduced. Since then politicians and regimes have employed a host of word play terminologies from Arabic to English and vice-versa. Nevertheless the process of centro-marginalization has undone this history-long tradition of
Cultural centralism is the base of centro-marginalization. In such a context technical federalism will amount to nothing more than a trick. Evasively the concept of share of power and wealth is being deliberated and then presented as the appropriate approach for solving the problem. As far as the process of culturally re-producing the margin in the centre is going on, there is no way that a sound federalism can be achieved. Centro-marginalization defeats federalism. If the child pupil from marginalized groups will be humiliated in his early years in school simply because he/she does not speak Arabic, then what is the meaning of federalism that stigmatizes non-Arab people?

The concepts of stigma and prestigma are embedded in the process of centro-marginalization. This is directly related to the problem of national character, personality and national identity. How is this going to be portrayed in our national educational curricula? Lacking any vision pertaining to the cultural problem has been the primary shortcoming of the struggle of the margin against the centre. The Western model of superficially recognizing the blacks and other races under the banner of multiculturalism and having them on the façade of every cultural activity where the parameters prevailing are the mechanism of assimilation is in no where to be followed. It has relegated the blacks in a similar way as slavery. Just like the marionette-slave, the Western culture of assimilation has yielded a very degenerate model for the blacks: to sing, dance and run. With such poor models it is hardly possible for them to fare well; to sing, dance and run you do not need to read and study hard- as perceived by young blacks. You only need to imitate. With school dropout and consequently juvenile crime in increase, the blacks are stigmatized as never before as good for nothing people. There is no way for this to happen in the Sudan, simply because this way the war is not going to stop.

The parameters of federalism should be the cultural premises and the
cultural rights of all the people of Sudan. Federalism should be based on the perspective of “Unity in Diversity” not that of the “Melting Pot”.

20.4. Plural Democracy not Liberal Democracy:

Democracy is not necessarily liberal. Liberalism is a Western cultural characteristic. The liberal philosophy came into shape in the course of defending the individual’s rights against violation by the state. Liberalism is individualistic by nature. In Sudanese society where the individual is identified according to his/her age group there is no place for either individualism or liberalism. Democracy is not a self-sufficient concept; it takes different shapes according to the cultural premises on which it is being grounded. This is why the Westerners have defined it with their own cultural identity, i.e. liberalism. This means that liberal democracy can never be applied in a society whose culture is not characterized with individual liberalism. It is really disgusting when one sees how the Sudanese intellectuals chew the term ‘liberal democracy’ without ever being able to swallow it. More than shallowness it tells about the vanity of their democracy which is nothing more than a technically expensive way of hassling people through the poll.

Another cynical term also chewed by our bogus intellectuals is the ‘democracy of Westminster’. It is the democracy where the bishops of the Church of England, not imams or rabbis, are members of parliament by the virtue of being religious men with the right to vote. It is a democracy where the Queen is the sponsor of the church. A democracy where the parliament is wholly based on two countering bodies: the Lords vs. the Commons, i.e. prestigmatic vs. stigmatic. The Lords are members by prestigmatic heredity or at their best appointed. This is not meant in any way to mock the British system, a mockery it rightly deserves, but to show how they have grounded democracy in their own culture according to their own ageless system of
prestigma/stigma. How can our intellectuals use such a term in referring to the crippled democracy so far applied in Sudan? Unless that they are observing the prestigma/stigma similarity.

The democracy that can be applied in a culturally plural society is by definition pluralistic democracy. The premise of pluralism here is the various cultures. The whole culture of the group is equated to the individual in the Western democracy. In a society where the individual is asked of his tribe before asked of his name, there is no individualism and by this virtue there is no liberalism.

21. Prosperity:

Sudan can make history once again by bringing the peoples and countries of Bilād al-Sūdān together with the peoples and countries of East Africa in a commonwealth and a common market with an area on the Red Sea as a Free Zone with outlet lifelines to inland countries, if only he knows where he belongs.

Muh ammad Jalāl Ah mad Hāshim

Beacon House, Ibstone Road

Stokenchurch, Bucks

England
Kwame Nkrumah was famous for advocating a Government for the entire continent of Africa; for what he projected as the United States of Africa, and sometimes referred to as the Union Government of Africa or a Union of African States. His slogan was "Africa Must Unite". That was his public position until he died in 1972.

However, it was reported by no less a figure than Amilcar Cabral that Nkrumah was thinking of modifying his position before he died in exile. It is significant that, before he died, Nkrumah told Cabral: "Cabral, I tell you one thing, our problem of African unity is very important, really, but now if I had to begin again, my approach would be different." (Cabral, Return to the Source: 91)

Since we have no record of actual changes in Nkrumah's approach, we must hold that his unmodified position was his last position on the matter. So Nkrumah lived and died a continentalist; an advocate of the United States of Africa.

With Nyerere, it is different. There is the evidence of his own words that he was a continentalist in 1963, just like Nkrumah; and that in 1997, two years before he died, he retreated in public from continentalist Pan-Africanism to sub-Saharan Pan-Africanism.

2. On his 75th birthday speech in 1997, Nyerere stressed the following points:

a) "North Africa is part of Europe and the Middle East."

b) "Africa south of the Sahara is on its own. . . . African leadership, the coming African leadership, will have to bear that in mind. You are on your own. . . ."

c) "The small countries in Africa [south of the Sahara] must . . . come together. . . . If we can't move towards bigger nation-states, at least let's move towards greater cooperation."

d) "Africa south of the Sahara is isolated. Therefore, to develop, it will have to depend upon its own resources basically. Internal resources, nationally; and Africa will have to depend upon Africa. The leadership of the future will have to devise, try to carry out policies of maximum national self-reliance and maximum collective self-reliance. They have no other choice. Hamna! (You don't have it)"

Nyerere gave a wise elder's parting advice to Black Africa to be self-reliant and go it alone; to not rely on the Arabs or the Europeans or the Americans or the Japanese or the Indians or on any other people whatsoever, as none of them have it in their self-interest to help develop Black Africa. That we are on our own means that Black Africa should organize itself, by itself and for itself.

In other words, because of our separate and unique situation in the world, Black Africans should, in effect, extricate ourselves from the problem and confusion Nkrumah created 40 years earlier by joining us in an embrace with the Arabs of North Africa in his quest for continental unification.

An implication of Nyerere's advice is for us Black Africans to withdraw from the Afro-Arab AU, US of Africa, etc. and organize our own Blacks-only collective outfit to solve our peculiar problems.

In 1963, Nyerere, just like Nkrumah, regarded the entire continent of Africa as a single geo-political unit, and the North African Arabs together with the south of the Sahara blacks as one single constituency.

But in 1997, Nyerere made it clear that he considered the south of Sahara Africa, black Africa, a distinct geo-political unit, quite separate in its identity and its destiny from Arab North Africa.
In that 1997 speech, Nyerere repeatedly emphasized that he was speaking about Africa south of the Sahara, and not of the entire continent. And his reason for considering the North African Arabs as a people apart, a people with a different identity and destiny is this:

"North Africa is to Europe what Mexico is to the United States. North Africans who have no jobs will not go to Nigeria; they'll be thinking of Europe or the Middle East, because of the imperatives of geography and history and religion and language. North Africa is part of Europe and the Middle East."

What, we may ask, led him to change his view? His reason, as stated in 1997, is purely geo-political and based on the likely realities of the 21st century. It has nothing to do with whether Arabs love or hate blacks; nothing to do with past historical relations between Arabs and Black Africans. So, even those who think that Arabs are our "brothers" and best friends, have to consider Nyerere's final position on the matter of Afro-Arab unity or alliance.

Even if, indeed, they are our "brothers" and best friends, it is in our enlightened geo-political self-interest not to cling to them in the 21st century. Their history, their circumstance, their aspirations and their destiny are different from ours.

It is significant that Nyerere's argument for our separately taking care of our own business is not based on the history of our relations with the Arabs. There are some Black Africans who feel that because of the Afro-Arab anti-imperialist alliance in the second half of the 20th century, an alliance whereby Arabs gave help to Black Africa during the liberation struggles, we should, in gratitude, treat the Arabs as part of ourselves, or at least as our permanent friends and allies.

Nyerere knew about the Arab help better than anybody else since he coordinated that help in his position as Chairman of the OAU Liberation Committee.

But despite all that, Nyerere is indicating that our interest in the 21st century demands that we give up that idea of relying on or identifying with the Arabs. We must recognize no permanent friends and no permanent enemies, only our permanent interests. And our interest in the 21st century, Nyerere urged, is distinct from the interest of the North African Arabs.

We must accept that fact and draw the necessary conclusions and act on them. Whatever help the Arabs gave to the anti-colonial struggles in Black
Africa, it does not require that we ignore the reality of the divergence of interests in the 21st century.

Nyerere is pointing out a key aspect of our reality that must be made the foundation of our behaviour: There is a time to be on one's own. And that time for Black Africa is the 21st century.

We are blessed with the fact that Nyerere lived long enough, and spoke his mind towards the end, so that we don't have to speculate on where he would have ended up on this issue.

With the wisdom of experience and at the end of a long life, he arrived at the conclusion that we must go our own way and self-reliantly. And that, I think, is what we should do if we are sane.

**But Is Nyerere Likely to Be Heeded?**

Certainly not by the nigger crazies whose inferiority complex makes them pathologically terrified of Blacks-only associations. To understand why Nkrumahists and other Continentalists are unlikely to accept Nyerere’s advice, we need to appreciate the psychological yearning that continentalism satisfies. Continentalism is the political counterpart of social integrationism, and both belong to the same complex of pathologies as skin bleaching and hair straightening: all are desperate attempts to desert the now powerless black race and join the now more powerful white race.

Continentalists, like all compulsive integrationists, are psychological victims of the white supremacist dogma that blacks cannot achieve anything without white guidance. As Amos Wilson explained, they have been intimidated by Eurocentric history; by the inflated European achievements.

All this talk about the great achievements of the Europeans, of the great white race, has intimidated them. And they subconsciously say to themselves: "Hey we'd better hang in with these white people because if we lose them we're going back into barbarism and primitiveness. Blacks can't be on their own!"

Subconsciously, they are driven to seek white company, and to fear and flee from any blacks-only group.

Lacking self-confidence and lacking confidence in the black race, they are pathologically grasping at any white straw to keep themselves from drowning.
If Europeans are not available, then they go for the next best thing: the white Arabs. Hence their craving for continentalism. Their negrophobic subconscious is insistently telling them "Without whites we can't take care of our own business. We can't be on our own. We can't go it alone.

We'll mess it up." That's the negrophobic message they get from their niggerized subconscious; the message that drives them to cling desperately to whites. That is the mindset that will prevent Continentalists from taking Nyerere's advice about Black Africans being on their own.

*Chinweizu Chinweizu's books include The West and the Rest of Us (1975); and Decolonising the African Mind (1987). His weekly column, The Black Power Pan-Africanist Perspective appears every Thursday in the Lagos newspaper Business Day.*
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CHINWEIZU on ANCESTORS' ANGER

Part I. The Anger of the Ancestors

Scatterbrained Ancestors
Ah, this land
This black whore
This manacled bitch
Tied to a post and raped
By every passing white dog:

The dog of the crescent sword
The dog of the militant cross
The dog of the red star!
Listen! Listen to the pack
Of scavenger dogs from white heartlands
Snarling in their gang rape of Africa!

Black Lady
Forced to wear
A white turban of shame
And white shoes of shame
With the acid of humiliation
Burning in her eyes
As she suffers their gang rape!

Ah, this land
This scatterbrained land
For two and half millennia
Most unlucky in its rulers;
This continent
This father of sciences
For two and half thousand years
Wallowing in a murk of magic,
Like an eagle
Shot in soaring flight across the skies
Which dropped, wings cracked,
Into the lightless ooze
Of a mangrove ravine,
And is forever unable to scramble up;
O, unlucky land!

Ah, Africa
Birthplace of monotheism
Home of the Sun Disc of Aten -
That father to the Tablet of Moses,
And grand uncle to the Cross of Jesus,
And grandfather to the Crescent of Mohammed,
And great-grandfather to the Red Star of Marx!
For what are they -
Tablet, Cross, Crescent and Red Star -
But icons of latter-day cults
Fashioned by white imitators
Of that heretic theological line
Invented in the fourteenth century BC
By Akhenatten, King of Khemet?
Yet, behold this venerable land,
Assaulted, dismembered,
In its supine, demented dotage,
By the mongrel progeny
Of a bastard it discarded!
Behold the white religions
Their war banners flying high;
A trinity of alien icons;
Red Star, Cross and Crescent,
Competing for reverent kisses
From black auxiliaries.

O paragon of self-contempt
With a genius of suicide!
For two and a half millennia
Driven by brainwashed shame,
They have bleached their black identity,
Scraping it off like shit from their fine skin;
They have scrambled from their black identity
Like a man fleeing his menacing shadows!
And like whales
Demented by sea-borne infections in their brains,
And are panting or white theologies
From St Peter's
From the Ka'aba,
From the Kremlin.
Like beached whales,
They have fled their habitat,
Fled their dark sea waters
Polluted by humiliations;
They are lusting for sacred waters
They hope will whiten their souls.
That one claims he is an Arab.
He now wears around his neck
A fake genealogical chain
Linking himself to the Quraish.
Look, look at him now!
Look at what air he wears!
He feels his worth increased
In the sight of his alien god:
And when he bites off his African tongue,
And stutters in Arabic,
He is giddy with divine pride
At being able to address his fellows
In "the language of God himself!
And when he dons the Arab turban,
And nails Arab name to his brow,
And bows in obedience to mecca,
Five times a day like a lizard,
Dramatizing thereby his allegiance
To the Arabs and their homeland,
He feels the gate of heaven opening for him!
He hears the trumpet of Angels
Blowing a fanfare to welcome him!

That other one,
At morning assembly each day,
Lustily chants
The identity of his desire:
'Our ancestors, the Gaul,
Were blond-haired and blue-eyed!'
But he was not taught to ad:
'Were half-naked and lived in caves.'
Yet his face, this strange Gaul,
Has nothing blond,
Has nothing blue,
Is ebony Black!

And the third,
Less crude, more cerebral
In his flight from his identity,
Declared with bright-eyed passion:
'I am deracialized;
And I am denationalized!
The God of the Dialectics, of Historical Materialism,
is color and nation blind.
From the mud of primitivism,
He lifted me into the astral planes,
And showed me the Universal Father!
I have done my dialectical ablutions,
I stand naked and purified
All ready to approach his altar.
Do not taint me with black identity;
Taint me not with parochialism!
I must cross that grand threshold;
I must stand under the radiant gaze of Prophet Marx,
I must join the mass of assimilation
into the Universal!'
And another of that sad lot,
Deranged by the world's contempt,
Grabbed a white boy by the collar
And sputtered into his face:
'I have bleached my face like yours;
I've adopted your white names;
I've defected to your white religion;
I've whitewashed my ancestral tree.
Why won't you treat me like an equal?
Why do you treat me like a dog?
'O dear dear, 'the white replied,
If you spit on what you are,
Why should I not do so?
If you flee from what you are,
And crave to be what I am,
Doesn't that show that what you are
is inferior to what I am?
Who would treat his mimic like an equal?
Do you think I am dotty like you?

O terrible, terrible, terrible!
What meningitis of the soul
Has twisted their identity spines?
Like yam tendrils fleeing earth damp,
They grope for a stake of twine on
And lift their leaves to the light:
They grope, despairingly grope,
For any genealogical tree With white bark.
II. The Anger of the Ancestors

And before this demented motley
Leaning its mammoth wretchedness
On the back of the burning horizon,
Behold the ancestors!
The volcanic anger of progenitors!
And their eyes,
Smarting at this circus of absurdities,
Are thirsting for the new black man
the black man who would not be whipped;
the black man who would not sell his kind;
the black man shielded by ramparts of cunning,
by parapets of reticence
against beams of false self-knowledge
aimed to char our heads;
the black man who would not suffer his brains
to be inflated with flattery,
soaked in whiskey,
shattered with nuances of contempt
scattered with nuances of contempt
scattered on a pavement before mocking faces,
before mocking white compassions,
and trampled by shining boots spiked with dollars.

But everywhere
in bazaars of febrile desires
a glitter of tinsel dreams,
a delirium of cash and lace,
elixir of mad modernity
sold by titillation;
And on the podia of academia,
catechists of aesthetica
are hawking esoterica;
And from minarets and pulpits,
ecclesiastical gunners
in turban and dog collars
are shooting into black soul
bullet commandments from killjoy gods;
And from pulsing electronic towers
Intellectual acrobats
Make somersaults of reason
to lure us to cheer our destroyers.
Everywhere, everywhere,
fat chefs of sophistries,
lying mothers of inventions,
grand ineptitudes, perched high on saddles of power,
conjure mirages of dancing waters
to scald the thirst in our throats.
Everywhere, everywhere,
from plazas of delirious power,
razzle-dazzle magicians
joyfully transmute our hopes
to hot ash.

And they say, the ancestors say:
the pink cheeks conquered us,
raped our imaginations, fathered on us
bastard ambitions that will stuff our seed
down the gullet of their greed.
Behold what strange progeny our conquerors sired on us:
Behold our new notables
Evangelists of new disorders
Black messengers of white gods
Brown skin with blond souls
Inebriate swooners before madonnas
Crusaders for the European Cross
Jihadeers for the Arab Crescent
Militants of the Russian Star
Trans-civilized idolators all
Craving a white message!
Behold what a strange progeny
Our Conquerors sired on us.

**III. If You Let Them**

O Black, hear and heed!
When the final war begins,
To drive white predators from our land,
Across hot sands and burning seas,
The jackal of the white race,
Greed and reconquest in their hearts,
Will dash forth to exterminate you.
They will caress your ears with lovely lies,
Numb your minds with white religions,
Distract your eyes with flashing wonders,
And riddle your bodies with white-hot bullets.
They will dispatch their black auxiliaries -
Black satraps wielding white power,
Black bishops in white dogcollars,
Black mullahs in white turbans,
Black generals in uniforms of white armies -
Who will skin and send your carcasses to meat shops.

If you let them, if you let them,
These believers in partnership
Of white rider on black ass,
They will drug you with delusions,
Mad, suicidal illusions,
With fairy-tales of good, white heavens,
With lies about white benevolence;
And with force, fraud and your own naive goodwill,
They will sweep your bones from veldt and forest,
Return your land to rack and ruin,
To their heartless despoliation.

If you let them, if you let the(m),
They will use your fears against you
Your lack of daring against you
Your respectability against you
Your sweet reasonableness against you
Your craving for trinkets against you
Your thirst for their praise against you
Your hunger for their world against you
Your contempt for your own against you
Your longing for world brotherhood against you
Your sense of self-shame against you
Your belief in their goodness against you
Your belief in their goodness against you
Your legendary patience against you
Your fairness fully against you
Your restraint roughly against you
Your sincerity sharply against you
Your avarice, cowardice, ignorance, hates
Your irresolution against you
And they'll stuff your mouths once more
With glass shards of defeat,
And force you to swallow them.

Woe to them who forget their history
And drug their hearts with false memories.
Woe to them who put their faith
In the fairness of white foes;
Who embrace as friends those jackals
Who swarmed in and grabbed our homeland,
Africa, land of Blacks,
And hacked our ancestral stalwarts of bloody deaths
On the abattoirs of history.
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Collective Security

By Chinweizu

It is absolutely amazing, quite tragic and a great sin of omission, that collective security has not explicitly been the paramount objective of Pan-Africanism since 1958. For a people all of whose woes for the past 2500 years (since the fall of the Black Egypt of the Pharaohs to White Persians in 525 BC) have resulted from their inability to secure their borders and protect their lands, populations, societies, cultures, values etc., achieving collective security should have been, and still should be, the paramount concern. Other than Nkrumah’s repeated demand for an African High Command; and Azikiwe’s mention, in 1962, of the need for some arrangements for collective security; and Haile Selassie’s mention of that need in his 1963 address at the inauguration of the OAU, I have found in the records no other treatment that has a bearing on the issue. Nkrumah, Azikiwe and Selassie did indeed raise the issue of collective security; however, they did so in an a-historical form, the wrong form.

The “Never Again” question

Consider a man who has just escaped, half mauled, from the den of a pack of hungry lions. If he is wise, his first order of business is to vow “Never again!” and ask how he strayed there in the first place, and then to take steps never again to make that mistake. If he does not do this, if he fails to learn from his harrowing experience, he is stupid and deserves to become the dinner for the next lion that comes his way. By failing to ask and answer
that “never again” question, Black Africa’s “independence” generation let Black Africa down and led us astray.

Unfortunately, since the “independence” generation did not have the ancestral sankofa orientation, the question of collective security was not posed in the correct historical form that would have allowed our past experience to point to an answer for the future.

The African High Command that Nkrumah urged did not go far enough in addressing the fundamental problem. It was limited to “an African High Command which could resist . . . acts which threaten the territorial integrity and sovereignty of African States.” [Revolutionary Path, p.345]; it would “plan revolutionary war, and initiate action” so that Africa will be liberated soon. [Revolutionary Path, p.482] It was not a doctrine that posed or answered the comprehensive historical question of how we fell into a history of enslavement, conquest and colonialism in the first place, and how we could ensure that we never again did so.

**Unity for security and survival**

Since 1958, Pan-Africanism has made African Unity its prime project. Now, the usual motive for the voluntary unification of states is security and survival. However Pan Africanism has strangely been obtuse on the matter of security and survival for its constituency. I do not find Nkrumah, Padmore, Diop, Azikiwe and the other advocates of continental unification anywhere articulating [and I stand to be corrected] the argument that the paramount objective of continental unification is the survival and security of Africans. If they did, and thought the matter through, and had bothered to educate themselves on the nature of Afro-Arab historical relations of the last two millennia, they would be simply suicidal or insane to have proposed a unification of Arabs and Africans under one continental state. Not even Nkrumah, for whom unification seems like a panacea, [note his long catalogue of benefits that he said it would yield], saw fit to include security
and survival, whether explicitly or implicitly, among his reasons for advocating continental unification. In light of the articulated and demonstrated Arab ambitions in Africa for the last 1,500 years, any unification of Black Africans with the Arab settler colonialists in Africa would be as suicidal for Black Africans as a unification between mice and cats would be for mice.

**Our endangered situation**

Consider this true story from Sudan:

"The dispute over oil," Victoria Ajang begins, "first became an issue of life and death for me in 1983. That year the government began its program to pipe oil from our land in the south up to the north. Students in my town were quite upset about our resources being diverted by the government, and so they held a protest march outside the local school. But the government would not tolerate this.

"On a summer night, the government militia forces suddenly swooped in on our village. We were at home relaxing, in the evening, when men on horses with machine guns stormed through, shooting everyone. I saw friends fall dead in front of me. While my husband carried out our little daughter Eva, I ran with the few possessions I could grab. "All around us, we saw children being [hit] in the stomach, in the leg, between the eyes. Against the dark sky, we saw flames from the houses the soldiers had set on fire. The cries of the people forced inside filled our ears as they burned to death. Our people were being turned to ash."

Victoria Ajang’s story of what happened to her village, illustrates what dangers they expose themselves to who do not take measures to ensure their security. They will be relaxing and entertaining themselves when their enemies make a surprise attack and destroy them. That is the situation Black Africans have allowed themselves to be in for 2500 years and have foolishly refused to take measures to prevent.
An unasked question

Two vital questions should have been asked and answered in 1958 by the All-African People’s Conference, namely: (a) “How do we set the rest of Black Africa free from colonialism?”. (This, thankfully, was indeed asked and answered) and (b)”How do we ensure that we shall never again be enslaved, conquered and colonized by anybody?” (This, alas, went unasked and remains unasked and unanswered till this day). Rather than take up the second task, we were diverted into other things. In Nkrumah’s own words:

“Long before 1957, I made it clear that the two major tasks to be undertaken after the ending of colonial rule in Ghana would be the vigorous prosecution of a Pan-African policy to advance the African Revolution, and at the same time the adoption of measures to construct socialism in Ghana.” – [Path, p.125]

In their desire to establish a new social order—apparently without bothering about how it would protect itself from our enemies-- Nkrumah set about building “scientific socialism” in Ghana; Nyerere set about building African socialism (Ujamaa) in Tanzania; Kaunda set about building African Humanism in Zambia; Houphouet Boigny set about building capitalism in Cote d’Ivoire; and others set about building other systems in the other countries, but nobody saw fit to ask the paramount question of African collective security, namely “How do we ensure that we shall never again be enslaved, conquered and colonized by anybody?” This question should have informed whatever new social order they set out to build, but did not. What is the result today?

Consequences of lack of historical focus on Collective Security

Several very costly errors have flowed from this our lack of proper [sankofa] attention to our collective security.

A] Our quest for African unity has been misguided in three respects:
A1] We have sought to unite a territory—the entire African continent—that is far too large for our security needs.

A2] By not finding out who our historic enemies are, we have included our Arab enemies among those we seek to unite with;

A3] By not understanding our security requirements, we failed to seriously undertake industrialization.

B] Even if we still recognize that they were our historic enemies during the centuries of the slave trade and colonialism, we have failed to realize that Europeans did not stop being our enemies with the ending of political colonialism [1957-1994]. In our amnesia and foolishness, we have treated our historic White European enemies as our best friends, as our mentors in development and now as our so-called ‘development partners’; and we have treated our historic Arab enemies as our African brothers and allies, and thereby left ourselves totally unprepared for their enemy attacks, for example:

B1] The AIDS bombing of Black Africa by the World Health Organization (WHO) and the USA took us totally unawares;

B2] For 50 years we have allowed the European imperialist institutions—the UN, and especially its IMF-WB-GATT/WTO troika, and our European “ex-colonizers” to tutor and guide us into maldevelopment and chronic poverty.

B3] For 50 years we have failed to recognize and collectively resist Arab colonialist expansionism and racism against Black Africans, as well as the persisting enslavement of Black Africans by Arabs.

For 50 years, for lack of an explicit and appropriate interest in our collective security, we failed to heed the fundamental strategic principle:

Know your enemy and know yourself, and in a hundred battles you will never be defeated. -- Sun Tzu
Had we sought to know our white enemies, what would we have learnt from our own sages who had already studied them? We would have learnt the following:

“The attitude of the white race is to subjugate, to exploit, and if necessary exterminate the weaker peoples with whom they come in contact.”

--- Marcus Garvey

“In their relationship with the Black race, Europeans are psychopaths.” --- Bobby Wright

“Black men and women, when will you cease to drift along the way which leads to the extermination of the Black race?”

--- Azikiwe

----------

For fifty years, due to our lack of focus on our collective security, we have paid a heavy price from AIDS, not just the millions that have died from it, but also the multi-generational consequences from the social dislocations caused by the death of parents and the abandonment of millions of babies as AIDS orphans.

For fifty years, due to our lack of focus on our collective security, we have also paid a heavy price from the economic war waged on us by the European powers that got us into their debt trap and impoverished us.

For fifty years, due to our lack of focus on our collective security, we have also paid a heavy price in the millions killed or enslaved by the Arabs, and in the land they have seized from Black Africans.

‘Pacifist morality’ and our lack of security consciousness?

We must observe that it was not only the leaders who failed to ask the vital
question about our collective security; the entire “independence” generation seems to have failed to do so. They were not suspicious of the colonial masters that had enslaved and conquered and exploited Black Africa for centuries; and even till now we are not suspicious of the Europeans and Arabs, which is why we give their NGOs unchecked access to our villages, without strictly monitoring them to make sure they are not subverting our society or culture. When a behavior is rampant in a society, it is useful to look for an explanation in the culture. I think this suicidal lack of security consciousness is ingrained in our culture.

Cheikh Anta Diop, in his Two Cradles Theory, lists ‘pacifist morality’ as one of the traits of the Southern Cradle cultures of which Black Africa is a part.

Nkrumah, in lauding the African Personality, said: “We have the gifts of laughter and joy, a love of music, a lack of malice, an absence of the desire for vengeance for our wrongs, all things of intrinsic worth in a world sick of injustice, revenge, fear and want.” [Revolutionary Path, p.114]

These traits of the African personality are not a virtue in the world as it is. The world requires a ‘warrior morality’ not a ‘pacifist morality’.

It was Steve Biko who observed, and correctly I think, that “we are not a suspicious race.” Some might think that that trait is a virtue, but it is not. It might be a virtue in ‘pacifist morality’ but it is a vice in ‘warrior morality’. And the world we live in demands ‘warrior morality’. To illustrate the warrior mentality that we lack, here is a story from Meiji Japan:

In a Japanese Hospital

The last patient of the evening, a boy less than four years old, is received by nurses and surgeons with smiles and gentle flatteries, to which he does not at all respond ... He is both afraid and angry — especially angry — at finding himself in an hospital tonight: some indiscreet person assured him that he was being taken to the theatre; and he sang for joy on the way, forgetting
the pain of his arm; and this is not the theatre! There are doctors here — doctors that hurt people. . . . He lets himself be stripped, and bears the examination without wincing; but when told that he must lie down upon a certain low table, under an electric lamp, he utters a very emphatic "No!". . . The experience inherited from his ancestors has assured him that to lie down in the presence of a possible enemy is not good; and by the same ghostly wisdom he has divined that the smile of the surgeon was intended to deceive ... ‘But it will be so nice upon the table!’ coaxingly observes a young nurse; ‘see the pretty red cloth!’ "No!" repeats the little man — made only more wary by this appeal to aesthetic sentiment ... So they lay hands upon him — two surgeons and two nurses — lift him deftly, bear him to the table with the red cloth. Then he shouts his small cry of war — for he comes of good fighting stock — and, to the general alarm, battles most valiantly, in spite of that broken arm. But lo! a white wet cloth descends upon his eyes and mouth, and he cannot cry, and there is a strange sweet smell in his nostrils, and the voices and the lights have floated very, very far away, and he is sinking, sinking, sinking into wavy darkness ... The slight limbs relax; for a moment the breast heaves quickly, in the last fight of the lungs against the paralyzing anaesthetic: then all motion stops. . . .


The people of the "independence" generation did not have the healthy suspiciousness that was displayed by that little Japanese boy! Nor have we acquired it till today.

**Our tragedy**

Why do I say it is tragic that we have not made collective security our paramount concern? Had we made collective security our paramount concern, it would have forced us to correctly answer the question: unity for whom? We would have investigated to determine those enemies from whom
we need security; and that would have obliged us to examine the history of our relations with the Arabs and with the Europeans. And having ascertained that Arabs are our mortal enemies, we would not have sought continental union with them. This is one way in which our lack of clarity on the question of who our historic enemies are has cost us dearly.

Just consider the long war in Sudan between the Black Arabs who are entrenched in power in Khartoum and the Black Africans of South Sudan. Black Africa would have mobilized and won that war long ago if we had a doctrine and an organ of collective security. In which case the genocide in Darfur would not have arisen at all. By the same token, the enslavement of Black Africans in Mauritania by the White Arabs there would have been ended by the collective intervention of Black Africa. Furthermore, the current Arab campaign to seize a belt of Sahelian borderlands stretching from Senegal to the Red Sea would have been checked. Same with the Arab ambition to seize the entire Nile Basin, all the way south to Kampala.

This lack of definition of who our collective enemies are has also prevented us from being on our guard against the Europeans. Many of us do not even recognize that the Europeans are our enemies, despite their having enslaved and colonized and exploited us for many centuries. Because we are not on guard against them, we allow them to come and go unsupervised into our countries, which is how they came in and inflicted AIDS on us by using AIDS-infected vaccines to vaccinate 97 million Black Africans in an alleged campaign to eradicate smallpox.

So, what do we do now?

**Breeding out pacifist morality traits**

As Cabral taught us, we need to struggle against our own weaknesses. As I have indicated, one of our weaknesses is our pacifist morality. It manifests as our unsuspiciousness, as our lack of malice, as an absence of the desire for vengeance for our wrongs, especially wrongs received at the hands of
whites.

Diop pointed out that the most essential function which a culture must serve is survival [Great African Thinkers, p. 244]. As we have seen, the pacifist morality of our culture has been maladaptive and has exposed us to many lethal dangers. We need to repair our culture. We need to evolve a new African culture that breeds out the pacifist mentality and inculcates a warrior mentality in ever four-year old. But can this change be effected? Yes, it can. Just consider what Shaka did, in just ten years, with his reforms. In fact, on just one fearsome day, he wiped out cowardice from the Zulu nation. So, if we set about things correctly, we can change from a pacifist morality to a warrior morality even in one generation. That is a task for our education system.

We need to change our child-rearing methods and adopt some functional equivalent of the Samurai upbringing that produced that 4-year-old Japanese boy. Then we should supplement that by emphasizing martial arts and the game of chess in schools. We should then top it off by instituting compulsory military service for all 18 year olds. The products of such a system are unlikely to have a pacifist mentality, or to be obtuse about collective security. It might be useful to indicate the basics of a Samurai education as a model of what we should functionally reproduce.

**A Samurai upbringing**

"But sons of samurai were severely disciplined in those days: and the one of whom I write had little time for dreaming. The period of caresses was made painfully brief for him. Even before he was invested with his first hakama, or trousers — a great ceremony in that epoch — he was weaned as far as possible from tender influence, and taught to check the natural impulses of childish affection. Little comrades would ask him mockingly, 'Do you still need milk?' if they saw him walking out with his mother, although he might love her in the house as demonstratively as he pleased, during the hours he
could pass by her side. These were not many. All inactive pleasures were severely restricted by his discipline; and even comforts, except during illness, were not allowed him. Almost from the time he could speak he was enjoined to consider duty the guiding motive of life, self-control the first requisite of conduct, pain and death matters of no consequence in the selfish sense.

There was a grimmer side to this Spartan discipline, designed to cultivate a cold sternness never to be relaxed during youth, except in the screened intimacy of the home. The boys were inured to sights of blood. They were taken to witness executions; they were expected to display no emotions and they were obliged, on their return home, to quell any secret feeling of horror by eating plentifully of rice tinted blood-color by an admixture of salted plum juice. Even more difficult things might be demanded of a very young boy — to go alone at midnight to the execution-ground, for example, and bring back a head in proof of courage. For the fear of the dead was held not less contemptible in a samurai than the fear of man. The samurai child was pledged to fear nothing. In all such tests, the demeanor exacted was perfect impassiveness; any swaggering would have been judged quite as harshly as any sign of cowardice.

As a boy grew up, he was obliged to find his pleasures chiefly in those bodily exercises which were the samurai’s early and constant preparations for war — archery and riding, wrestling and fencing. Playmates were found for him; but these were older youths, sons of retainers, chosen for ability to assist him in the practice of martial exercises. It was their duty also to teach him how to swim, to handle a boat, to develop his young muscles. Between such physical training and the study of the Chinese classics the greater part of each day was divided for him. His diet, though ample, was never dainty; his clothing, except in time of great ceremony, was light and coarse; and he was not allowed the use of fire merely to warm himself. While studying of winter mornings, if his hands became too cold to use the writing brush, he
would be ordered to plunge them into icy water to restore the circulation; and if his feet were numbed by frost, he would be told to run about in the snow to make them warm. Still more rigid was his training in the special etiquette of the military class; and he was early made to know that the little sword in his girdle was neither an ornament nor a plaything. He was shown how to use it, how to take his own life at a moment's notice, without shrinking, whenever the code of his class might so order.¹

1. *Is that really the head of your father?* a prince once asked of a samurai boy only seven years old. The child at once realized the situation. The freshly severed head set before him was not his father's: the daimyo had been deceived, but further deception was necessary. So the lad, after having saluted the head with every sign of reverential grief, suddenly cut out his own bowels. All the prince's doubts vanished before that bloody proof of filial piety; the outlawed father was able to make good his escape; and the memory of the child is still honored in Japanese drama and poetry.

Also in the matter of religion, the training of a samurai boy was peculiar. He was educated to revere the ancient gods and the spirits of his ancestors; he was well schooled in the Chinese ethics; and he was taught something of Buddhist philosophy and faith. But he was likewise taught that hope of heaven and fear of hell were for the ignorant only; and that the superior man should be influenced in his conduct by nothing more selfish than the love of right for its own sake, and the recognition of duty as a universal law.

Gradually, as the period of boyhood ripened into youth, his conduct was less subjected to supervision. He was left more and more free to act upon his own judgment, but with full knowledge that a mistake would not be forgotten; that a serious offense would never be fully condoned; and that a well-merited reprimand was more to be dreaded than death. On the other
hand, there were few moral dangers against which to guard him. Professional vice was then strictly banished from many of the provincial castle-towns; and even so much of the non-moral side of life as might have been reflected in popular romance and drama, a young samurai could know little about. He was taught to despise that common literature appealing either to the softer emotions or the passions, as essentially unmanly reading; and the public theater was forbidden to his class. Thus, in that innocent provincial life of Old Japan, a young samurai might grow up exceptionally pure-minded and simple-hearted.

So grew up the young samurai concerning whom these things are written — fearless, courteous, self-denying, despising pleasure, and ready at an instant's notice to give his life for love, loyalty, or honor.”

2. Samurai women, in some provinces at least, could go to the public theater. The men could not, without committing a breach of good manners. But in samurai homes, or within the grounds of the yashiki, some private performances of a particular character were given. Strolling players were the performers. I know several charming old shizoku who have never been to a public theater in their lives, and refuse all invitations to witness a performance. They still obey the rules of their samurai education.

Extract from “A Conservative” in Lafcadio Hearn, Writings from Japan, pp.291-293

If we learn from the Samurai upbringing, we cannot allow our children to be brought up on Channel O, and the like.
A change in our concept of security

Besides inculcating a warrior mentality in all Black Africans, we need to change our still-colonial concept of security.

The colonial notion of security was the security of the colonial state and enterprise from the people it came to exploit and oppress. This was the doctrine of security which conceived the colonial army as a back-up for the police i.e. as an army to be used for riot control and punitive expeditions. This doctrine has been inherited by the neo-colonial states and has not been changed. [In Nigeria it was applied by the British to suppress the Aba women’s uprising, and recently by Obasanjo to wipe out the restive peoples of Odi and Zaki Biam].

In neo-colonial Africa, it has been noted that a small army, incapable of serving as an effective instrument of foreign policy, tends to ‘look inward’—to intervene in domestic politics; and that by and large, African forces are deployed only against their own people in their own countries. Furthermore, as Nyerere noted in 1961, “If an African state is armed, then realistically it can only be armed against another African state”[See Opoku Agyeman, Africa’s Persistent Vulnerable Link to Global politics, pp. 18, 19, 20, 23]

Can such internal security armies defend Black Africa against the Arab League, or Belgium or France or the UK, let alone against NATO?

Here is Azikiwe’s suggestion for an African Convention on Collective Security.

“This should make provisions for the following: a multilateral pact of mutual defence . . . ; an African High Command . . . ; a doctrine of non-intervention in Africa, on the same lines as the Monroe Doctrine in the Western Hemisphere. This doctrine should make it clear that the establishment or the continued existence of any colonial territory in the continent of Africa, by any European or American or Asian or Australian power shall be regarded

We need to adopt and develop this line of thinking. Security has to be against our external enemies: Arabs, Europeans and whoever else; and against enemy capabilities, existing and potential. Hence we will need to monitor enemy capacity as it changes, lest we find ourselves equipping ourselves to defend against obsolete weapons, and preparing for the last war, as it were.

Furthermore, our concept of security must be broadened well beyond military security to include economic, food, health and ideological security, since we have been under attack by the Arabs or the Europeans in all these areas. In fact, we need collective security of a total sort-- security against all possible means of attack, presently known and potential, and from all possible enemies.

*Copyright © Chinweizu*
Debt Trap Peonage

Monthly Review, Nov, 1985 by Chinweizu

For a country like Nigeria, which has already fallen into "debt trap peonage," the problem of escaping it breaks down into two tasks: escaping from it, and taking measures to avoid falling into it again. In order to find solutions to these two tasks, I am going to look at five questions: (1) What is Nigeria's debt situation today, and how was it brought about? (2) What makes it a case of debt trap peonage? (3) Why is it necessary to escape debt trap peonage? (4) How can that be done? (5) What stops Nigeria from taking the steps necessary for escaping it?

Today, six years after we were lured into unnecessary borrowing by lenders eager to recycle petrodollars, Nigeria's foreign debt is officially said to be 11.08 billion pounds sterling (U.S. $16.6 billion). Debt service charges are expected to consume 3.272 pounds sterling billion ($4.9 billion), some 38.47 percent of our 1984 export revenue of 8.5 billion pounds sterling ($12.75 billion); that is without including service charges on the $5.5 billion trade debt that we are anxious to convert into long-term debt. And as if all this mountain of debt was not burden enough, we are seeking an IMF loan of about $2 billion for "structural adjustments," so that we can get even more loans from international bankers.

As our oil revenues decline, we seem to be turning into a loan addict. Our urge is to grab loans and ever more loans, like a drug addict who must have more and more heroin to keep going. And like the heroin addict, we are craving these loans, not for sound purposes, but simply to finance our spendthrift consumer habits and our ambitious maldevelopment programs.

In classic peonage, workers, though nominally and legally free, are held in servitude by the terms of their indenture to their masters. Because their wages are set too low to buy the necessities, the master grants credit but restricts the worker to buying overpriced goods from the master's own store. As a result, each month the peon goes deeper and deeper into debt. For as long as the arrangement lasts, the peon cannot pay off the mounting debt and leave, and must keep on working for the master—which suits the master perfectly. For the master's aim is neither to starve the peons nor to see them free from the chain of debt, but rather to keep them working until they die. Peons cannot run away, either. The law recognizes their debt and will enforce the master's claims. Besides, no other employer will take them on so long as they owe the old master. So, peons who run off but do not get clean away are either captured and brought back, or starved in hiding.
The third world countries that are today accumulating massive debts are in an analogous situation. They do not earn enough from the export of their mineral and agricultural products to pay for the overpriced manufacturers they import from the West. The West, through international banks and government aid, lends them the difference. Each year they need more loans to make up these deficits, and so their foreign debt mounts. Unable to pay off their debts and powerless to survive the dire consequences of repudiating them, these countries are obliged to continue in permanent underdevelopment, supplying low priced raw materials to their industrial creditors and unable to concentrate their attention and resources on developing their economies in their own interest.

Such is precisely the situation into which Nigeria has put itself. And I must stress that Nigeria was not captured and forced into this situation, but volunteered itself into it. In 1978, when Nigeria agreed to contract the first billion of these debts, it had more income from oil than it could sensibly spend. Though it did not need the debt, it allowed itself to be persuaded to sample the pleasures of debtorship. In that, Nigeria is more like the person who was persuaded to take a first shot of heroin, got to like the thrill, and took more and more, soon becoming an addict. Indeed, Nigeria did enjoy the thrills of being a spend-thrift, and did soon become a loan addict. Nigeria has become, not just a debt trap peon, but a squander-addicted debt trap peon.

Nigeria shares three crucial characteristics with a heroin-addicted debt trap peon. First, both debts are unsecured consumer debts, made up of subsistence and spending-spree expenses, and with future income as the only collateral. Second, both loans are pure peonage loans, that is, loans made not because of the potential of the project the loan is to be used for, but simply in order to secure legal control over the economic and political behavior of the debtor. Third, the only way made available for getting out of both debts is by getting into more debt.

But what is wrong with this situation? Why is it necessary to escape it? Those of us who look forward to the day (which we may not ourselves live to see) when Nigeria will be an industrial world power, and those who wish to contribute to the early arrival of that day, cannot feel happy about our getting into a debt trap peonage that removes our economic sovereignty and hands the piloting of our economy over to our creditors. Today, that means turning Nigeria into a financial protectorate of the IMF. We can already see what that means. IMF teams come to inspect our books; we take our economic programs to them for approval; and they dictate what kinds of social and economic restructuring we must pursue. It is just as if we were back in the old colonial days, when the Colonial Office had to approve our
budget and economic programs, subject, of course, to these being serviceable to the larger imperial aims of our masters.

If we had any sense of national honor, we ought to cringe in shame. Here we are, an allegedly sovereign nation, being treated, twenty-four years after independence, like some delinquent schoolboy or some bankrupt company incapable of managing its finances.

But the need to escape debt trap peonage goes beyond the sentimental matter of national honor, and beyond the (perhaps to most people) abstract matter of economic and political sovereignty. Debt trap peonage is injurious to any country's development prospects; and the squander-addicted peonage that Nigeria is getting more deeply into is doubly injurious. Besides making us peons, it ruins our social fabric and disorients us. Let us see what injury has already been done, first to our finances, then to our social foundations and national psychology.

For today's $16.6 billion debt (i.e., two years' export revenues), we must now pay some $5 billion a year in service charges. For us, that does not make sense. But you can see why the banks came after us to borrow, and still want us to borrow more, provided the IMF can guarantee policies that will enable them to keep pumping similar billions out of us each year. And what do you think their weapon for keeping us hooked on loans is? Our habit of profligacy, that's what! We are addicted to loans because we are addicted to profligacy.

At first, to justify a relatively minor loan of $1 billion to be added to our huge oil revenues, we were encouraged to go on a spending spree. We were even helped to put together a lavish purchasing catalogue that we mistook for a development plan. As our profligacy became a habit, the doubling of our oil income didn't matter: we still needed a bit more to pay for our even more rapidly enlarging desires, and so we still wanted loans. This habit of spending beyond our means is at the root of our condition. If we learned to feel fine with our expenses well below our income, we would psychologically be in good shape to start plotting our escape from debt trap peonage. But curbing profligacy, like getting off heroin, is not easy, especially if it involves a drop in what we imagine our living standards to be.

Regarding our development prospects, debt trap peonage forces us to place our economy under IMF supervision. Given the fundamental antagonism between the interests of the peon and the master (in this case, between Nigeria and the West), we can fully expect that the IMF will insist on policies that will divert us from our national goal of developing into a powerful, prosperous, modern, industrial nation. Anyone who thinks that the IMF will
approve programs or sponsor policies which will develop Nigeria in such a way as to threaten the economic hegemony of the Western powers needs to go and think again. The IMF's job, as overseer of the global economic arrangements of the West, is precisely the opposite.

The other reason for getting out of debt trap peonage is that under it, policies will be imposed that will bring social chaos upon us. If we think that things are bad now, we should look down the road a few years and see what peonage will visit on us. For that, all we need do is look at countries that have allowed the IMF to tell them how to manage their economies. If you like, study the recent history of Brazil. (Those of you who read The Guardian [Lagos] regularly may have already understood the plight of Brazil. For, in our one year of existence, we have, in our "Economy and Business" pages, given as much coverage as possible to developments in Brazil. Our aim has been to sensitize Nigerians to what might soon be happening here, and why, if we remain, like Brazil, under IMF tutelage.) In brief, this is the Brazilian story.

In the 1970s Brazil went on a borrowing spree. Today its debt is almost $100 billion; its debt trap agonies fill the headlines. Since its exports cannot pay the debt service charges, Brazil is on the treadmill of seeking the rescheduling of its debts. But before the banks agree to roll over its loans, Brazil has to agree to the austerity measures decreed by the IMF. These measures however, call for severe hardships to be imposed on the population. As a result, Brazil has been plunged into semipermanent social unrest. Strikes, riots, and factory closures have become the disorders of the day. Hunger roams the streets and countryside. In the middle of 1983, numerous supermarkets were looted by hungry city dwellers. Starving rural folk who had fled to the cities were reduced to near cannibalism. Indeed, where in the 1970s Brazil went aborrowing, in the 1980s it has gone assorowing.

Caught in an endless round of debt rescheduling and endlessly screaming for fresh loans to pay off old debts, Brazil has been subjected to the insolence of powerful nations. When, last October, U.S. Treasury Secretary Donald Regan, while on a visit to Rio, voiced "fear" for the future of Brazil, a Brazilian senator cried out that the remarks were "insolent, inadmissible, and intolerable." There were demands to have Brazil's honor defended. Yet is there no end in sight to Brazil's debts, social unrest, and international humiliation.

But then, some might say, the IMF insists on inculcating financial discipline, and that can only be for the good of a financially undisciplined nation like Nigeria. My answer to that is: not necessarily, it all depends. Though the IMF
has come to be used by third world governments as the bogeyman that forces them to impose the hardships of financial discipline on their countries, we must ask: Is it really necessary to use the IMF as a bogeyman? And is the kind of discipline it imposes the kind we need?

Citizens have been known to make great sacrifices when they believe in the cause for which the sacrifices are demanded. So, to use the IMF as a bogeyman simply suggests that a government has not bothered to earn the confidence of its people in its ability to lead them on the hard and risky journey to development. As for the kind of discipline which the IMF likes to impose, it is the wrong kind for the wrong aims. What we need is the discipline of the farmer who plants his or her seeds, tends his or her fields, harvests his or her crops, and guards his or her granary from thieves and rodents alike. What we do not need is the pseudodiscipline of the robot who, once programmed, assists robbers in looting his or her own house.

If, for the above reasons, debt trape peonage is not good for us, how do we get out of it and stay out of it? Let me begin by disposing of a solution that in fact is no solution at all, but is the very problem itself. The conventional unwisdom says that the solution to our mounting debt is to reschedule it. But seriously, isn't that just what peons are obliged to do by their masters? For so long as their earnings are not enough to meet their needs and pay off the growing debt, rolling it over is not a cure but a prolongation of the disease.

For Nigeria, switching from short-term loans to medium-term loans, or from either to long-term loans, is like switching from heroin to methadone: it is merely the substitution of one addiction for another, when what is needed is an end to the addiction. Of course, addicted peons, if driven too hard, could commit suicide; but that would be cutting their throats to spite their enslaver's or dealer's pockets. The only remedy for the condition is to give up the craving for heroin, and then either repudiating the debt (by running far beyond the reach of the master's power of the law), or seeing to it that the terms of any rescheduling allow the debt to be worked off within a lifetime. For only then can peons walk out free, with the masters powerless to use the law to stop them. Let us consider these options.

The peons chances of running away from their debts are pretty slim. But can a sovereign state do that? Well, that becomes a matter of power, doesn't it? It boils down to one question: does the debtor state have the power to defy the armed might of the nations to which its creditors belong? If you examine the history of the Caribbean, you will find that, earlier in this century, debts owed to European and U.S. interests served as occasions for the takeover of nations by the U.S. marines, and for the takeover of their finances for the
purpose of collecting payments. One remarkable example was that of the Dominican Republic. In 1905 the United States took over its finances and used the proceeds from its customs to pay off its foreign debt. This exercise lasted until 1924, when the U.S. military finally left.

You may say that the world has changed considerably since then. But has it? And in the appropriate respects? The Western countries may not be able to enforce their will by armed might wherever they wish, as the recent examples of Iran, Vietnam, and Lebanon show. But they have other means available to them. Perhaps their most fearsome weapon today is economic warfare. The United States was unable to get its hostages back from Iran through an Entebbe-style raid, but when it embarked upon economic war, seizing Iranian assets all over the world, Iran had to yield.

If the Western powers waged economic war on Nigeria, if they cut off all trade, all credit, all food supplies, seized our assets around the world, and blockaded our ports and air space, wouldn't Nigeria collapse under the pressure? That is because Nigeria (or any third world country, for that matter) hasn't the consumption habits and production capacity to withstand concerted economic war from the West. Cuba has survived U.S. economic pressure for twenty-five years, but Europe did not go along with the U.S. blockade and the Soviet Union served as Cuba's umbilical cord and defender. Who would do the same for Nigeria if all our Western creditors ganged up on us?

Such considerations probably explain why all that Latin American talk of forming a debtors' cartel remains just talk. The most they were able to propose at the Quito debtors' summit last January (where twenty-seven Latin American and Caribbean countries met to discuss how to get out from under their $350 billion debt burden) was to seek three things from their creditors: a drastic reduction in interest rates on past and future loans; an extended repayment schedule; and the limiting of loan repayments to manageable percentages of national export earnings.

The implication of the Quito summit is that if we lack the power to walk away from our debt, then the best we can hope for is to work it off. Thus we must take on no new loans, and we must pay off our existing debt. For Nigeria, this cure would require us to end our squandermania, drastically reduce our spending on imports, and devote most of our export earnings to paying off our debts. But, most importantly, we would have to avoid any new debt.

Of course, there is room for variation in the severity of the curative program. Now, using current projections, $16.6 billion is roughly two years
of export revenues for Nigeria. We could in the most extreme version of the regimen, cut off all imports for two years and use all our export earnings to retire our debt. This would probably be the best cure; but would a spoiled and pampered population stand for such a short sharp shock? You could hear them uttering: What? Go without my daily Chivas or Remy? Drive a dented Mercedes Benz? And for two years? The psychological wrench of this variant of the cure might be just too much. So we might have to plan for it to take four or five years to pay off a debt that could be inconveniently paid off in two.

But how would such a total freeze on imports and new debt differ from the unacceptable IMF medicine? In at least two ways. First, the IMF medicine is futile. Inasmuch as it does not require us to stop acquiring new debt, it does not aim to cure. It is simply an alleged cure that puts us through the hardships of hospitalization and medication, but keeps giving us fresh infections of the debt disease it pretends to be curing. If the aim is to regain health and freedom, then, from the point of view of a victim economy, the IMF hardship is pointless hardship. In contrast, the self-administered cure is both appropriate to the disease, and drastic enough to kill it off in the shortest possible time and get us out of hospital to enjoy our freedom.

Secondly, in development terms, the self-imposed cure has irreplaceable advantages. To get cured of the squandermania and import mania which make us into loan addicts, we need a therapeutic shock to our system. Like Chu Teh, the Chinese general who got rid of his opium addiction, we need to put ourselves in isolation on a boat without a scrap of our "heroin" (imports and debts) on board, and sail off for the years it will take to overcome our withdrawal pains and be cured. For that, we must collectively have the discipline and determination derived from a conviction that a difficult course of action is in our best interest. Such resolve, being voluntary, would mobilize our spirit of sacrifice for national salvation and organize us for the long hard march to development. The IMF program of hardship, on the other hand, being imposed by an outside overseer and being clearly contrary to our interest, cannot gain our free consent. To impose it would call for such repression as would pit government and people against each other, and tear Nigeria apart.

If we really want to get out of debt trap peonage, we should have nothing to do with the IMF and its "cure." All this preoccupation with debt rescheduling, with scampering about for new loans, all this flitting about to Washington and London and Paris and Riyadh is a dramatic waste of time, a monumental misdirection of effort. Dr. Soleye would make better use of his time by staying here, working out the details of a regimen of total withdrawal, and
writing to tell the international bankers and the IMF to expect a full repayment in two or three or four years' time.

But if we shun such a cure, why might that be? This question goes to the psychological heart of the matter of escaping debt trap peonage. For what keeps us from the cure is not unrelated to what caused us to be lured into the trap in the first place, and might lure us back into it even if we get out this time.

I am told that the ultimate basis of the banking business is confidence or trust, which is why many banks in the United States go by the name of "trust companies." Confidence and trust are matters not so much of numbers as of psychology. Alas, however, they can be abused. In fact, the confidence man (con man), with his confidence tricks (con plans), cannot operate without first obtaining the confidence of his intended victim. And getting people to fall into debt trap peonage is done by conning them.

But why do some people fall for con tricks while others do not? After all, they say that it takes two to tango; and the con man can come with his con plan, but it is up to you to fall or not to fall for it. This is a crucial point to understand if we wish to avoid getting conned into debt trap peonage. So, let us probe that part of the conning process that we ourselves can control.

When you analyze how people (who, after all, have not been captured in battle and dragged off to a slave farm) are lured into a debt trap and kept in peonage, you soon discover that the operation's success depends on the victims having a psychology that makes them susceptible to confidence tricks and crackpot ideas. Let me illustrate this with the example of how Nigeria was lured, back in 1978, onto the path that led to the debt trap, and of how Nigeria is now allowing itself to be conned into getting even deeper into debt. When we see the crackpot ideas we have been accepting from those who want to con us, we can more easily appreciate why we fall for them.

One of the key arguments used on us in 1978 was that if we borrowed money we did not need, the experienced lenders would be in a position to supervise and guide our development efforts, since they would then have a financial stake in our development. It was a foolish argument, and some of us said so at the time. It is still a foolish argument, and all that our falling for it did was to enable the international loan sharks to get their teeth into the succulent belly of our future earnings. But why did we fall for it?

As is usual with confidence tricks, the con man presented to us only a part of the picture, and relied on our own stupid expectations to make us go along
with him. And we did. We fell in with his plans by thinking that, if he took such a deep interest in furthering our development, we might get the development we wanted without any strenuous effort or risk on our part. We would let him take the wheel and do the driving and instructing while we would half listen, and nod or giggle occasionally, while cosily taking in the lovely view as we got driven to our destination. So we eagerly let him get into the driver's seat, and we have been taken for a ride. But the gasoline consumed has been ours, and the wear and tear has been on our car, while the destination has not been the one we thought we were being driven to (the paradise at the end of the road of development), but the peonage farm the driver had intended all along to take us to.

The basic illusion underlying our behavior is the notion that development is some sort of turnkey on a wall which we can buy without going through the rigors and dangers of a hunt. But development is not like that. You cannot buy it and fly it in and install it. True, the foreign financiers may have all the expertise in the world on development. But the point about our development is not the supervisory transfer to us of their expertise, but our development of our own. And the way to develop Nigerian expertise is by giving ourselves the opportunity to try, fail, learn, and succeed. Development, like a child's learning to walk, involves shaky steps, falls, bruises, pain, and cries, as well as steady stands and, finally, firm footsteps. And just as nobody else can learn to walk (or drive, or eat, or talk) for another, even so nobody else can do our developing for us. We must do it ourselves, taking the responsibility and the risk, and being quite prepared for failures, since some are inevitable.

In contrast to what we did, or rather allowed others to do to us while we thought they were doing it for us, development requires us to take full control of our economy, and to tackle the problems of building it up ourselves. That is how every developed country did it. That is the secret of how the Soviet Union and Japan and the United States did it. That is how Britain and France did it. That is how China has been doing it. None of them did it by handing over the directing and problem-solving involved to another nation or group of nations. Even the Chinese had to kick out their "big brother" Russians in 1959 and take complete charge of their own development.

When, back in 1978, Western con men sold us the crackpot notion of the value of creditor supervision, they did so by playing on our lazy greed for the fruits of development without any stomach for the process itself. Now, in 1984, in order to hold us in peonage, we are being sold two notions by con men, including, alas, some of our own high officials who seem to be parroting their foreign mentors.
One of these notions concerns the alleged need to create confidence in Nigeria among the international banking community. According to a report in the Broad Street Journal of December 1983, the permanent secretary in the ministry of finance, Abubakar Alhaji, tried late last year to gain the support of the Nigerian Labor Congress for the government's efforts to get an IMF loan. He explained to them that the most crucial benefit Nigeria needed from the IMF loan was the restoring of international confidence in Nigeria, a confidence that would enable Nigeria to secure additional loans from the international capital market.

Now let us appreciate what all that means. Mr. Alhaji was, in effect, telling us that the loan from the IMF would give Nigeria access to more of the very loans that would get us deeper into debt trap peonage. And he thought that that was a good thing for Nigeria! Well, as far as I can see the only thing that would restore confidence in a man who is determined to hang you is not evidence of your stupid docility, of your resignation to his power, of your unwillingness to holler or even make a fuss, let alone trying to escape or hang him instead. So, instead of worrying about restoring that kind of injurious confidence abroad, we should concentrate on creating confidence among Nigerians in the development potential of our economy, and in our own ability to realize that potential through our own efforts.

Another crackpot notion that Western con men have been trying to sell us is that of our being "underborrowed." Even the minister of finance in the last administration, Adamu Ciroma, tries to parrot that crackpot idea and get us to accept it. Well, it seems to me utterly foolish to accept that we are "underborrowed" even as we have to use nearly 40 percent of our export earnings to pay charges on a mountain of spendthrift debt. As far as I am concerned, Nigeria became overborrowed on that day in 1978 when we allowed ourselves to borrow one kobo that we did not absolutely need. By that I mean one kobo we did not have the absorptive capacity to invest prudently. And what did we use our $16.6 billion loan for? Most, if not all, of it was squandered. If you consider that, according to Oladele Olashore of the International Bank for West Africa, Nigeria did not get more than 25 percent value for all our imports, you can see that no less than $12 billion of that mountain of debt was wasted. In other words, our injudicious imports merely helped the Western countries to recycle into their pockets most of the money they were loaning us or paying us for our oil.

What disposes Nigerians to accept such crackpot notions? What keeps them from taking the cure for their condition? What are they trying to evade by replying on foreign debt to finance their development? Without foreign financing (through oil and loans), Nigeria would have to undergo internal capital accumulation, and enduring the rigors of internal capital
accumulation and mobilization is not an easy process. They are accompanied by great hardships and risks. And basically Nigerians do not want the rigors and risks of development. All they want are its fruits. So they think they can beg (aid), borrow (loans), and sell (oil) their way to development.

Obviously, Nigeria falls for these con tricks and crackpot notions because, deep down, Nigerians (or at least the elite from which all our leaders come) have the psychology of the sucker. Suckers are greedy but lazy and want the easiest way to their overblown ambitions. Suckers believe that there is such a thing as a free lunch, and that they are smart enough to snatch it from a hungry lion's table. Suckers want to go to paradise but do not want to die. Suckers believe in perpetual motion machines. Their lazy greed blinds them to the elementary fact that, in the real world—as opposed to that of lazy fantasy—what you get is what you pay for, no more, and quite often less!

You are, of course, free to want an easy way to the paradise of development. But is there one? Economic history shows that development happens to be one of those journeys (much like climbing Mt. Everest) for which there are no easy paths, only more or less difficult ones. So, if you think you have found a broad and easy road, you can be sure (if Christ is to be believed) that it doesn't lead to paradise.

If Nigerians are at all serious about development, and therefore serious about escaping their debt trap peonage, they need to abandon their sucker psychology and fantasies. They need to alter their expectations to conform to the truth that the price of development must be paid, not in money alone but in effort, and not by others but by ourselves.

In that regard, let me tell you what a lawyer friend of mine, a Nigerian, once told me. He said that any man who goes to the police and complains that he has been swindled by a money doubler should himself be locked up. I think that is a position we, as a nation, should adopt. So, instead of self-righteously complaining about the wickedness of those who conned us into the debt trap (usually meaning the West), or against those who refuse to give us all the aid we crave (usually meaning the Eastern bloc countries), we should speedily end our foolish spending spree, retire our debts, and free ourselves from the strangling strings of foreign aid and loans. Then we can use our resources to develop ourselves. Should we ever need to get into some international lending and borrowing after that, our watchword ought to be: never lend more than you can afford to write off, and never borrow more than you can invest and repay without strain.
In conclusion, let me say this: ultimately, there is no magic formula for averting debt trap peonage. Like corporate or military strategy, the task calls for intelligent analysis of concrete situations, clear formulation of goals and objectives, meticulous application of principles derived from experience, some practical inventiveness, and a dogged watchfulness against con men and crackpot ideas. In the light of our current experience, we should above all rein in our sucker's psychology, beware of Greeks bearing gifts, and practice that eternal vigilance which is the price, not only of political, but also of economic liberty. In short, we should get into the habit of using our heads in our national interest. But unfortunately, as a Lagos taxi driver once told me, "Nigerians think the head is a spare part." May I suggest that we attach it at once, and put it to work immediately?
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Garveyism not Continentalism is what Black Africa Needs!!

Written by Chinweizu

Monday, 16 July 2007

1] The essence of Garveyism consisted of two projects:

A] Black Governments:

Here is Garvey’s conclusion, a century ago, after traveling in the Americas and Europe and informing himself on the situation, worldwide, of Blacks [Negroes]:

I asked: “Where is the black man’s Government?” “Where is his King and his kingdom?” “Where is his President, his country, and his ambassador, his army, his navy, his men of big affairs?” I could not find them, and then I declared, “I will help to make them.”

[\textit{P&O}, II:126]

And he formed the UNIA to help do that.

B] A Black Superpower in Africa:

In the 1920s, Garvey diagnosed the global prospect of the Blacks and prescribed the remedy when he said:

The Negro is dying out . . . There is only one thing to save the Negro, and that is an immediate realization of his own responsibilities. Unfortunately we are the most careless and indifferent people in the world! We are shiftless and irresponsible . . . It is strange to hear a Negro leader speak in this strain, as the usual course is flattery, but I would not flatter you to save my own life and that of my own family. There is no value in flattery. . . . Must I flatter you when I find all other peoples preparing themselves for the struggle to survive, and you still smiling, eating, dancing, drinking and sleeping away your time, as if yesterday were the beginning of the age of pleasure? I
would rather be dead than be a member of your race without thought of the morrow, for it portends evil to him that thinketh not. Because I cannot flatter you I am here to tell, emphatically, that if we do not seriously reorganize ourselves as a people and face the world with a program of African [Negro] nationalism our days in civilization are numbered, and it will be only a question of time when the Negro will be as completely and complacently dead as the North American Indian, or the Australian Bushman. [*P&O*, II:101-102] . . .

This is the danger point. What will become of the Negro in another five hundred years if he does not organize now to develop and to protect himself? The answer is that he will be exterminated for the purpose of making room for the other races . . . [*P&O*, I:66]

*[T]he Negro peoples of the world should concentrate upon the object of building up for themselves a great nation in Africa.* . . .[*P&O*, I:68]

We [in the UNIA] are determined to solve our own problem, by redeeming our Motherland Africa from the hands of alien exploiters and . . .[by] the creating for ourselves [there] of a political superstate . . . a government, a nation of our own, strong enough to lend protection to the members of our race scattered all over the world, and to compel the respect of the nations and races of the earth. . . . [*P&O*, I:52; II:16; I:52]

Go ahead, Negroes, and organize yourselves! You are serving your race and guaranteeing to posterity of our own an existence which otherwise will be denied them. Ignore the traps of persuasion, advice and alien leadership. No one can be as true to you as you can be to yourself. To suggest that there is no need for Negro racial organization in a well-planned and arranged civilization like that of the twentieth century is
but to, by the game of deception, lay the trap for the destruction of a people whose knowledge of life is incomplete, owing to their misunderstanding of man’s purpose in creation.

[P&O, II:16]

2] **Continentalism**

Continentalism is the doctrine and project of uniting the entire continent of Africa, uniting all the races that now live on it, black and white, Negro and Arab, preferably under one government that will rule the entire continent. This project has been going on since the 1958 Conference of Independent African States that was held in Accra, Ghana. It produced the Afro-Arab OAU, then the present Afro-Arab AU [Africa Unmanned/Arabist Underwear], which is on the brink of transforming into an Afro-Arab USofAfrica.

By the end of the 20th century, with the rise of black-ruled countries in Africa and the diaspora, Garvey’s first project was realized, but only partly so, since these black comprador governments remain fronts and agents for white supremacy and White power and none has become a Government of black people, by black people, and for black people.

Moreover, none of these black-mask governments of White Supremacy has dared to embark on the second and vitally urgent Garvey project of creating a Black superpower that would be in the same power rank as China and the G-8.

The dangers which Garvey pointed out in the 1920s are still with the black race. If anything, they have been intensified and augmented by such disasters as the AIDSbombing of Black Africa by the USA and the WHO; Arab expansionism and colonialism in the Afro-Arab conflict zone that stretches from Mauritania to Somalia, including the Afro-Arab war theatres in Chad, Darfur and South Sudan; UN Imperialism which, through the IMF, World Bank and WTO, has inflicted Debt Trap Peonage, economic maldevelopment,
and deepening poverty on the Black countries of the world. Black powerlessness continues without letup. And the black extinction that Garvey alerted us to is already underway.

Whereas Garveyism correctly focuses on our developing the Black Power we need to defeat these dangers and protect ourselves from all dangers; Continentalism says nothing at all about Power, let alone about **Black Power**. It doesn’t even offer to create Black Unity. Its focus is on unification of the entire continent, which translates into Afro-Arab unification. Since the Arabs have, for nearly two thousand years, been White invaders, exploiters and enslavers of Black Africa, Afro-Arab unification is like a unification of black lambs with white lions that eat lambs—a unification whereby the lambs end up in the stomach of the lions! The Arabs would naturally love, welcome and eagerly promote such unification. But isn’t it suicidal for the Black Africans to agree to it, let alone campaign eagerly for it—as some have done for the last 50 years?

For that basic reason, **Continentalism, with all its projects – OAU/AU, USofAfrica, is the mortal enemy of Black Africans.**

Those Blacks who are deluded into thinking that Afro-Arab unification would be good for Black Africans would do well to find out just how rosy life has been for those blacks who have lived under Arab colonialism since the 1950s, and especially in Darfur and South Sudan, where the blacks have taken up armed struggle to escape Arab colonialism and racism.

**3] The Garveyite Black Survival Project**

We do not need to politically integrate or federate all the 53 Arab and Black African neo-colonial states on the African continent to produce a Black African superstate that can protect all Black Africans wherever they are on earth.
To implement the Garvey idea, what we need, above all, is just one Black African country, big and industrialized enough, and therefore powerful enough to be of G-8 rank, a country that could serve as the core state—protector and leader—of Global Black Africa.

We also need a Black African League that shall be the collective security organization of Global Black Africa, our equivalent of NATO and the defunct Warsaw Pact. These are the two things we need in this 21st century to implement the Garvey requirement for Black African survival.

For building a Black African superpower, as urged by Garvey, an ECOWAS or SADC Federation, or some equivalent in East or Central Africa is more than enough. Just one of them, if integrated and industrialized by 2060, would meet the need. ECOWAS or SADC is big enough in territorial size, population and resource endowment to become an industrialized world power provided its neo-colonial character is eliminated.

Let us look at the numbers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>AREA in sq. km</th>
<th>Population in 1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
<td>6.5m</td>
<td>185m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>7m</td>
<td>130m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>8.5m</td>
<td>156m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>9.5m</td>
<td>256m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>17.1m</td>
<td>148m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>3.3m</td>
<td>900m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>9.6m</td>
<td>1.2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>2.4m</td>
<td>350m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ECOWAS, with 16 states, 6.5m sq. km and nearly 200m population; or SADC, with 11 states, 7m sq km and some 130m population—would be a country of sub-continental size, and in the megastate league, in territory and population and resources, to which belong the USA—with 9m sq. km and some 260m people; Brazil—with 8.5m sq. km. and 156m people; and Russia, India etc. ECOWAS or SADC, if properly integrated, industrialized, and thoroughly decolonized, would be a megastate of the type Black Africa needs. So why don’t we get on with the task of building each into a power of G-8 rank? Why set off on the false, diversionary and dangerous mission of Arab-Black African state integration of the impotent neo-colonialist OAU/AU/USAfrica type?

Of course, ending their neo-colonial character is anathema to the Black colonialists who now misrule the Black African countries. These compradors would rather set off on the quest for an unjustified USofAfrica that would still have the neo-colonial character that suits the comprador interest and temperament.

The second component of the Garvey project is to replace the OAU/AU with a proper collective security organization for Global Black Africa, an organization to which the Black African Diaspora countries and communities will rightfully belong. It is one of the blemishes of Continentalist Pan-Africanism that it is embodied, at the interstate level, in an OAU/AU from which the Diaspora originators of Pan Africanism have long been excluded whereas the Arab enemies of Black Africa are, not only members, but the dominant bloc. The Black African Diaspora are only now being brought into the OAU/AU structures as an afterthought and as no more than second-class members. That is not how it should be.

The history of Black Africans demands that we replace the Arab-castrated OAU/AU with a blacks-only collective security organization, and not with yet another Arab-castrated outfit called the USofAfrica.
Unless the members of a group are keen for their group to survive, the group will most probably not survive; for its members will fail to do what must be done for their group to survive. And any such group does not deserve to survive.

If Black Africans wish to survive, they must profoundly change their priorities: Not slothful consumerism here on earth, not paradise for their souls in the hereafter, but collective security here on earth must become their ruling passion.

Those Black Africans who are keen for the Black African people to survive in the 21st century and beyond will have to ensure that the Garvey Black survival project is accomplished in the shortest possible time, starting yesterday. They have two paramount tasks to accomplish simultaneously: (1) They must, by all means necessary, politically integrate, and complete the abandoned decolonization of, ECOWAS and SADC, and effect their exit from maldevelopment by industrializing them into powers of G-8 rank. (2) They must build a Black African League that will organize the collective security of the Black African World.

----------------------
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The Black race will be exterminated if it does not build a black superpower in Africa by the end of this century.

----------------------------------------------------
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Introduction

To avoid wasting anyone’s time, let me make clear who I am not talking to, who I do not want to hear from, for as Confucius said: “There is no point people taking counsel together who follow different ways.” (Analects XV: 40)

My audience consists only of those Black Africans who want the Black African people to survive. If you are a black African, but don’t much care if the Black African people survive or not, I have nothing to say to or discuss with you. So, don’t read on. Just go away.

But if you want the Black African people to survive, with dignity and in security and prosperity, just like the white or yellow peoples of this earth, then welcome! We have vital matters to discuss.

Since white Europeans began raiding Africa in the 15th century for black
captives to enslave; since white Arabs invaded Egypt in 640 AD; and indeed ever since white Persians conquered Black Egypt in 525 BC, the cardinal question for Black Africans has been:

*How can Black Africans organize to survive in the world, and with security and respect?*

That question has remained unaddressed for 25 centuries. We must today face and answer it correctly for the conditions of this 21st century, or we perish.

Pan-Africanism is an ideology made up of the most important ideas that have brought the Black race thus far in our quest for liberation from imperialism and racism, and for the amelioration of our condition in the world; it continues to be the vehicle for Black African hopes and aspirations for autonomy, respect, power and dignity. This ideology is embedded in the thinking of our intellectual progenitors, from Boukman of Haiti to Biko of South Africa. These thinkers include giants like Dessalines, Blyden, Sylvester Williams, Casely-Hayford, DuBois, Garvey, Padmore, Nkrumah, C.L.R. James, Azikiwe, Malcolm X, Aime Cesaire, Cheikh Anta Diop, Cabral, and Nyerere.

There were three main strands of Pan-Africanism in the 20th century: that of DuBois, that of Garvey and that of Nkrumah. These strands each aimed to accomplish Black Africa’s emancipation from white domination, but they differed in what they defined as the constituency to be emancipated and in the project through which that emancipation would be pursued. In other words, they differed in their answers to the two key questions: emancipation for whom? And by what means?

For DuBois [1868-1963], the constituency was the Negroes (black peoples) of Africa and the Negro Diaspora in the Americas; and the project was to abolish the color line and socially integrate blacks with whites.
For Garvey [1887-1940], the constituency was all the Negro peoples of the world, wherever they were; and the means to achieve emancipation was by building a Negro superpower in Africa, an industrial superpower that would be “strong enough to lend protection to the members of our race scattered all over the world, and to compel the respect of the nations and races of the earth. . . .”

For Nkrumah [1909-1972], the champion of Continentalism, the constituency was, as in the OAU, the inhabitants of the African continent, Arabs and Negroes together, but without the black Diaspora; and the means to achieve emancipation was by building socialism and integrating the neo-colonial states on the continent into one continental state with a single continental government.

DuBois was a pioneer, with the inevitable limitations in the work of a pioneer. Garvey was a great leap forward from DuBois; and Nkrumah was a great leap backward from both Garvey and DuBois. Why do I say that? DuBois got the constituency right and the project wrong; Garvey got the constituency right and the project right; Nkrumah got the constituency wrong and the project also wrong. But that is a topic for another occasion.

My task today is to present to you the legacy of Marcus Garvey. I shall start with a summary of what he did, and then go into what he bequeathed us, and then what lessons we should learn from him.


**What Garvey did**

Between 1910 and 1914, Garvey traveled to investigate, first hand, the condition of Blacks in the Caribbean and Central American countries, as well as in Europe. In his own words, while in London in 1914, after he had
traveled through almost half of Europe, Garvey asked:

“Where is the black man’s Government?” “Where is his King and his kingdom?” “Where is his President, his country, and his ambassador, his army, his navy, his men of big affairs?” I could not find them, and then I declared, “I will help to make them.” [II:126]

And he set out to help to make them by dramatizing the possibility of Black power in a world dominated everywhere by white power. By his own account, given in 1925 in the USA, he had, between 1914 and 1922, “rous[ed] the Negro’s mind to all the possibilities of the future one way or the other. We did everything that was humanly possible to arouse consciousness in sleeping Negroes all over the country, all over the West Indies and all over the world . . .” [p. lxxvii]

Through the organization he founded, the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) and its auxiliaries, and through businesses, conventions and parades, Garvey put before the eyes of Negroes the political, economic, military, religious and social possibilities of Black Power. This drama, enacted in the streets of Harlem, New York, stirred the imagination of Negroes around the world. The impact of Garvey’s drama was felt far and wide. He had, in the words of Adam Clayton Powell, Sr. “awakened a race consciousness that made Harlem felt around the world”. [p. xix] 5

He made his audience imagine things they had never thought of, things they had been brainwashed to regard as impossible for Negroes to do. Of course, he did not build Black Power, but by putting on the stage, as it were, the symbols of a Negro Empire, he triggered a dream and motivated the next generation of Negroes to actualize it.

Garveyism inspired Zik in Nigeria, Nkrumah in Ghana [pp.xxxviii-xlv]. His work was followed and read about in Kenya, Ghana, Namibia, South Africa. It influenced Harry Thuku, an early nationalist in Kenya, some in the ANC in South Africa, and Sam Nujoma’s elders in Namibia belonged to the UNIA
branches in Namibia. Elijah Muhammad’s Nation of Islam was heavily influenced by Garvey, and Malcolm X was a son of Garveyites. Such men and their followers, in the generations after Garvey, became the disciples and actualizers of Garvey’s dramatized dream.

White power, of course, saw danger to itself from the Garvey drama, and astutely sought to kill the dream by discrediting Garvey. But it was too late. The dream was already implanted in the minds of Negroes the world over. Jailing Garvey after his show had been put on was like shutting the stable door after the horse had bolted.

Whereas Garvey only dramatized Black Power, Dessalines had actualized it in Haiti a century earlier. White power had quickly destroyed the Haitian example and tried to eradicate all memory of it. Haiti had to be made to fail, so that white power should be more secure by sustaining the lie that Blacks cannot rule themselves. For the same reason, Egyptology annexed the Black Egypt of the Pharaohs to white civilization. The inspiring example of Garvey was discredited. Likewise, the inspirational potential of Nkrumah’s Industrialization program, contained in the Seven-Year Development Plan he launched in 1964—and symbolized by the Volta River Project, with its Akosombo Dam & Hydroelectric power complex and the Aluminium smelter at Tema—had also to be discredited.

**Garvey’s Legacy:**

I am going to describe three aspects of the Garvey legacy, the things he left behind for us:

(I) the example of his practice as an institution builder;

(II) his profound ideas;

(III) the projects he defined for his successors to implement.
I: His practice as an institution builder:

Garvey was a futuristic, forward looking nation builder who urged us to create our own future. As he put it: “We have a beautiful history, and we shall create another in the future that will astonish the world.”[I, 7]

His work was founded on an unsentimental analysis of our global historical realities.

He prospected for problems that lay in ambush for us in the future, and devised solutions to forestall them: e.g. the problem of the extermination of the black race by the white race.

He was an all-round entrepreneur, a builder of institutions. Here are some of them:

• Political institutions: The UNIA, with its one thousand (992) branches and several million members world wide, and its Annual International Conventions of the Negro peoples of the World;

• Business institutions: Black Star Line; Universal Publishing House; Negro Factories Corporation; the Negro World newspaper; the Liberian rubber plantation project (that the Liberian Government handed over to Firestone);

• Social institutions: Black Cross Nurses; The African Orthodox Church; The Juveniles; peerage and knighthood honors [II,313];

• Para-military institutions: Royal African Guards [II 97]; African Motor Corps; The Universal African Legion;

• Colonization project: The “back-to-Africa” project which sought to build four settlements in Liberia, starting with a town on the Cavalla River, at a projected cost of $2m [II, 380, 390]

• Educational institutions: School of African Philosophy, Toronto, 1937
II: His Ideas:

Marcus Garvey and the Black Power movement: Legacies and lessons for contemporary Black Africa (2)

II: His Ideas:

Garvey’s great ideas included the following:

1) Race First principle—“We believe in the supreme authority of our race in all things racial.” [II, 137]: “You can do no less than being first and always a Negro, and then all else will take care of itself.” [African Fundamentalism]

2) Racial privacy and autonomy—“We demand complete control of our social institutions without interference by any alien race or races.” [II, 140]

“If we live in our own district, let us rule and govern those districts. If we have a majority in our communities, let us run those communities. We form a majority in Africa and we should naturally govern ourselves there.” [II, 122];

3) Intellectual autonomy— “We are entitled to our own opinions and not obligated to or bound by the opinions of others.” [African Fundamentalism]

4) Self-Reliance— “The UNIA teaches our race self-help and self-reliance. . . in all those things that contribute to human happiness and well-being.” [II, 23]

“I trust that you will so live today as to realize that you are masters of your own destiny, masters of your fate; if there is anything you want in this world, it is for you to strike out with confidence and faith in self and reach for it.” [I, 91];

“A race that is solely dependent upon another for its economic existence sooner or later dies.” [I, 48]
5) Nation building—“The Negro needs a nation and a country of his own, where he can best show evidence of his own ability in the art of human progress.” [II, 23]

“The . . . plan of the UNIA [is] that of creating in Africa a nation and government for the Negro race.” [II, 40]

6) Entrepreneurship—“Why should not Africa give to the world its black Rockefeller, Rothschild and Henry Ford? Now is the opportunity. Now is the chance for every Negro to make every effort toward a commercial, industrial standard that will make us comparable with the successful business men of other races.” [II, 68]

“Go to work! Go to work in the morn of a new creation ... until you have . . . reached the height of self-progress, and from that pinnacle bestow upon the world a civilization of your own . . .” [II, 103]

7) Industrialization—“the race can only be saved through a solid industrial foundation.” [I, 8] 10

“Being satisfied to drink the dregs from the cup of human progress will not demonstrate our fitness as a people to exist alongside of others, but when of our own initiative we strike out to build industries, governments, and ultimately empires, then and only then will we as a race prove to our creator and to man in general that we are fit to survive and capable of shaping our own destiny.” [I, 8]

Garvey based his work on a profound analysis of global historical realities, as illustrated by the following doctrines on (A) the features of the world and (B) the traits of the Negro:
(A) Features of the world:

1) The ways of the white race—“The attitude of the white race is to subjugate, to exploit, and if necessary exterminate the weaker peoples with whom they come in contact. They subjugate first, if the weaker peoples will stand for it; then exploit, and if they will not stand SUBJUGATION nor EXPLOITATION, the other recourse is EXTERMINATION.” [I, 13]

2) Propaganda—“among some of the organized methods used to control the world is the thing known and called PROPAGANDA. Propaganda has done more to defeat the good intentions of races and nations than even open warfare. Propaganda is a method or 11 medium used by organized peoples to convert others against their will. We of the Negro race are suffering more than any other race in the world from propaganda—Propaganda to destroy our hopes, our ambitions and our confidence in self.” [I, 15]

3) Force—“The powers opposed to Negro progress will not be influenced in the slightest by mere verbal protests on our part. . . .Pressure of course may assert itself in other forms, but in the last analysis, whatever influence is brought to bear against the powers opposed to Negro progress must contain the element of FORCE in order to accomplish its purpose, since it is apparent that this is the only element they recognize.” [I,16]

“I pointed out to you that your strongest armament is organization, and not so much big guns and bombshells. Later on we may have to use some of those things, however, because it appears that some people cannot hear a human voice unless something is exploding nearby. Some people sleep too soundly, when it comes to a question of human rights, and you have to touch them up with something more than our ordinary human voice.” [ II, 112]
4) **Know your enemy**—“To see your enemy and know him is a part of the complete education of man” [I, 17]

5) **Prejudice**—“Prejudice can be actuated by different reasons. Sometimes the reason is economic, and sometimes political. You can only obstruct it by progress and force.” [I, 18] 12

“So long as Negroes occupy an inferior position among the races and nations of the world, just so long will others be prejudiced against them, because it will be profitable for them to keep up the system of superiority. But when the Negro by his own initiative lifts himself from his low state to the highest human standard he will be in a position to stop begging and praying, and demand a place that no individual, race or nation will be able to deny him.” [I, 26]

6) **Safeguards**—“Races and peoples are only safeguarded when they are strong enough to protect themselves.” [II, 107]

7) **Power**—“The only protection against INJUSTICE in man is POWER—physical, financial and scientific.” [I, 5]

“Power is the only argument that satisfies man. Except the individual, the race or the nation has POWER that is exclusive, it means that that individual, race or nation will be bound by the will of the other who possesses this great qualification. . . . Man is not satisfied or moved by prayers or petitions, but every man is moved by that power of authority which forces him to do even against his will.” [I, 21, 22]

**(B) Weaknesses of the Negro race:**

1) **A General lack**—“The race needs men of vision and ability. Men of character and above all men of honesty, and that is so hard to find.” [I, 49] 13

2) **Traitors at the top**—“The traitor of other races is generally confined to
the mediocre or irresponsible individual, but, unfortunately, the traitors among the Negro race are generally to be found among the men highest placed in education and society, the fellows who call themselves leaders.” [I, 29]

3) **Lack of respect for internal authority**—“The Negro in Western civilization . . . has but little, if any, respect for internal racial authority. He cannot be depended upon to carry out an order given by a superior of his own race. . . . This lack of obedience to orders and discipline checkmates the real, worthwhile progress of the race.” [II, 292]

4) **The Intellectuals**—“It is astonishing how disloyal and selfish is the average Negro ‘intellectual’ of the passing generation to his race. . . [He] is the greatest fraud and stumbling block to the real progress of the race. He was educated with the wrong psychology and perspective. . . .[and] intermingling with the whites is their highest ambition.” [II, 286]

5) **The Negro politicians**—“the thoughtless, selfish Negro politician and leader sold the race back into slavery.” [II, 103]

6) **The Negro rich**—“The rich are selfish and foolish, and their primary purpose in life is to ape the whites, and as quickly as possible seek their company with the hope of social absorption, and jumping over the race line.” [II, 88] 14

7) **Disloyalty of the successful Negro**—“Billions of dollars have been lost to the Negro race within the last fifty years through disloyalty on the part of successful Negroes, who have preferred to give away their fortunes to members of other races, than to bequeath them to worthy institutions and movements of their own to help their own people.” [II, 92]

Such insights into realities provided the basis for Garvey’s prescriptions for solving the problems of the Negro race.
Garvey’s Africa:
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Garvey’s Africa:

It is important to take note of Africa’s place in Garvey’s ideas. Some have been misrepresenting Garvey’s idea of Africa, hijacking him to support Gadhafi’s USofAfrica. For example, Prof. Molefi Asante has stated [in an email of March 31, 2007]: “I support the United States of Africa as the vision of Nkrumah, and Garvey before him.”

I shall show that Prof. Asante is wrong.

Garvey’s was a Pan-Africanism of the Negro race, a Pan-Negroism to which he was unequivocally devoted. I challenge anyone to produce any passage where he could be correctly interpreted as speaking for both the Negroes and the white Arab invaders/settlers and enslavers of Negroes in Africa. Here are a few examples of Garvey’s references describing what he wanted to do in Africa.

II, 37: Establishing a nation in Africa for Negroes

II, 39: An African nation for Negroes

II, 40: Creating in Africa a nation and government for Negroes

II, 48: Restoration of Africa to the Negro peoples of the world

II, 49: A national homeland for Negroes in Africa

II, 81: Promotion of a strong and powerful Negro nation in Africa

II, 230: To give the Negro a country of his own in Africa

II, 253: To found and develop a nation for the race in Africa
I submit that none of these can be correctly construed as referring to building in Africa a continental union of Arabs and Negroes, with a continental union government. For Garvey, Africa was the Negro homeland, a place for Negroes to do great things for and by themselves.

**Garvey’s idea of the Negro—Who he included among Negroes:**

“I am a Negro. I make absolutely no apology for being a Negro.” [I, 212]

“We [of the UNIA] are determined to unite the 400,000,000 Negroes of the world for the purpose of building a civilization of their own. And in that effort we desire to bring together the 15,000,000 of the United States, the 180,000,000 in Asia, the West Indies and Central and South America, and the 200,000,000 in Africa. We are looking toward political freedom on the continent of Africa, the land of our fathers.” [II, 95]

“When we speak of 400,000,000 Negroes we mean to include several of the millions of India who are direct offsprings of that ancient African stock that once invaded Asia.” [II, 82]

Not a word anywhere of any Arabs, whether in Africa or Asia! Garvey was exclusively concerned with Negroes and what they should do in Africa; never with the Arabs and the Negroes doing anything together, least of all uniting under one continental government. 17

**III: Garvey’s paramount projects:**

Garvey had two paramount projects:

1] To help create black governments, presidents, ambassadors, armies, navies, etc.

2] The project of a black superpower in Africa

In the 1920s, Garvey, after diagnosing the global prospect of the Blacks, prescribed the remedy for their problems when he said:
“[T]he Negro peoples of the world should concentrate upon the
object of building up for themselves a great nation in Africa. . . [of]
creating for ourselves [there] a political superstate . . . a
government, a nation of our own, strong enough to lend protection
to the members of our race scattered all over the world, and to compel the respect of the nations and races of the earth. . . .” [P&O,
I:68; II:16; I:52]

Whereas the first project of creating Black governments was achieved worldwide in the second half of the 20th century, beginning with Nkrumah’s Ghana in 1957 and concluding with Mandela’s South Africa in 1994, the second has not even been attempted.

------------

**The challenge of Garvey’s example:**

Having taken a glimpse at what Garvey did a century ago, what does his example challenge us to do in this century. What lessons must we learn from his example?

Consider the breathtaking range of Garvey’s projects: The UNIA with about a thousand branches and millions of members world wide; businesses that ranged from a 18 steamship company to restaurants and laundromats; colonization projects to build towns in Liberia; a massive rubber plantation project in Liberia; mammoth month-long annual conventions; a church denomination; paramilitary outfits; etc. All in a space of ten brief years!

Garvey tried to do all at once, which is why he is Garvey the Great. And by far the greatest leader of blacks in the 20th century.

I submit that the challenge to Black Africans in the 21st century is to build on Garvey’s legacy by following his example, embracing his ideas and
implementing his project of a Black superpower in Africa.

We ordinary folks should do whatever bit we can out of the lot; but we must form a movement that sees to it that every dimension of the nation building/race uplifting project he pioneered is carried out.

I submit that what is needed for the 21st century is a new Pan-Africanism with two paramount features inspired by Garvey’s legacy:

[a] a Pan-Africanism that can cure Black Africa of the weakness and powerlessness that made slavery, colonialism and racism possible; a powerlessness that has today exposed us to extermination—as through the AIDS bomb and other biological weapons of mass destruction that target only people with black skin; and through destroying our food security and autonomy by obliging us to use GM (genetically modified) seeds; and through the policies of impoverishment imposed by the IMF-World Bank-WTO regimen.

[b] a Pan-Africanism that addresses the everyday problems of the Black African masses, at home and abroad. 19

I submit that we don’t need any brand of Pan-Africanism that lacks these two features, for it would not help Black Africans to regain their dignity or to physically survive.

**Lessons from Garvey for the new Pan-Africanism:**

In building a new mass-oriented Pan-Africanism shaped by Garvey’s black superpower project, we would do well to apply the following lessons from Garvey’s arsenal of methods and ideas.

1) We should thoroughly study the world and proceed to action from a fundamental and comprehensive analysis of our global historical realities.

2) We should end our ancestral habit of not discerning when danger looms;
and form a habit of prospecting for future dangers and problems and providing solutions well ahead of their arrival on our doorsteps.

3) We should insist on a monoracial, Pan-Negro constituency.

4) We should insist, in all things, on race consciousness, racial self-reliance and racial autonomy.

5) We should take full responsibility for our survival, today, tomorrow and the most distant future—Garvey was concerned about our situation five hundred years into the future.

**The mother of all problems in Black Africa: the lack of a strong core state:**

Before I go on to outline a 21st century upgrade of Garvey’s Pan-Negroism, let me begin by considering the paramount problems Garveyism set out to solve, problems that are still very much with us.

Back in 1922, Garvey correctly articulated what he called the “True Solution to the Negro Problem” when he said:

“We are determined to solve our own problem, by redeeming our Motherland Africa from the hands of alien exploiters, and found there a government, a nation of our own, strong enough to lend protection to the members of our race scattered all over the world, and to compel the respect of the nations and races of the earth.” [P&O, I 52]

That is a succinct statement of the solution to the fundamental problem that has plagued Black Africa ever since the Black Egypt of the Pharaohs was conquered by white invaders 2,500 years ago! It is the solution to the mother of all problems of Black Africa, the absence of a strong core state. But that solution, though so clearly articulated, has been ignored for the past 50 years during which it could and should have been implemented.
In some other elaborations of his solution, Garvey spoke of the need to create “for ourselves a political superstate” [II, 16]

To what problems of the Negro was this superstate, this strong core state, the solution? These were the problems of (a) the sufferings and humiliations of the Negroes and (b) the prospect of their extermination by the white race. Garvey summarized them:

(a) About the first problem, Garvey said: 21

“Do they lynch Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans or Japanese? No. And Why? Because these people are represented by great governments, mighty nations and empires, strongly organized. Yes, and ever ready to shed the last drop of blood and spend the last penny in the national treasury to protect the honor and integrity of a citizen outraged anywhere.” [I, 52]

Some of us may think that the lynching problem of a century ago is over. It is not. Just remember Jena! There are still too many cases of blacks being shot with impunity by police in every part of the world, of blacks being economically lynched through racial profiling and other illegalities; of judicial lynching whereby blacks are disproportionately jailed for offenses that blacks and whites commit. All over the world, black lives are still regarded as valueless. Black people are still victims everywhere in the world. They remain a people marked out for destruction.
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(b) About the second problem, Garvey said:

“The Negro is dying out . . . There is only one thing to save the Negro, and that is an immediate realization of his own responsibilities. Unfortunately we are the most careless and indifferent people in the world! We are shiftless and irresponsible . . . It is strange to hear a Negro leader speak in this
strain, as the usual course is flattery, but I would not flatter you to save my own life and that of my own family. There is no value in flattery. . . . Must I flatter you when I find all other peoples preparing themselves for the struggle to survive, and you still smiling, eating, dancing, drinking and sleeping away your time, as if yesterday were the beginning of the age of pleasure? I would rather be dead than be a member of your race without thought of the morrow, for it portends evil to him that thinketh not. Because I cannot flatter you I am here to tell, emphatically, that if we do not seriously reorganize ourselves as a people and face the world with a program of African nationalism our days in civilization are numbered, and it will be only a question of time when the Negro will be as completely and 23 complacently dead as the North American Indian, or the Australian Bushman. [II:101-102] . . .

“If we sit supinely by and allow the great white race to lift itself in numbers and in power, it will mean that in another five hundred years this full grown race of white men will in turn exterminate the weaker race of black men for the purpose of finding enough room on this limited mundane sphere to accommodate that race which will have numerically multiplied itself into many billions. This is the danger point. What will become of the Negro in another five hundred years if he does not organize now to develop and to protect himself? The answer is that he will be exterminated for the purpose of making room for the other races that will be strong enough to hold their own against the opposition of all and sundry.” [I, 66]

**Three reasons for building Black Power today:**

That was how Garvey, looking five hundred years ahead, characterized our vital problem a century ago. How can it be described today? I would put it like this:

We have three types of problems today:
(a) the daily attacks and humiliations we suffer at the hands of racists;

(b) the poverty and misery of the Black African masses; and

(c) our extermination that is already in process today. I must emphasize that the future is not long for Black Africans, if we continue with our foolishness in not recognizing that our extermination is already in process—as through AIDS and other biowarfare weapons that target only black-skinned people; ethnic cleansing as in Darfur; the destruction of our economies by IMF/World Bank/ WTO policies; the destruction of our food autonomy through GM foods; enemy-induced wars and culturecide; etc.

These are the problems that Pan-Africanism must offer to solve and be able to solve for Blacks if it is to have any value for us, if it is to deserve any claim on our allegiance. If we built black power we would solve all three problems and guarantee our survival in dignity and prosperity. Who would dare to assault any black-skinned person on the streets of Jena or Munich or Kiev or Libya if the whole world knew that a black superpower was watching out, and would and could punish the attack? Black Africans would cease to be poor and miserable if their countries produced industrial and agricultural abundance. And all thought of exterminating blacks would perish if our enemies knew they would be severely punished, militarily and economically, for merely entertaining the idea. So, those are the three reasons why we must build a Black Superpower in Africa today. I would, therefore, say that

The problem of the 21st century is the problem of Black African power: how to build it, and enough of it to stop the extermination of Blacks that is now in process, and to compel the respect of all humanity and guarantee the survival, dignity and sovereign autonomy of Pan-Africa.

Let me first show how Garvey’s superstate project, if upgraded and implemented, would supply the power that we sorely need. Then I will go a
little bit into why so vital a project has not been undertaken for 50 years.

**What the project of building a Black superpower can do for our society.**

Let me point out how a leadership that understands the need to build a Black superpower, and is committed to building it, would have to transform our society and give us all a much better life.

Like Garvey told us a century ago: “the race can only be saved through a solid industrial foundation.”[I, 8] And he set up the Negro Factories Corporation to show the way. Now, a superpower of today has to be industrialized. It must build its own factories to produce everything from cups to computers, from towels to tanks, from books to atom bombs, from medicines to machine guns, from spoons to satellites. Such is the currency of national and racial power in this age.

If Black Africans are to live in safety and be respected, we must make our own medicines, light bulbs, pots and pans; and build our own kitchen utensils, electrical appliances, generators, computers, rockets, tanks, aircraft carriers, nuclear submarines, atomic bombs, ICBMs, satellites, etc. And a program of industrialization to enable us to make these things requires all manner of things that would transform the lives of our population.

Let’s consider the case of Nigeria. What are some of the woes that afflict Nigerians, that Nigerians endlessly complain about after five decades of deliberately and foolishly evading industrialization? Nigerians routinely complain of NEPA (erratic electric power), bad roads, bad system of transportation, poor housing, poor medical facilities, filthy streets and neighborhoods, poor healthcare systems, decayed education system, anarchy on the roads, a political leadership incurably addicted to corruption, lootocracy, etc. etc. What impact would a program of industrialization have on these ills? 26
The hub of an industrial society is its set of factories. These must be daily fed with raw materials, energy, finances, machines and skilled workers; their output must be evacuated and transported to the markets for consumers to buy. This means that, on a daily basis, enough and steady electrical power must be made available (a factory town cannot afford erratic NEPA outages, brown-outs, burn-outs, surges, etc. or the machines will be breaking down, making the workers idle and causing financial losses to the factory proprietors, whether these be private investors or the state). The machines must be attended each working day, from opening time to closing time, (hence the workers must all get to their workstations on time so there will be the full complement of hands to service the machines once switched on).

If hundreds of thousands of workers must be at their jobs by say, 8 am, there must be an efficient public transport system to get them there on time from their homes, preferably in dormitory suburbs. And if they are to do this five working days a week, the transport system must work efficiently every day. And since the machines must all be fully manned at any time, worker absenteeism cannot be tolerated. Hence it becomes important to the proprietors that workers be seldom off work because of illness or accidents. Hence adequate health facilities must be available in the factory town. This also means that public health and hygiene become the concern of the proprietors and the town authorities. Hence filthy streets and neighborhoods would be discouraged by factory owners and city authorities alike.

Since factories must have skilled and disciplined workers, the education system would have to be sound. The products of all schools would have to know their stuff. Ill-trained and incompetent holders of fake certificates would be unacceptable in factory and 27 society. And campus gangsters who disrupt work and life on campuses would have to be exterminated. So too exam malpractices which make the certificates inauthentic and worthless.
And in-as-much as the factories will need to draw raw materials from the farms, they will stimulate agriculture. In fact, it is the inputs from industrialization, and the demands from industrialization that can galvanize our agriculture, and so increase employment in the rural areas, thereby reducing the flight of the rural poor to the urban areas. Jobs galore; jobs in the towns, jobs in the villages, no hungry and angry desperados (alias area-boys, yan iska or bayeye), no plague of armed robbers, no shanty towns. Safety in the streets. This is just an indication of how the requirements of its factories would transform a factory town.

**Marcus Garvey and the Black Power movement: Legacies and lessons for contemporary Black Africa (5)**

Now imagine a country whose life is shaped and disciplined by tens of thousands of industrial factories. There are many such. They are the developed countries to which members of the Nigerian elite escape in order to enjoy their loot while perversely keeping Nigeria in disorder and poverty.

Such is the transformative potential of the project of industrialization. By the way, what is the transformative potential of the OAU or AU or the USofAfrica? Zero! And what is the transformative potential of racial integration? Again, zero!! We can racially or politically integrate all the countries of the African continent, or even of Black Africa, and nothing will improve for us. We can build all the infrastructure we want; we can meet all the MDGs and employ all the neo-liberal NEPAD devices and meet the targets of the African Peer Review Mechanism and still leave our economies and societies in the rut of maldevelopment. (By the way, do you know what the acronyms NEPAD and MDG really stand for? I’ll tell you: NEPAD is the New European Program for Africa’s Demise; and to see what MDG means, you have to reverse the order of the letters to GDM, which means Goals that will prevent Development in this Millennium). Consider the OAU, AU, USofAfrica, racial integration, NEPAD, MDGs, infrastructure building, and all that 29
jazz—such will not pull Black Africa out of its social decay, poverty and powerlessness. That’s all like building a car with a fine body, but without an engine.

Industrialization, I submit, is the engine missing from our economies and societies, and we should dedicate ourselves to industrialization if we want to be prosperous and respected, and if we don’t want to perish. Of course we shall, in due course, together work out the details of the kind of industrialization program we need and the modalities for accomplishing it, so as to optimally satisfy our collective security requirements as well as conform to our cultural, social, economic and ecological needs; but my task here is simply to get across the point that **industrialization is absolutely necessary, is the priority area, if we are to have any future at all.**

Now, to the obvious and key question: where will the political will be found to create such a society in Black Africa? The answer is **FEAR.** If a leadership is aware of the dangers from lagging behind in the competition between the powers in the world, if it understands that it will itself be defeated and exterminated by the more industrially powerful societies, it will find the will to undertake such a transformation of its society. That was how Japan, Russia, China, found the political will to industrialize. So too the rival countries of Europe since the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century.

So, if our leadership gets to appreciate Garvey’s point about the danger of us all being exterminated by the more powerful races who desire to take our land and resources for themselves, it is **almost guaranteed** that they will find the political will to build an industrialized superpower in Black Africa.

Let me emphasize: The political will to industrialize and become a great power comes from a healthy **fear of being conquered, dishonored, oppressed, enslaved and exterminated through losing a war.** This was made explicit in the case of the Soviet Union when **in February 1931, Stalin predicted and warned his people:** "We are 50 or 100 years..."
behind the advanced countries. We must make good this lag in 10 years. Either we do it or they crush us.” And he drove his people with the proverbial whip and scorpion, and forced them to industrialize at a desperate pace. And Russia industrialized in 10 years flat! Which was just in time to be ready when Hitler unleashed his armies on Russia in June 1941.

In the case of Japan, the Japanese spirit felt deeply dishonored in 1853 by Commodore Perry’s breach of their self-imposed isolation, and by the arrogance of the American and European intruders. And they feared they would be colonized and oppressed by the white world powers. To redeem their honor and avoid such a detested fate, they found the political will to industrialize and turn Japan into a world power of the first rank during the Meiji era in the second half of the 19th century.

In the case of China, it was the fear, in 1919, of China being carved up by the European powers that gave Mao’s generation the will to wage a thirty-year civil war against the Chinese compradors, and conquer China by 1949, and then to industrialize it into a nuclear power by 1964.

The motivation was the same for Britain, France, Germany and the other members of the concert of Europe. For centuries, the fear of losing any of the wars between them motivated each to build up its power. None wanted to be defeated and lose its sovereignty.

In the 19th century, nearly every Black African polity went to war to prevent loss of sovereignty to the invading Europeans. Though massively outgunned, they still fought. 31

Against larger armies using artillery, maxim guns, etc., they fought even with spears and arrows and cutlasses. It was “sovereignty or death” as it were! Given that quite natural reaction of our ancestors, why are we behaving differently now? Why did I say “it is almost guaranteed that they will find the political will to build an industrialized superpower in Black Africa”? Why didn’t I say “it is guaranteed”? 
It could well be that the Black comprador elites in Africa today have
degenerated from the level of humanity displayed by their ancestors, and
have become subhuman in their preference to stomach insults and dishonor
gladly; that they are spineless enough to suffer humiliation with equanimity;
that they are so debased that they can contemplate without indignation the
prospect of the extermination of the black race; that they lack human self-
respect, lack a sense of dishonor, and are quite happy to live in a state of
shame! Otherwise, why have they put up with the disgrace of being last in
everything laudable on earth? Why are they tolerating gross misgovernment,
chronic maldevelopment and a disgraceful powerlessness?

It is quite possible that our Black comprador rulers are too infantile to take
responsibility for the collective security of Black people; too infantile or
comatose to take an interest in the processes of extermination that have
already been unleashed on us by our European and Arab enemies; too
infantile to comprehend the abundant evidence of our extermination; too
deranged to understand that the survival of a people cannot and should not
be left to happenstance or to the enemy’s goodwill.

Frankly speaking, our leaders are like crawling babies who are eating dirt
and playing in a sandpit without knowing they are in the middle of a
battlefield. All they are concerned with is stuffing their mouths and being
entertained by the booming sounds of 32

artillery, the rat-a-tat-tat of machine gun fire, the spectacle of explosions
and laser guns lighting up the night sky. Being breast-feeding infants well
below the age of reason, and too young to be frightened, thinking about
their safety is well beyond their ability.

The point is that if fear of extermination will not cause our comprador elites
to undertake industrialization, then nothing will get them to do it. In which
case Black Africa is doomed and finished.

But if we have any sense of race honor, and if we wish to physically survive,
we need a new Pan-Africanism, a Pan-Africanism with a clearly articulated and consistent set of doctrines, a Pan-Africanism with correct objectives and strategy, a Pan-Africanism that is committed to building a Black superpower in Africa. Such a Pan-Africanism will have two vital merits:

[a] by creating industrial power, it would cure Black Africa of the weakness and powerlessness that made possible slavery, colonialism, racism, and our ongoing extermination;

[b] by seeking to meet the requirements for industrial power, it would address the problems of the everyday life of the Black African masses, and eliminate poverty.

----------

Now, why has this vital project of building a Black industrial superpower in Africa not been undertaken thus far? There are five main reasons. First, it has not been undertaken primarily because for 50 years we blindly followed Nkrumah and Padmore who had shunted the train of Pan-Africanism unto the wrong tracks, the Afro-Arab OAU/USofAfrica tracks that have led us nowhere but towards the dungeons of Arab colonialism. Their obsession with building continental unity through a continental 33 government has diverted us from the correct task of building a Black African industrial superpower.

We need to note that the OAU/AU Pan-Africanism of the past 50 years failed to meet our most vital need for the Black power that would ensure our dignity and physical survival. Nor can its current devices, like NEPAD, MDG, and USofAfrica do the job. These are all diversionary nonsense sold to us by our enemies to serve their own anti-Black African interests.

Secondly, our leaders have been indulging in delusions. Some said they were building socialism; all claimed they were pursuing development; all
claimed they were engaged in nation building. But, in reality, all were simply addicted to the conspicuous consumption of psycholollipops like gold beds, private jets, mansions in Europe and Dubai, and Swiss bank accounts. So addicted are they to consumania that they can spare no thought for the dignity and survival of the race.

**Marcus Garvey and the Black Power movement: Legacies and lessons for contemporary Black Africa (6)**

Thirdly, we are saddled with a comprador elite that is in mental slavery to Arabs and Europeans; a Black elite for whom life without white mentors and white approval is too terrifying to be thinkable; a comprador elite that is too terrified or stupid to admit that Arabs and Europeans have been our mortal enemies for centuries; a comprador elite that is too comatose to independently analyze our situation, diagnose our problems and think up our own solutions to them.

Fourthly, Black Africa’s elite is so scatterbrained that some resist evidence of the danger of our extermination out of the naïve and false belief that this is the “modern world” and it won’t be allowed by “world opinion”; and some stupidly trust in Jehovah or Allah, the gods of our white enemies, to ensure that Blacks are not wiped out.

Fifthly, our leadership is infantile. They are psychologically retarded babies in adult-sized bodies. Never having been taught their true history, they are like those adults who have regressed to the mental state of babies after being hypnotically deprived of the memory of their past. The babyish mentality of our elites prevents them from understanding the danger in which we are. Like babies at the breast, we cannot recognize the abundant evidence of the grave threats to our survival.

We suffer from a profound lack of knowledge of world and Black African history, and we exhibit complete ignorance of the devious ways of the world;
and since we do not know or value the history we need to learn from to survive, we don’t know that many peoples have been killed off by their enemies, and we don’t know that a people’s survival is not automatic but has to be ensured by foresight, forward planning and vigorous action. Since babies are unable to monitor their environment to discover what dangers the future holds for them, the security of a society cannot be entrusted to its babies, no matter how big in body they are.

Let me emphasize that a village is doomed which leaves its security in the hands of its breast-feeding babies. Breast-feeding babies are only concerned about their food and body comfort. The habit of constant reconnaissance is not for babies. Our comprador elites are entirely like breast-feeding babies. They cannot therefore discern and confront and defeat the forces orchestrating our extermination.

Which is why we are today in the situation which Garvey projected we would get to in 500 years; we are in the situation in which the Native Americans of the USA found themselves in the 19th century, and the Black Australians were in the 19th century.

What is to be done?

First of all, we need to learn our true, Afrocentric history. This requires a profound reform of the education system, and especially reform of the history curriculum. This is where we must begin. A cure to the babyish mentality of our comprador elites has to begin with psychotherapy, with a therapeutic education curriculum that would implant 36 in our leaders at all levels a patriotic spirit and a collective security consciousness and teach them the social responsibilities of leadership. We must look to psychotherapy for further remedies.

Secondly, for half a century we have had a Pan-Africanism that, due to ignorance or lack of appropriate information about Black Africa’s historical,
sociological, cultural and security realities, is mostly disconnected from and unresponsive to the Black African peoples’ problems, aspirations and interests. The time is overdue for the demise of that kind of Pan-Africanism.

I submit that the relevant Pan-Africanism for the 21st century must be based on the Garvey Pan-Negroism that was abandoned since 1958. Pan-Negroism must be reinstated and upgraded and its projects quickly accomplished if the Black race is to survive till the end of this 21st century.

We do not need to politically integrate or federate all the Black African neo-colonial states on the African continent to produce a Black African superstate that can protect all Black Africans wherever they are on earth.

To implement the Garvey idea, what we need, above all, is just one Black African country, big and industrialized enough, and therefore powerful enough to be of G-8 rank, a country that could serve as the core state—protector and leader—of Global Black Africa. 37

We also need a Black African League that shall be the collective security organization of Global Black Africa, our equivalent of NATO and the defunct Warsaw Pact. These are the two things we need to implement in this 21st century to meet the Garvey requirement for Black African survival.

For building a Black African superpower, as urged by Garvey, an ECOWAS or SADC Federation, or some equivalent in East or Central Africa is more than enough. Just one of them, if integrated and industrialized by 2060, would meet the need. ECOWAS or SADC is big enough in territorial size, population and resource endowment to become an industrialized world power provided its neo-colonial character is eliminated.
Let us look at the numbers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>AREA in sq. km</th>
<th>Population in 1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
<td>6.5m</td>
<td>185m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>7m</td>
<td>130m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>8.5m</td>
<td>156m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>9.5m</td>
<td>256m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>17.1m</td>
<td>148m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>3.3m</td>
<td>900m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>9.6m</td>
<td>1.2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>2.4m</td>
<td>350m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ECOWAS, with 16 states, 6.5m sq. km and nearly 200m population, or SADC, with 11 states, 7m sq km and some 130m population, would be a country of sub-continental size, and in the megastate league, in territory and population and resources, to which belong the USA—with 9m sq. km and some 260m people; Brazil—with 8.5m sq. km. and 156m people; and Russia, India, etc. ECOWAS or SADC, if properly integrated, industrialized, and thoroughly decolonized, would be a megastate of the type Black Africa needs. So why don’t we get on with the task of building each into a power of G-8 rank?

It is by building Garvey’s Negro superstate in Africa that the redemption of
Negroes will be accomplished. Let me translate that into today’s language: It is by building a Black superpower in Africa that the Black race will redeem itself from its backwardness and weakness and poverty, and from racism and the contempt of the rest of humanity.

To avoid the integrationism and lack of attention to racial survival, racial security and racial power-building that DuBois and Nkrumah exhibited, it is important for the new Pan-Africanism to be given a name that reflects its focus on power for an exclusively Black African constituency. I therefore propose we call it BLACK POWER PAN-AFRICANISM. That will also distinguish it from the feckless continentalist, integrationist OAU/AU variety of the last 50 years.

----------

**Conclusion:**

It is unfortunate that Garvey’s statement of the solution to our paramount problem is not as well known as Du Bois’ claim that “the problem of the 20th century is the problem of the color line.” Here is Garvey again:

“[T]he Negro peoples of the world should concentrate upon the object of building up for themselves a great nation in Africa. . . [of] creating for ourselves [there] a political superstate . . . a government, a nation of our own, strong enough to lend protection to the members of our race scattered all over the world, and to compel the respect of the nations and races of the earth. . . .” [P&O, I:68; II:16; I:52]

We should make this Garvey statement the central mantra of Pan Africanism from here on, as it should have been for the last 80 years. It is the solution to the problem of the color line and much else besides, since the individual members of two cohabiting races cannot be socially equal if their races are grossly unequal in power—a simple fact that escaped our learned Dr Du Bois but did not escape Garvey.
Finally, I propose the following slogans for this revitalized Pan-Africanism:

[a] Black Africa for Black Africans, at home and abroad

[b] The problem of the 21st century is the problem of Black African power: how to build it, and enough of it to stop the extermination of Blacks that is now in process, and to compel the respect of all humanity and guarantee the survival, dignity and sovereign autonomy of Pan-Africa.

[c] Build ye first the kingdom of collective security, and you can, within its ramparts, achieve all your other desires!
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[d] Build a Black superpower in Africa and build also a Black African League as the collective security organ of the Black race.

[e] Black Africa! Industrialize or perish!!

And the last word, Garvey’s solution once again:

[f] “[T]he Negro peoples of the world should concentrate upon the object of building up for themselves a great nation in Africa. . . [of] creating for ourselves [there] a political superstate . . . a government, a nation of our own, strong enough to lend protection to the members of our race scattered all over the world, and to compel the respect of the nations and races of the earth. . . .” [P&O, I:68; II:16; I:52]

Finally, I recommend that every Black African should own a copy of Marcus Garvey’s Philosophy and Opinions, and read it every day, the way you read your Bible or Koran.
Socialism Or Communalism?

Written by Chinweizu

Wednesday, 14 January 2009

The Black race will be exterminated if it does not build a black superpower in Africa by the end of this century.

----------------------------------------------------

Socialism or communalism?

By Chinweizu

Several African leaders of the “independence” generation advocated or implemented what they called socialism. Prof. Prah reports that,

By the mid-1960s, practically all African heads of state, with the exception of Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, Leon Mba of Gabon and V.S. Tubman of Liberia had at one time or the other espoused African socialism. Consistently, such ideologues have put a distance between what they variously defined as African socialism, and 20th century Marxian socialist formulae, with the emphasis on class struggle. Tom Mboya anchored his definition of African socialism on the pre-industrial communitarian ethos of Africa. . . . In Tanzania under Julius Nyerere, populist socialism was described as Ujamaa socialism.

-- [African Nation, pp. 80, 81]

The “African socialism” of many of these leaders was a prestigious misnomer for African communalism. Here is Tom Mboya’s exposition of it; his is quite representative of expositions by Nyerere, Kaunda, Senghor, Mamadou Dia etc.

“In Africa the belief that 'we are all sons and daughters of the soil' has
always exercised tremendous influence on our social, economic and political relationships. From this belief springs the logic and the practice of equality, and the acceptance of communal ownership of the vital means of life—the land. The hoe is to us the symbol of work. Every able-bodied man and woman, girl and boy, has always worked. Laziness has not been tolerated, and appropriate social sanctions have developed against it. There has been equality of opportunity, for everyone had land—or rather, the use of land—and a hoe at the start of life. The acquisitive instinct, which is largely responsible for the vicious excesses and exploitation under the capitalist system, was tempered by a sense of togetherness and a rejection of graft and meanness. There was loyalty to the society, and the society gave its members much in return: a sense of security and universal hospitality.

These are the values for which, in my view, African Socialism stands. The ideals and attitudes which nourish it are indigenous, and are easily learnt, for they have been expressed for generations in the language of the soil which our people understand, and not in foreign slogans.

All African leaders who have written on this subject are agreed on these points. President Nyerere has said: 'My fellow countrymen can understand Socialism only as co-operation.' And President Senghor of Senegal, speaking at the Dakar conference in December 1962, on the 'African roads to Socialism', said: 'Socialism is the merciless fight against social dishonesties and injustices; fraudulent conversion of public funds, rackets and bribes...'

I have, I hope, given some idea already of the reason why Africans call these attitudes 'African Socialism', and not just 'Socialism'. . . . There is a positive desire, arising out of what may start as a negative reaction, that whatever is of value in Africa's own culture and her own social institutions should be brought out to contribute to the creation of the new African nation.

I wrote earlier about the task of reconstructing the economy in the days
after Independence. In the effort to do this, new values have to be established in place of colonial values and we have to decide what part the traditional African social and cultural structure can play in the country's economic development. Its main difference from the European structure, which was of course the one officially favoured during the colonial era, is that it is communal by nature. Most African tribes have a communal approach to life. A person is an individual only to the extent that he is a member of a clan, a community or a family. Land was never owned by an individual, but by the people, and could not be disposed of by anybody. Where there were traditional heads, they held land in trust for the community generally. Food grown on the land was regarded as food to feed the hungry among the tribe. Although each family might have its own piece of land on which to cultivate, when there was famine or when someone simply wanted to eat, he merely looked for food and ate it. . . .

When money was introduced, the African came to work for wages; but he still maintained contact with his native land as the only source of security to which he could look in old age or in sickness. He was secure in his mind that he could go back to his home and be taken care of by his people. It was a social security scheme, with no written rules, but with a strict pattern to which everyone adhered. If someone did not adhere to the pattern, and did not take on the obligations inherent in the system, he found that, when he next got into trouble, he received little or no attention.

He was expected to live harmoniously with others in his community, and to make his contribution to work done in the village. . . .

The practice of African Socialism involves trying to use what is relevant and good in these African customs to create new values in the changing world of the money economy, to build an economy which reflects the thinking of the great majority of the people. . . . The challenge of African Socialism is to use these traditions to find a way to build a society in which there is a place for everybody, where everybody shares both in poverty and in prosperity, and
where emphasis is placed upon production by everyone, with security for all.

. . . In his booklet *UJAMAA—the basis of African Socialism*, Julius Nyerere brings out clearly the essential difference of African from European Socialism. He writes:

The foundation, and the objective, of African Socialism is the Extended Family. The true African Socialist does not look on one class of men as his brethren and another as his natural enemies. He does not form an alliance with the "brethren" for the extermination of the "non-brethren". He rather regards all men as his brethren—as members of his ever-extending family'. 'UJAMAA, then, or "Familyhood", describes our Socialism. It is opposed to Capitalism, which seeks to build a happy society on the basis of the Exploitation of Man by Man. And it is equally opposed to doctrinaire Socialism, which seeks to build its happy society on a philosophy of Inevitable Conflict between Man and Man.


--------------

Nkrumah differed from all the others. Nkrumah, a self-declared Marxist, espoused Marxism, which is also known as “scientific socialism”. He declared “Pan-Africanism and socialism are organically complementary. One cannot be achieved without the other.” [*RevolutionaryPath*, p. 127] Is that claim true? Nkrumah merely asserted but did not bother to demonstrate this dogma of his. Unfortunately, it is false, as false as his many fallacious claims about what “only a continental union government” could achieve for Africans. It is like his opportunistic and Canute-like nonsense that “if in the past the Sahara divided us, now it unites us.” [p.129]. Marxism (Scientific socialism) has as much organic or historical or cultural connection with Africa as Hinduism, Taoism or Shinto. Marxism in Africa, just like Christianity, is an alien, imperialist import. For either of them to be organically connected to
Pan-Africanism, European cultural imperialism would have to be organically connected to Africa, which is not the case. As Prah pointedly asked: “What is the relevance of ‘scientific socialism’ to the notion of African unity? [African Nation, p. 63] If it has no relevance to the objectives of Pan-Africanism or to African history and culture, how can it be correctly said to be organically complementary to Pan-Africanism? That Nkrumah was both a Pan-Africanist and a Marxist, is only a fortuitous coincidence in his intellectual life. It does not make Pan-Africanism and Marxism organically related in any way.

Furthermore, Ayi Kwei Armah has argued, correctly in my view, that Marxism, in its approach to non-Western societies and values, is decidedly colonialist, Western, Eurocentric and hegemonist. . . . Marxism, in its approach to the non-Western majority of the world's peoples, is demonstrably racist — racist in a prejudiced, determined, dishonest and unintelligent fashion. Western racists hold that Western art is art, but African art is primitive art. . . . what makes Western art civilized and modern is that it originates in the West; what makes African art primitive is that it originates in Africa. Racism is luxuriously illogical. That is partly why, for Marx and Engels, communism is modern, civilized and serious when it appears in Europe (even if it has only a spectral form). The same communist phenomenon, when it manifests itself in the non-Western world, is dismissed as primitive communism, even though it appears there not as a fuzzy liberal specter but in human form — vigorous, pushing toward birth in societies familiar for ages with communism as a lost tradition and a real hope, often aborted, sometimes fleetingly realized.

—“Masks and Marx”, pp. 41-42

Since Pan-Africanism is anti-racist, anti-colonialist and anti-Eurocentric, Nkrumah cannot be correct in claiming that Pan-Africanism and a racist, colonialist and Eurocentric Marxism, a.k.a. “scientific socialism”, are organically complementary and that one cannot be achieved without the
other. That is tantamount to claiming that anti-racism and racism, anti-colonialism and colonialism, anti-Eurocentrism and Eurocentrism, must be achieved together in Africa.

In contrast to Nkrumah’s “scientific socialism”, the African socialism of the other leaders is derived from African communalism and therefore has a historical and organic link to African culture. As Nyerere explained:

“By the use of the word ‘ujamaa’, therefore, we state that for us socialism involves building on the foundation of our past, and building also to our own design. We are not importing a foreign ideology into Tanzania and trying to smother our distinct social patterns with it. We have deliberately decided to grow, as a society, out of our own roots, but in a particular direction and towards a particular kind of objective. We are doing this by emphasizing certain characteristics of our traditional organization, and extending them so that they can embrace the possibilities of modern technology and enable us to meet the challenge of life in the twentieth century world.”

--Nyerere, “Ujamaa is Tanzanian socialism” in J. Ayo Langley ed, Ideologies, p. 546

Nkrumah would have done well to follow Nyerere and to heed Azikiwe’s wise counsel on ideologies:

“It is obligatory for us to adopt a tolerant skepticism in respect of alien ideologies and then examine impartially our aboriginal lore of good living. If we reacted otherwise, then we would be desecrating the legacy which our forebears had bequeathed to us from past generations.”—Azikiwe, “Tribalism . . . ”, in J. Ayo Langley ed, Ideologies, p. 474

We need to note that both Capitalism and Socialism are ideologies made-in-Europe to solve the peculiar problems of a modern European society in which two antagonistic classes confront each other, one having seized all the society’s means of production leaving the other with only its labor to sell to
live. Unless and until that situation is replicated in Africa—and that would be a disaster-- these rival ideologies will remain inappropriate for Africa. After all, theories about the camel’s way of life should not be applied to the whale’s.

It should be pointed out that the ancestral African political economy combined private ownership with communal ownership. As Kaunda described it:

“our ancestors worked collectively and co-operatively from start to finish. One might say this was a communist way of doing things and yet these gardens remained strongly the property of individuals. One might say here that this was capitalism. Collectively and co-operatively they harvested but when it came to storing and selling their produce they became strongly individualistic. They did not finish at that. When it came to sharing the fruits of their labour like meals, for instance, they shared them communally. Indeed, one is compelled to say a strange mixture of nineteenth-century capitalism with communism. Yet, as is said above, this was original and the pattern essentially African.”


African Socialism or African Communalism?

Why did these African leaders choose the tag “African Socialism” for what was actually African Communalism? I suspect that in the global climate of the 1960s which was dominated by the intra-European Cold War, they found it prestigious to attach a European label to their African-derived political ideology, hence the “Socialism”; but they also needed to distinguish their ideology from European socialism, hence the “African” in the name. But I think the time is past when we should seek to enhance the value of something African by making it seem a variant of something European. Our
intellectual independence requires that we name things correctly and on our own terms. I will therefore use the term African Communualism henceforth to describe what has been called African socialism.

Towards an Industrial Communalism

Nyerere, Senghor, Kaunda, Tom Mboya, Mamadou Dia and the rest of them began the process of formulating an ideology for building a political economy that would put in modern form the pre-colonial African political economy of agrarian communalism. The project remains uncompleted and should be continued from where these pioneers left off. The challenge to work out an industrial upgrade of pre-colonial African communalism is before our intellectuals and should be taken up. As Nyerere put it:

“Who is to keep us active in the struggle to convert nationalism to Pan-Africanism if it is not the staffs and students of our universities? Who is it who will have the time and ability to think out the practical problems of achieving this goal of unification if it is not those who have an opportunity to think and learn without direct responsibility for day-to-day affairs”—“Dilemma . . .”, in Langley ed., Ideologies p.352

We should then invite our students and academics to take up the challenge and provide us with the much needed Industrial Communalist Ideology and thereby give us a framework of ideas with which to solve our problems, with which to define and pursue our interest in the world.

I would caution them not to be put off by Nkrumah’s unsound dictum that

“Practice without thought is blind; thought without practice is empty.”—[Consciencism, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1964, p. 78] We should realize that Nkrumah’s dictum is blind to the virtues of division of labor; it suggests that thinkers who are not also agitators should be regarded as
having nothing to contribute. And that even a muddle-headed thinker who is an agitator is preferable to a clear thinker who is not also an agitator. Let those talented to think for us unabashedly do so. Let those who are talented agitators and political organizers do that unabashedly. And if we spawn any of those rare persons who combine first rate thinking with first rate organizational skills, we should be thankful and get them to contribute in the way Cabral contributed to Africa and Mao contributed to China, and Lenin to Russia.

For the benefit of those who take up the challenge, let me stress that they should conceptualize our situation in a comprehensive way, so that the ideology they come up with can help solve our problems comprehensively. Unlike Nyerere, Kaunda and co, who were trying to work out a communalist system, but who did not explicitly impose on their system the conditions for defending it in the world as it is today, those who set out to fashion a neo-communalist system would do well to consciously design it so it can achieve the Black Power necessary to protect it in this century. The mix of principles of ownership of the land and other means of production must be consciously such as to allow the setting up of giant industries. In principle, there should be no reason why a giant industry should not be communally owned by an entire village or town. Modes of ownership by communities should be invented to supplement and complement individual ownership. In addition there is much to be learnt from the Industrialized systems of Sweden and Japan and from pre-colonial Asante. According to Prof. Opoku Agyeman:

Collectivism is the predominant impulse in Sweden, in the sense that the system emphasizes the sovereignty of collective well-being over individual private interests. In Japan, where society is similarly conceived in corporate terms, individuals ‘are seen to benefit only through the elevation of the group as a whole.’ In Asante, the welfare of the national society was placed well above calculations of individual self-interest and self-indulgence.

Prof Agyeman further elaborates:
“The logic of the Japanese “capitalist” system places a heavy reliance on the private market. And yet Japan’s market economy is not based on Adam Smith’s notion “that a society benefits from the liberation of individual greed—each person seeking his own self-interest.” In “socialist” Sweden the government’s role has been to foster social uses of ownership, which is overwhelmingly private, to ensure the sovereignty of society’s interests over private interests. . . . In “mercantilist” Asante, even though the public sector loomed larger than the private, no rigid antipathy to private enterprise existed. On the contrary, the private sector was nurtured by the state to generate wealth through the fostering of a breed of private entrepreneurs.

Socially responsible uses of the ownership of the means of production, private or public, is a demonstrable value in all three cases. In Sweden, while it is acceptable for a private owner of industry to create a fortune, this is conditional on the wealth being used in socially useful ways. In Japan, the private sector exudes social responsibility through a “corporate socialism” that confers such benefits as lifetime employment and egalitarian job practices. In Asante, private acquisition of wealth was encouraged but on condition that the riches were obtained by honest means and hard work and could be relied upon by the system for pecuniary assistance.

--Opoku Agyeman, Africa’s persistent Vulnerable link to Global Politics, pp. 92, 90, 91

The great challenge facing African thinkers, whether or not they are also political leaders, is to fashion an industrial communalist ideology to guide the political economy of an industrialized Black superpower. In this task, they have much to learn from case studies of pre-colonial African countries like Asante and Zulu; and also from non-African countries like modern Japan, Sweden, Cuba and China.
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The Black race will be exterminated if it does not build a black superpower in Africa by the end of this century.

----------------------------------------------------

The African Nation?

By Chinweizu

Is there an African nation? Where is it? Are there African nations? If so, where are they?

I submit that the African nation does not exist and has never existed. There is the African race, but it is not a nation. There are many African nations, but these are what we have learned to defame by calling them tribes. These so-called tribes were the true nations in pre-colonial Africa. What nowadays are called African nations, are not nations at all; each is just a country under the jurisdiction of a state. It is fashionable to call them nation-states, but that is at best a courtesy.

Why is it important to determine whether or not Black Africa is a nation? Pretending that Black Africa is a nation when it is not would be as delusional as leaning on a walking stick without noticing that it is made of ice. When things get warm the ice will melt and you’ll be leaning on air. Alternatively, if a builder lacks cement blocks and, in desperation decides to call heaps of beach sand by the name cement blocks, he will soon find that he can’t lay the heaps course on course like he could actual blocks. For lack of the factors that make a population cohere into a nation, the African nation, being a pseudo nation, would disintegrate under pressure, just like an ice
stick in warm weather. For example, suppose you had an army of the so-called African nation. And half your army were Black Muslims each of whom said in his heart: “I am a Muslim and I worship Allah and I follow the way of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him). I have no relationship with you, except that your skin is black. The lightest Arab is closer to me than you. If there were to be war between Muslims of any shade of color and the darkest of black people, I will be on the side of Muslims.” If a Black African army is filled with such people, what chance has it of defending Black Africa from the Arabs? Such is the danger of fashionably pretending that there is an African nation when, in fact, it doesn’t yet exist. We should all take to heart Nyerere’s warning: “It is no part of transforming dream into reality to pretend that things are not what they are.” –[Nyerere, “Dilemma of the Pan-Africanist” in Langley ed., Ideologies, p. 347]

Now back to the question: Is Africa a nation? In attempting to answer this question scientifically, rather than sentimentally, we would be helped by starting from the following statements from three different disciplines: Cultural anthropology, Historiography and Biology.

Let’s hear first from cultural anthropology through Cheikh Anta Diop:

“The cultural identity of a people [is] centered on three components—linguistic, historical, and psychic.”

--Diop, in Great African Thinkers, p. 268

Also according to Diop, the psychic factor is the domain of poets, singers, storytellers. Note the example of the brothers Grimm who, by collecting German folk tales in their Grimm’s Fairy Tales, laid the psychic foundation of German national identity; also note the role of the epic Kalevala in fostering national identity in Finland; also the role of the Mahabharata epic in fostering Indian national consciousness, and the role of the William Tell legend in the national identity of Switzerland. Similarly, the Old Testament has been an indispensable anchor for Jewish identity; for the Japanese, the
Nihon gi or Chronicles of Japan, which was compiled in 720 AD and the Kojiki or Records of Ancient Matters, which was compiled in 712 AD, with their collections of myths, legends, historical accounts, songs, customs, divination and magical practices of ancient Japan, have provided the psychic bedrock of Japanese national identity.

Let’s next hear from historiography through Jaques Barzun:

“What makes a nation? A large part of the answer to that question is: common historical memories; . . . a common language, a core of historical memories with heroes and villains; . . . a nation is forged into unity by successive wars and the passage of time. . . . It takes a national war to weld the parts together by giving individuals and groups memories of a struggle in common. Needless to add, nationalism can arise only when a nation in this full sense has come into being.”

–[Jacques Barzun, Dawn to Decadence, pp. 775, 776,695, 435

Finally, let’s hear from ethology, the biological science of animal behavior, through Robert Ardrey:

“A biological nation is a social group ...which holds as an exclusive possession a continuous area of space, which isolates itself from others of its kind through outward antagonism, and which through joint defense of its social territory achieves leadership, co-operation and a capacity for concerted action. It does not matter too much whether such a nation be composed of twenty-five individuals or of two hundred and fifty million. It does not matter too much whether we are considering the true lemur, the howling monkey, the smooth-billed ani, the Bushman band, the Greek city-state, or the United States of America. The social principle remains the same.

--Robert Ardrey, The Territorial Imperative, pp. 210-211
What Diop, Robert Ardrey, and Jacques Barzun together tell us is that a nation is made by shared language, historical memory of struggles carried out together, and a shared body of myths, legends, epics, songs etc., and demonstrates it nationhood by outward antagonism and the defense of its common territory.

It doesn’t take much reflection to grasp the fact that by these criteria, there is no African nation as yet, and there never has been. The African nation, though talked about in some Pan-Africanist circles, remains only an aspiration. The languages are diverse; there is no shared body of myths, legends, epics, songs etc; and the historical consciousness has never been fostered.

Unsurprisingly, we do not behave like a nation. We do not defend our joint territory. If there was an African nation already in existence today, it would have manifested its nationhood by collectively defending the portions of the common Black African territory that have been under attack by Arabs for the past half century, as in Mauritania and Sudan. In particular, an all-Black-African army would have gone to defend the people of Darfur from Arab attack since the ethnic cleansing began there. But the rest of Black Africa has left the Mauritanians and Afro Sudanese to their fate, as if they were aliens, and their fate did not concern the rest of us.

The behavioral test of territorial defense aside, the contrast between India, China, Arabia on the one hand and black Africa on the other, should highlight the fact that Africa is not and has never been one nation. India was politically unified in the 4th century BC and had shared a common culture for centuries even before that; China was politically unified in the 3rd century BC and has shared a common history and culture ever since. The Arabs became a nation through Mohammed when they finally, and for the first time, shared the same religion and political leadership, and then dispersed, in a burst of imperial aggression, from the Arabian peninsula and spread to occupy the lands from the Persian Gulf westward to the Atlantic coast of
Morocco. Thus, the Arabs became a nation 14 centuries ago and have shared a common historical consciousness ever since then. In contrast, it was only in the 20th century, with the European conquest and colonization of all of Africa, that Black Africans first began to think of themselves as one. And they have yet to be unified politically or culturally, let alone in religion.

----------------

Every one of these Black African countries of today is not a nation but a noyau, i.e. “a collection of individuals held together by mutual animosity, who could not survive had they no friends to hate”. Every one of the Black African countries today is populated by people of many pre-colonial nations and is like a refugee camp into which the populations of many genuine nations have been herded by force.

What would it take to make nations out of these colonial concentration camps that the Europeans carved out in the late 19th century during their scramble to conquer Africa? And what would it take to make the African race into a nation? Lessons could be learnt from Ashanti, Zulu, India, China. A shared struggle against our Arab enemies would be a good start for a common historical consciousness.

But is it much use trying to turn Black Africa into a nation this late in time? I don’t think so. The tasks before us in this 21st century can be accomplished without Black Africa becoming a nation. Fostering Black African unity through various methods is more feasible and desirable. It would be much easier to turn SADC and ECOWAS into nations, into modern superpowers, than to start doing what India and China did three millennia ago by conquest.
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Chinweizu in conversation with James Eze

Q: Sir I hope you don’t mind my recording this conversation. Some of the things you have already said so far are too exciting for a reporter to pass up.

A: Does this mean that without a tape recorder you cannot do a summary description of a conversation an hour later? If you can’t do that, you couldn’t have been a journalist in Zikâ’s time because there was no tape recorder then. Can’t you be at a meeting and report the proceedings later if it is so crowded that you couldn’t bring out pen and paper to write?

Q: As a matter of fact I could and I have indeed done it many times before. I don’t know if it would sound immodest to say that I also have a good memory. The fact is that I consider meeting you a privilege and I wouldn’t want to summarize what you have to say but to have it in a format that will make reference to it at a later time possible. I also would like to take direct quotes from you and I wouldn’t want to quote you out of context or paraphrase your statements in a manner that robs them of the vital punch lines.

A: I’ve heard you. The point is, we are discussing a general institutional failure. You yourself can have the best memory in the world, you can still do very good work, but as an institution, something is not being cultivated. And that is the point. The journalism profession in Nigeria today, and probably in most of the world, has deviated from the craft tradition where you are trained on the job. That great tradition is lost and with it a lot of knowledge of how to do things. Now, you rely on Mass Comm Departments to train journalists, but there’s no substitute for learning on the job. Most farmers can still farm because they learn it on the job, because they go through the
nitty-gritty under the observation of the elders; and the elders will explain and tell them when they are not doing anything right. Training is based ultimately not on lectures but on that practical hands-on context. Engineers are trained in universities, but most industries regard fresh graduates as raw material. They have the theory, they have the general information, but when they get to the factory floor they have to really bend down and pick up some practical knowledge.

**Q:** But does that necessarily imply that the design of our education system may have left out some vital loose ends?

**A:** Do you have an education system?

**Q:** Well, we have a system in place at the moment even if it does not qualify as an education system.

**A:** You have what you dignify by calling it an education system.

**Q:** Well, it’s perhaps because some of us are products of this system and may not have had the good fortune of knowing how other systems work.

**A:** Well, the argument is not with you but with those who maintain the system and call it an education system. An education system trains somebody to live in a particular society. That's what every proper education system does. As somebody recently said in a book: A Chaga with the education of an Eskimo is, from the point of view of his society, uneducated, as he would be were he to have been exclusively educated in a Western school or university. Now, if you take an Eskimo who lives in his environment, his ecosystem, and give him the training of an Englishman who lives in a different environment, is that education? You train him to live in English society but he is not going to live in English society. In Eskimo society, he cannot fit in because he has a wrong mentality; his attitude, his notion of his ecosystem and how to exploit it are all wrong. So, he is not
educated. He cannot function effectively in Eskimo society because you trained him for English society, which is in a different ecosystem. What we practice here is some version of the English education system. You see the students in all these schools with their jackets and blazers, especially these new ones in Lekki and V.I. What are they being trained to be? What society will they operate in when they graduate? Not English society, not American society but Nigerian society. And they are not being trained to function in Nigerian society or ecosystem. Start with language. Language is critical in any culture. So when you train people in a language that is not the language of their culture, you have not trained them for their culture. This is a very large issue, actually, but the point is that what we call our education system here is basically a miseducation system. We are miseducating our children by trying to train them as if they are going to live in the industrialized society of England, with the traditions of England and among people who think and behave as the English people do. But that's not the society they are going into. So, on the premise that an education system trains people to live in their own society and ecosystem, what we have here is a miseducation system. It’s all crap! People think they are doing a great thing here: They give birth to a child and hand it over to an alien education system and expect that at the end of 20–30 years he would come back to be part of them. It can't be, because they have molded him differently, alienated him from his culture.

Q: How can a good education system be designed? What are the standards in other societies?

A: The standards in other societies should not interest you because they were designed for their own peculiar purposes. You have to ask yourself what kind of training you need in your own society, and then invent a system to provide it. It's not something you copy; it's something you invent. You have to know what you want, what kind of society you want the products to live in. If you haven't worked out all those things, then you
haven't started, because it's only when you know the purpose for which you plan to train the next generation that you can invent an education system that will serve your purpose.

For a century now, we have not been educating our people for our society and its ecosystem. It started when the British conquered us. So, it's a great error that has been perpetuated for a century or more. We don't even train people to speak our languages. Here we are, holding this discussion in English. It's not your fault or mine. I am just pointing out the cumulative effect of a century of misdirection. It was not the fault of our ancestors directly because somebody conquered them and imposed an alien and alienating system on them. The white people trained people here because they needed clerks to help them exploit us. That's why they brought their schools. They didn't bring their schools to help us survive. The people who designed the present system did not do so in our interest. They came here to destroy us. And some of the structures they brought in, we have foolishly adopted as our own and we can't see beyond our noses to realize that what they have given us is poison, and that we should throw it out and find something else. We haven't reached that stage in our understanding of our situation. So, we perpetuate the ruinous system the British left behind.

Q: This miseducation, as you rightly pointed out, has been going on for over a century. So, when shall we wake up to its disturbing reality?

A: Well, it's not in the hands of any other people; it's in our own hands. The world is moving on. It is when we want to wake up from our slumber that we will wake up. Fela, in one of his songs, told us what to do. He reminded us that, as in other lands, it is the culture of our people that our schools should teach. That's the basic need. But was he heeded? We blacks haven't understood that this our imported way of living isn't a good way. Until we find that out, we'll keep messing up. But, as usual, we don't ask ourselves the fundamentals. Take this matter of education, which is our gloss of Igbo
ozuzu. In contrast to this education, which is a process of book learning and Europeanization, ozuzu was the process of socializing a child into the Igbo way of life, so he became an adult equipped to behave in the Igbo way, rather than the Eskimo way, the European way or some other non-Igbo way, or even like a wild animal! Unlike this education, ozuzu was specific and appropriate to a cultural context, the Igbo context. It aimed to produce, not just any kind of educated person, but an Igbo person, a well-behaved Igbo person, suffused with the Igbo worldview, and living by the Igbo code of conduct. And I am sure that every other pre-colonial African society had its own equivalent of Igbo ozuzu, an equivalent that was appropriate to its own specific culture. To get back to your point about our waking up, we shall continue on our present ruinous way until we wake up and retrace our steps to our ancestral system of culturally appropriate education, and then develop it. The pertinent question to ask is not how other societies educate but how did our ancestors socialize and acculturate their children for their environment? The answer does not lie in copying how other societies conduct their own training. There's so much to learn from what our ancestors did. If we find out how we did it in ancient times, we can then adapt from it and make a new version that will serve our new situation. What they did is still relevant. After all, we still live in the same ecosystem as they did. And they mastered how to live in it, which is why we have survived so far. And we should gratefully use their legacy to our benefit.

Q: Now, talking about our ancestors, you are a distinguished black scholar. How valid is the claim that Greek civilization had its origins in Africa, particularly Egypt? And also how true is the claim that these ancient Egyptians from whom the Greeks borrowed the now famous European model of civilization were actually black?

A: The long and short of it is that the ancient Egyptians, those who built the pyramids and all of Pharaonic civilization were black; and they played a central role in the formation of Greek culture. The evidence of that is
abundant. Pythagoras, Orpheus, Homer, Thales, Lycurgus, Solon, Plato, Eudoxus and other famous Greeks that founded the various aspects of Greek civilization went to Egypt to learn. Much of what is propagated as Greek philosophy and Greek knowledge were things they learnt when they went to Egypt to study. There are books on that. Here, for instance, is Onyewuenyi's book on that (produces a copy of Prof. Onyewuenyi's *The African Origins of Greek Philosophy: An exercise in Afrocentrism*).

Furthermore, Egyptian influence on Greek civilization was not exerted only through students who took Egyptian learning back to Greece. In addition, by ancient Greek accounts, settlers from Egypt and Phoenicia had, much earlier, either founded or supplied ruling dynasties to such Greek cities as Thebes, Argos, Sparta and Athens. Athens is actually named after an Ancient Egyptian city Sais which was reportedly also called Athenai; and the Greek goddess Athena is a version of the goddess Neith of the Egyptian Sais/Athenai. In addition, many Greek words, (about 25% of the Greek vocabulary, by some expert estimates) are derived from Ancient Egyptian. Greek place names that were derived from Egyptian words testify to what the ancient Greeks themselves said: that Egyptians had colonized Greece in remote times and taught civilization to the Greeks. They also said that Greek religion, including its oracles and mystery rites, was introduced from Egypt. A good popular account of all this is given in the book *Black Spark, White Fire* by Richard Poe. If the specialist argument interests you, you can look it up in the multi-volume work *Black Athena* by Martin Bernal.

On the matter of the color of the Ancient Egyptians, Herodotus, whom the Europeans call the father of history, said that the Egyptians were black. In fact Cheikh Anta Diop has an essay, Origin of the Ancient Egyptians, in which he quoted about ten of those Greek and Roman writers who lived during the first six centuries after the whites had overrun Egypt. They all say that the ancient Egyptians were black. People who went there and saw them with their own eyes, said that the ancient Egyptians were black. They
were still a black population even centuries after whites had overrun them. In contrast, those claiming today that the Ancient Egyptians were not black have not produced even one ancient eyewitness report that says the Egyptians were anything other than black.

The bottom line is that Ancient Greek civilization was a daughter of Egypt; and that the Ancient Egyptians were blacks. The white boys now pretend that the Ancient Egyptian civilization was created by white people and that it did not spawn Greek civilization. They are lying about all that and they have been doing so for the last three centuries. Their ancestors knew differently. The Greeks themselves said differently. So, even if you don't believe what anybody else says, there are the ancient Greeks themselves who studied in or visited Egypt, and they said so.

**Q: How come black people could not sustain this civilization after the Europeans invaded Egypt? Where was our proverbial knowledge?**

**A:** You first have to understand that black civilization was destroyed. Chancellor Williams wrote a book, *The Destruction of Black Civilization*, where he describes that. The easiest way to understand what happened is to take what happened to your own country in the last century. Once you lose sovereignty, you are rubbished. Loss of sovereignty is the worst thing that can happen to a people. The Egyptians tried long and hard to maintain their sovereignty and power: it took the white people more than 1000 years of repeated attempts to finally overrun Egypt. But once they finally accomplished it, it was one white group after another. The Persians were the first whites to overrun Egypt. Before them, other groups had penetrated Egypt but were fought off by the Egyptians. The long and short of it is that 525 BC was the final defeat of Egypt, about 2,500 years ago. After the Persians, the Greeks defeated the Persians and took over Egypt. Then the Romans took over and occupied it till the Arabs invaded Egypt.

The Arab invasion was the turning point because all the previous conquerors
just sent people to administer Egypt, but the Arabs came in large numbers to live. They were a settler multitude. They swamped and drove the real Egyptians away so that today, most Egyptians don't look black. The only Egyptians who are still black are descended from remnants of the ancient Egyptians. People like Sadat, the former Egyptian president. Sadat didn't look like the normal Arab; he was black, being of Nubian descent, from the Nubian remnants of the Ancient Egyptians. Boutrous Ghali, who was presented as an Egyptian, is a Copt and the Copts are descendants of Greek invaders. So, Boutrous Ghali is a white man. He descended from people like Cleopatra who were the Greek colonizers of Egypt. But, by the lying accounts of modern Europeans, the Copts are the real Ancient Egyptians! The long and short of it is that 525 BC marked the end of the sovereign ancient black Egypt. Everything since then has been the Egypt of white invaders. The invaders have long since taken over. That's the way it is with conquest. If you allow yourself to be conquered, you are finished. Not many peoples survive conquest, especially by conquerors who are determined to eliminate you. Black Africa is struggling to shake off the effects of just one century of people who didn't even come in droves to live here. It's so hard. They scattered your civilization, scattered your culture, scattered your mind and scattered your mentality. And just getting yourselves out of that disaster is difficult enough, not to talk of when they come in large numbers to settle permanently and take over your land. So, you can begin to understand what happened in Egypt.

But the basic thing is that those illustrious Egyptians were black. The pyramids were built by black people. All of the glory of Ancient Egypt belongs to black people.

But there are other questions, of course. Why is the influence of Ancient Egyptian civilization not so manifest in the rest of Africa? It's necessary to ask such questions. Egypt happens to be one great achievement but where are the others? This is what makes it easier for the whites to claim Egypt.
Maybe if pyramids like those of Ancient Egypt are found all over the continent and you lose Egypt to the whites, that's not so bad. There would still be enough visible remains to save you from the imputation of having achieved nothing. There are all kinds of questions about African history that need to be investigated, but black people are yet to wake up from their slumber to investigate them. Cheikh Anta Diop once asked: How can Africans love Africa when they don't know Africa? A century of European brainwashing through the education system has done its damage, and to get out of it is a long and difficult process. So, people should just read Cheikh Anta Diop's works to get themselves started. These include *The African Origin of Civilization: Myth or Reality*, *Pre-Colonial Black Africa*, *The Cultural Unity of Black Africa*, and *Civilization or Barbarism*.

**Q:** It would seem that all these claims and counter claims have not been helped by the seeming lack of any enduring account of how black people evolved as a race. To the best of my knowledge, there doesn't seem to be a historically black theory of creation outside of the big bang. You are knowledgeable in these things, do you know of any?

**A:** We have the Ancient Egyptian cosmogony: it is the original from which the Hebrew cosmogony in the Bible was derived. Dogon cosmogony was recorded in 1946 by some French anthropologists. I believe there were many others and that, wherever there appears to be none, it has been simply lost. The notion that some societies did not have their own world systems, including cosmogonies, is, I think, just a Euro chauvinist prejudice. The valid question, to my mind, is: would these cosmogonies still be remembered now, after what befell black people for all of the last century?

**Q:** These things are known to have a way of enduring through the generations. They may not be popular but you would still find people who know about these accounts if ever they existed.
A: Well, if there are such people who do remember, until you seek and find them, how would you know? Indians can remember theirs and their journey through time because they still have the institutions that have transmitted Hindu lore and knowledge for many thousands of years, from one generation to the next, orally, by their own methods, under their own authorities. So too the Dogon. **The condition for finding ancestral bodies of knowledge, cosmogonies included, seems to be this: The society must have preserved its ancestral organization, especially the institutions of the initiates, those that conserved and transmitted ancestral knowledge of all sorts.** In the 1940s and 1950s, there were still many such societies left in Africa, societies that had managed to preserve some cultural autonomy and had saved their ancestral institutions from total destruction by the intolerance and fanaticism that is standard with Christians, Moslems, colonial administrators, Europeanizers and Arabizers. That was why French anthropologists were able to document the world systems of the Dogon, Bambara, Bozo, Kouroumba and others. (See the book *Conversations with Ogotemmeli*, by Marcel Griaule). The point I am making is that many such accounts as we had would have been destroyed in the last century because part of the main work of the missionaries was to attack all our institutions, calling them works of the devil and so on. So, they interrupted the transmission of ancestral lore, and there are things that, if you interrupt transmission for two generations, they are gone! If father doesn't teach son and son doesn't teach grandson, the knowledge is lost. And too much of that has happened to us in the last 100 years. So, even if a cosmogony existed in a given society and we cannot find people who have received it from their parents, it's lost. We Africans are like a people hit by a rampaging hurricane of barbarism from Europe, a hurricane which swept through our continent, disrupting and destroying so many things. If our people had woken up in the 1960s, it would have been easier to start reconstructing the transmission structures because, at that time, some of these things were still around. But now, after a full century of loss, it's very
difficult to find the bits and pieces, especially for people who had no strong institutions for preserving ancestral lore.

But even those who still have strong institutions may have found it hard to do so under the hostile and deforming conditions of colonialism. Look at Bin people for instance. Their monarchy is still intact. I, therefore, think that keepers of their ancestral world systems are still there. So they could begin to reconstruct, but any society that does not have strong institutions that can preserve those things is worse off. *Ndi-Igbo* are in this sad group. Even the remnants of those few institutions that *Ndi-Igbo* had have been destroyed. That’s what you destroy when you attack shrines and sacred groves. Missionaries destroyed most of them 100 years ago; now it’s our own people who are destroying the remainder. You recently demolished Okija shrine over some rubbish, some false and sensational allegations, whereas it’s such institutions and their priests that preserve knowledge of the kind you are asking about. The more you demonize them, the more you lose these precious things. Now, this has gone on for a century; so what are you going to pick up that will be intact, coherent and authentic? This is the reason why we don’t know as much as we should know.

Take, for instance, the institution of Eze Nri, whether in Oraeri or in Nri: Is it still being preserved? Are they still keeping the ancestral traditions intact? When the keepers of a tradition go Christian or Islamic, a lot of things get adulterated, abandoned or lost. So there are all kinds of difficulties in recovering the ancestral tradition after five generations of this type of damage. I am not saying that the full story, if we had collected it a century ago, would have answered all the questions you are raising. I am saying that we don’t even have that little to tell us how far we can recreate our history and the various myths of origin that we had. There are myths of origin all over the world but if we could find out our own, it would help to answer some of these questions.
Q: Now, how would you assess the present Nigerian society as it is. Are we showing any real signs of readiness to stand on our feet?

A: Nigeria? Stand on its feet? This Nigeria that cannot survive one month without imports? That must be the joke of the century! Can Nigeria defend herself? Can Nigeria defend her territory and population from any attack? If she can’t, what are you talking about? Where is Nigeria going? Nowhere but down the drain and into the sad condition of Haiti. The world is in crisis, you can’t defend yourself, you can’t even grow your own food? All it would take to scatter Nigeria is an embargo from wherever we import all these importables. If they embargo exports to Nigeria for one month will there be any Nigeria left? You are in a disaster if you can’t even survive for a month unless your enemies allow you to eat. The root of the disaster is that you don’t even understand that you are at war and that you have enemies; and you take your imperialist enemies as your best friends!

Q: Are we at war really?

A: You’ve been at war for six hundred years and you don’t even know it, and you’ve lost every battle in that war. When you don’t even know you are at war then you’re lost. Europe has been making war on the world since the time of Columbus. You complain about slave trade. Who were the slaves? Were they not prisoners of war? You talk of the scramble for Africa; was it just a scramble? It was the conquest of Africa, but you delude yourselves by calling it a scramble. Colonialism: you were slaves to colonial masters, doing forced labor for them; your foreign conquerors came and ruled you, that’s slavery and that’s war. When some armed fellow comes to your house and takes it over, comes into your bedroom and tells you what to do and not do, is he your friend or your enemy? We don’t understand that we are at war and that we have been at war for a long time. And that we have lost every major encounter. Even your so-called independence might have counted as
a partial victory, but it isn’t, because you didn’t get independence. You
didn’t. So, if a people are at war and have lost every battle for six centuries,
are they not in disaster? It’s not that a disaster is coming, we are already in
the final stages of it. The question now is: Will there be black people living
here in the next century? Will the people of Nigeria survive till this time next
century?

**Q: What is the nature of this war? It’s not a shooting war evidently.**

A: It’s long past the shooting stage. When Lugard and his troops were
conquering different bits and pieces of Nigeria, when they attacked Sokoto,
Lokoja and other places; when British troops attacked Arochukwu and
crisscrossed all over Igboland shooting, burning and destroying, that was the
shooting stage that led to what you now call colonialism. So, we lost the war
before the shooting stage, lost it at the shooting stage, lost it at the
fundamental cultural stages when they destroyed our ancestral education
system and destroyed our religion. We lost all those stages of the war. It’s
like what’s happening in Sudan now: the Arabs overrun a village, kill the
men, rape the women and force them into slavery, capture the small
children and raise them up as Arabs. That’s exactly what the British did to
us. They defeated all your kingdoms and non-kingdoms, captured the small
children and sent them to mission schools where they raised them as fake
Europeans. That’s what we all are.

**Q: That’s what we all are?**

A: That’s what we all are; every one of us now in Nigeria. For five
generations so far. You see people have a baby today, tomorrow they hand
him over to the church and the school where children are brainwashed as
imitation Europeans. It’s a cultural war, a military war. The military stage is
over but it can come back again. We still have episodes of the shooting war
erupting from time to time -- as in Bakalori, Odi, Zaki-Biam and in the case
of the Apo Six -- when armed units of the Nigerian State massacre defenceless Nigerians, and do so with impunity. And there is the political side too: you guys claim you have democracy, you have the AU, you have NEPAD. You haven’t asked yourself what those organizations and programs actually are; what purpose were they instituted to serve and what will happen to you in another 50 years if they continue? You are at the tail end of a 600 year old disaster.

**Q: What is the nature of this struggle?**

**A:** It has been comprehensive all along. But at this terminal stage, it’s mostly a cultural war. But it’s also an economic war in the sense that when Obasanjo goes and throws away $12 billion of your money to the Paris Club, that’s the economic side of the war. When he jacks up your petrol prices, that’s the economic side of the war. Who are the beneficiaries of this jacking up and all that? Whose orders is he carrying out? Enemy orders. And how many thousands have starved, gone mad or even died from the effects of these enemy policies (foreignization, deregulation, etc) that OBJ has been implementing? They are the present day casualties of the economic side of this war. But, of course, you don’t understand that the IMF, the UN, the WHO, the World Bank and WTO are enemy institutions. So you are at war on every front and you don’t even know it. They use these agencies to dictate your government policies, down to the last detail. None of your budgets is devised without abiding by the framework that the World Bank and the IMF impose, before it is allowed to be written up and announced and you are allowed to implement it. Nyerere called it the *International Ministry of Finance*. I call it the *Imperialist Ministry of Finance*. That’s what the IMF actually is. And the imperialists use it to run Nigeria and the other provinces of their global G-8 empire. And they sent you their agent, Mrs. Okonjo-Iweala to be your Finance Minister and you accepted, and she is doing their job. She is on leave from the World Bank. That wasn’t quite clear until the other day when the MIT Alumni Magazine wrote that she is on leave from
the World Bank. So, she’s still on their job. And she’s your Minister of Finance designing policies to impoverish you and enrich her imperialist masters. You say you are not at war? Well, it’s worse than a Trojan Horse because the enemy has taken control of your brain. In the old imperialism, they would send a white governor general to come and run your affairs. After a while they began sending their agents whom you appointed as consultants to your presidents and to your ministry of finance, to co-ordinate oversee things for the imperialists. Now they have locals whom they have trained and brought up and you just make them your Minister of Finance or Central Bank Manager or this or that. So, your own people are now running the provinces of their empire for them. That is the disaster in which you are. And the bottom line of all this is that when you project all the things that are happening now, you’ll see that your economic system is on its way to implode.

**Q: How?**

A: The self-uprooting dynamic of this upside-down economy will cause it to implode. But even before you get to that point, there’s the matter of oil. Your oil is not going to last forever, is it? In fact, it will soon finish. This Nigeria you talk about, what is it? It’s only a pool of oil under your ground. And who mines it? The foreigners mine it, they tell you how much they have taken and give you some money. And even before the oil finishes, if they refuse to pay you tomorrow, Nigeria will collapse in 6 weeks. This Nigerian state you are talking about with Obasanjo and all his *gragra*, all this foolishness about being the giant of Africa and about getting a permanent veto seat on the UN Security Council; if Obasanjo, or whoever takes over Aso Rock, doesn’t have the money to pay his security services, nobody will take orders from him; Nigeria will collapse in one week. So when the Americans were warning about your collapsing in 10 years, they were just being nice to you. All it takes for them to destroy Nigeria, whenever it is in their interest to do so, is to instruct the oil companies not to pay you a damn
penny for six weeks, and Nigeria is finished. Nigeria is a failed state already, and if you don’t have oil revenue for six weeks all your governors, all the contracts they have been sharing will come to an end. And who will be loyal to the Nigerian state if money is not being dished out? You are living in a state that doesn’t really exist. It’s only a contraption that the foreigners built and are using for their own purposes. They can disappear it any day they like. All that your on shore-off shore debate. None of the oil is effectively yours. It’s like a child who is told that a goat is its own. The day it’s killed he will not know. If he is lucky, he will arrive to see his goat in the soup pot on the fire. The oil still left in Ijaw land in the Niger Delta, who mines it? If they refuse to mine it tomorrow, what will you do? If the oil companies say they are pulling out tomorrow, what will you do? They have their reasons for not doing so for now. You are a big power, right? Big enough for a Security Council veto seat, right? The easiest way for them to call your game, to dispel your delusions and cut you down to size, is to say: sorry, we shall no longer mine oil in Nigeria and your state will collapse. You don’t have the off shore oil under your control. The US Navy is in physical possession of all the oil fields in the Gulf of Guinea. You can’t dislodge them. What do you have to dislodge them with and say: this place is mine, I want you out? So, oil money is the only thing holding Nigeria together today and that oil is not in your control. So, your state is not only insecure, it’s rickety, it has no economic foundation. All it takes is for someone to stop paying money into its account and this conceited Lugardian state will disappear, poof! Your president cannot give an order to anyone and have it carried out if there is no money to share, whether legally or illegally. The caliphate thinks it is clever but it does not realize that the game it’s been playing is coming to an end.

**Q: The caliphate itself?**

**A**: The caliphate is dead. All you have been seeing for a hundred years is the artificially revived corpse of the caliphate. It was already dying when the
British propped it up for their own purposes and later handed Nigeria over to it to run for them. The caliphate has foolishly run Nigeria into the ground and turned it into a cesspool, and neither Nigeria nor the Caliphate will survive without oil revenue. Nothing in Nigeria will survive without oil revenue and that revenue can be stopped any day by the G8 masters when it suits their interest. So, you are not in control of anything. You can’t even feed yourselves, you can’t produce food. To produce food, you now must depend on fertilizers, and fertilizers depend on oil. The Nigerian state has even sabotaged the refineries that would help produce fertilizers locally to lessen the impact of an enemy embargo. If your oil money is cut off, but you have working refineries, you can try to make your own fertilizers and carry on for a while. But now, with your refineries killed off, if there’s no imported fertilizer for one season, there’ll be no food! What I am pointing out is that you are living in a rickety structure that is already as good as dead. All that is waiting to happen is Nigeria’s official funeral. And you are shouting keep Nigeria one, Nigeria will survive. How can it? Why should it? Okay let’s watch and see.

**Q: What must Nigeria do to counter these obvious inadequacies?**

**A:** I am not an adviser to Nigeria. If I have any idea, why should I help to sustain this rickety structure by giving it to them? Nigeria to me is an enemy state. So, I don’t see why I should give out any idea on how to preserve Nigeria.
Q: Nigeria, an enemy state?

A: Yes, it was created by our enemies. Lugard was an enemy of the African peoples he conquered and foisted the Nigerian state on. And that state has not changed. It was programmed to be the enemy of the Nigerian peoples, and so it remains. Just think of Bakalori, Odi, Zaki-Biam, the Apo Six. Is that the behavior of a friend or enemy of the Nigerian people? So why should I be advising an enemy creation on how to preserve itself? It’s none of my business.
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Introduction

This paper deals with the officially explicit and illicit policies aimed at marginalizing the Nubians in both Egypt and the Sudan by, first, driving them away from their historical homelands by systematically impoverishing their region; secondly, re-settling Arab groups in the lands the Nubians leave behind; thirdly, pushing the Nubians into Arabicization through biased educational curricula at the expense of their own languages and culture; fourth, nursing a culture of complicity among the Nubian intellectuals so as to help facilitate these policies. Three cases will be discussed in this regard; (1) the case of the governor of Asuan, Egypt (the capital of the Nubian region in southern Egypt) in granting leases of land and built homes to non-Nubians; these are the lands from where the Nubians were evacuated under the pretext of building the High Dam in 1964. So far, the incessant complaints of the Nubian have fell on deaf ears. 2) The official guarantees made by the then Minister of Interior of the Sudan (General-Brigadier Abdul Rahim Muhammad Husain- presently the Minister of Defense) to the Egyptians regarding the safety of Arab settlers from Egypt into the Nubian basin in northern Sudan. 3) The decision taken lately by the minister of Education in the northern State forbidding the Nubian pupils from uttering a
word in Nubian languages within the precinct of the schools.

The paper will also draw on the racist Arab culture toward the Nubians, in both countries with special emphasis on Egypt. It will discuss in this regard the racist, anti-black approach of Egyptian policies toward the Nubians in particular. In the Sudan it will draw attention to the fact that the ethical premises of slave trade are there lurking behind the scene, targeting non-Arab people in general. In this context the paper will discuss the massacre of the Sudanese refugees lately committed with cold blood in Cairo on December 30th 2005 at the footstep of the UNHCR office and in front of the cameras of international media.

Then in the conclusion the paper will shed light on how it is quite possible and predictable for the Nubians in both Egypt and Sudan to join the rising waves of ethnic rebellions in Sudan, thus bringing Egypt to the table of reckoning along with the Islamo-Arabist regime of Sudan. It concludes with certain recommendations for this conference to adopt.

**The De-Population of the Nubian Region in Sudan and Egypt**

In 1964 the construction of the High Dam in Aswan was completed, a matter that resulted in an area of 500 km along the Nile course (310 km in Egypt, 190 km in the Sudan) to be submerged under the reservoir. The reservoir, i.e. the lake, bears two names, 'Lake Nasser' in Egypt, and 'Lake Nubia' in the Sudan. This has lead to the resettlement of about 16500 Nubian families in Egypt (with a similar number of Nubian families on the Sudan side) away from their historical lands. In the case of Egyptian Nubians, the area resettlement was a barren place called Koum Ambo near Aswan. In the case of the Sudanese Nubians the area of resettlement was a place called Khashm al-Girba in middle-eastern Sudan, known to be of rainy autumn, contrary to the Saharan Nubian region.

In 1963 the Aswan Regional Planning Authority (ARPA) was founded by the Egyptian government to be developed in 1966 upon recommendations
from both the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) into Lake Nasser Development Centre with a Six Years Plan. In 1975 upon the project findings the High Dam Development Authority was established. Developmental planning has continued up to the present time with constant help from the UNDP. Two economical activities have been available to the local people; namely fishery and agriculture. In this regard it is worth mentioning that the majority of the either the fishers or the farmers are not Nubians, but rather are people coming from other areas with the encouragement of the Egyptian government which monopolizes the marketing (for fishery, cf. Lassaily-Jacob, 1990; for agriculture, cf. Fernea & Rouchdy, 1991).

The main question here is why did the governments of both Egypt and the Sudan evacuate the area if were keen on development. No development, even the most mechanized one, can be achieved without man power. The Nubians were driven away from their historical home lands on the bank of the Nile at gunpoint. This experience has proved to be very traumatic to them, a matter that their endeavours to go back and resume living in their old villages have been reflected in their vocal music and songs (Mannan, 1990). A new genre of songs of homesickness has been developed of which the late Hamza Eldin (1929-2006) with his melancholic melodies and music stands as an example (cf. www.hamzaeldin.com).

The anti-developmental nature of the depopulation of the Nubian region is demonstrated in the fact that a scheme of compensation had been implemented to redeem the evacuated Nubians. A true developmental approach to the whole project could have been achieved. The Nubians could have remained in their historical lands at the bank of the Lake Nubia, with new houses built in the same characteristic architectural and decorative design (cf. Wenzil, 1970). With such an approach one would not be in need for compensation. Even so, the compensation was not enough as usual in such cases, even though some scholars and officials might argue against
that (for the case of Egyptian Nubians, see Fahim, 1972; for the case of the Sudanese Nubians, see Dafalla, 1975).

The Non-Nubian Re-Population of the Region

The Nubians in both Egypt and the Sudan did make many attempts to go back and establish small colonies of settlements and agriculture. They farmed the drawdown areas by pumping water from the reservoir (Fernea & Rouchdy, 1991). However, all these attempts were occasionally aborted by the fluctuating water level of the reservoir, a matter the Nubians believe it to be intentional by the authorities which never encouraged them to go back.

By the 1990s the Egyptian government began following a policy of repopulating the evacuated Nubian regions. It began encouraging Egyptians other than Nubians to settle in the evacuated areas around the reservoir lake. It did this while the Nubians were kept away from their own historical lands, living in a pigsty style of life in their barren area of Koum Ambo. The same thing happened in the Sudan, with tacit encouragement from the government to the Arab Bedouin who began settling in the evacuated area. The repopulation of the Nubian region in Egypt has become an official policy entrusted to both the Minister of Agriculture and the Military Governor of Aswan. Villages with full facilities and utilities were built by the Egyptian government and distributed to individuals and families from outside the regions with bank loans to start with. The latest of this is the inauguration of the settlement at the old Nubian village of Kalabsha with 150 non-Nubian families, which was opened by the Minister of Agriculture Amin Abaza (cf. al-Wafd Newspaper, 18/05/2006). On 11/06/2006 the Al-Hram Newspaper (the unofficial voice of the government) announced that tens of thousands of feddans were to be distributed in the Nubian region to people other than the Nubians. When the Nubians demanded that their lands be returned to them, they get an arrogant reply from the military Governor of Aswan: "If you want your lands, go fetch them beneath the water (cf. Rajab al-Murshidi in
At the same time, the Nubians who ventured building their own colonies and farms in their old lands began facing obstacles at every corner. No one from the international community has come to help the Nubians in Egypt. They began voicing their problem through the internet, making use of the numerous Nubian websites, which mostly evolve around the home-villages bearing their names (cf. www.abirtabag.net; www.jazeratsai.com; www.karma2.com; www.3amara.com; www.nubian-forum.com/vb; www.nunubian.com).

This racist and Apartheid-like policy is adopted by the Egyptian government in order to contain the discontent among its Arab population who had been negatively affected by the 1992 Agricultural Law, which has come into effect by 1997. This law has liberalized the land tenure market by abolished the old land rental and tenure by returning the it to its old feudal owners, thus compelling the peasants to re-hire it all over again, with the threat of rental price increase looming over their heads. During the 1990s the price actually tripled and by now it has quadrupled (Roudart, 2000/1). This has caused a turmoil and unrest among the peasants who began seeking other jobs. Migration of the peasants to other areas of agricultural schemes of reclaimed land, away from their home village, was encouraged by the government. The Egyptian government adopted the policy of intermigration so as to solve (1) its chronic problem of population explosion, and (2) to compensate those who have been negatively affected by its land liberalization law. Re-settlement in the reclaimed land of the New Valley in Sinai was officially encouraged, a matter the peasants were not enthusiastic about. Being riverain all through history, such a move was too much for them. That is how the Egyptian government began re-settling them in the Nubian regions which was evacuated four decades ago against the will of its historical people, the Nubians. In doing this the Egyptian government is consciously pushing the Nubians into being completely assimilated and
Arabized, a policy pursued by the successive Egyptian governments.

The Settlement of Egyptian Peasants in the Nubian Region in Sudan

In the Sudan the Nubians faced the conspiracy of both their government and the Egyptian government. Those who were affected by the construction of the High Dam, like their brethren in Egypt, were evacuated from their land and resettled in the Eastern region. The environment in their new home was completely different than that of their old home. However, only one third of them were affected by the High Dam, where the land of two third still remain unaffected in the old region. Being severely underdeveloped, the Nubian region continued to expel its people to the extent that whole villages are almost empty at the present.

In late 2003 news leaked out revealing that negotiations on highest levels with the Egyptian government had been made so as to facilitate the settlement of millions of Egyptian peasants, along with their families, in the triangle of the Nubian basin, Halfa-Dungula-'Uwēnāt. The aim of this move is said to safeguard the Arab identity of Sudan against the growing awareness of Africanism in Sudan generally and among the Nubians in particular. The Sudanese delegation, which was backed by a Presidential mandate, was led by Arabist Nubians, General-Brigadier Abdul Rahim Muhammad Husain (then Minister of Interior, presently Minister of Defense). A cover-up plan named “the Four Freedoms” which theoretically allows the Sudanese and the Egyptians as well to own agrarian lands and settle in both countries was officially declared. The cover-up plan has come out half cooked as both parties were too eager in their scrambling to create a de facto situation before the Nubians become aware of what was going on. There is no agrarian land to be owned by the Sudanese investors in Egypt. But there is land for the Egyptians in the Sudan. On 31/03/2005 a mainsheet press release from the State Minister of Agriculture in Khartoum (dr. al-Sadig Amara, an Arabist Nubian as well) revealed that 6.1 Millions of feddans in the triangle of Nubian basin had been sold to the Egyptians.
(investors and peasants) with long term leases, i.e. investment through settlement (cf. *al-Sahafa Newspaper*, No. 3892). There is no mention of the Nubians in all these deals which seem like have been made overnight.

In official visits to Cairo, the two ministers mentioned above held meetings with Egyptian scholars and intellectuals who were sceptical about the viability of resettling millions of Egyptian peasants in the Sudan. Such a scheme applied in Iraq a few years ago during the war against Iran resulted in literally eliminating physically and cleansing the poor peasants immediately after the war ended. However the two flamboyant ministers chivalrously gave their solemn pledges reminding their audience that they are backed Presidential mandate.

The Minister of Defense went out of his way challenging his audience to bring forward their solutions about tackling the population explosion in Egypt if not by migrating to the vast areas of the sparsely populated Northern Sudan. Furthermore, lamenting the fact that the Egyptian migration to the Sudan has significantly diminished in the late decades after independence, he drew the comparison that the migration from West Africa has steadily increased. The State Minister on his behalf lamented the hesitation of some Egyptian intellectuals and officials, urging them to expedite moving to the Nubian basin before *slc* other people move there first (for more details, see: [http://www.ahram.org.eg/archive/Inde](http://www.ahram.org.eg/archive/Inde); another source of information is also: [http://acpss.ahram.org.eg/ahram/2001/1/1/CONF20.HTM](http://acpss.ahram.org.eg/ahram/2001/1/1/CONF20.HTM).

As the Nubian Memo to Kofi Annan (cf. Hashim, 2006) stated it, the Egyptians wanted the area of the reservoir completely depopulated of its indigenous people (i.e. all the Nubians affected in both the Sudan and Egypt). Disrupting the Nubian society of Northern Sudan and Southern Egypt has been a target for the governments of both countries as the Nubians constitute the only African entity on the Nile from Kōsti and Sinnār up the White and Blue Niles respectively down to the Mediterranean Sea.
The silencing of an Ancient Tongue: Don't speak Nubian

The Nubian languages, like all national languages in the Sudan, are on the brink of becoming extinct (cf. Hashim & Bell, 2005). The state not only did nothing to help enhance and promote the national languages, but look at them as a threat to the national unity. Of over 100 national languages in the Sudan (cf. Hurreiz & Bell, 1975), not even a single one of them has been recognized by the state. The state-supported Arabic is encroaching at the expense of the dying national language. The successive governments of post-Independent Sudan have never heeded the calls from concerned bodies such as UNESCO (cf. UNESCO, 1988; or for recent reference, see: http://www.unesco.org/most /ln2lin.htm#resources) for using the national language as means of instruction, especially in primary levels.

The Nubian languages, especially the ancient form which was used during the Christian kingdoms, have been in use as the official language of the state and in daily use for centuries, from the 6th century to the up to the present (cf. Hashim & Bell, 2004). However the toll of the systematic onslaught on the national languages that that has been going on for the last six centuries has begun to show.

On 27/05/2006 the Nubians in the Sudan were shocked to read the headline news that the regional Minister of Education in the Northern state had given his explicit orders that no Nubian pupil to utter a word of Nubian language within the precinct of the schools. For decades, right from the beginning of the 20th centuries, the Nubian languages were fought against by the Arabization-oriented school administrations using the infamous tactic of the Ottoman Turkish Mijidi piaster (cf. Hashim, Forthcoming). The obsolete piaster was to be hung from a string on the neck of the pupil who dared utter a word in the Nubian language inside the school (they were mostly boarding schools). The piaster was to be passed to another pupil only when caught committing the sin of speaking one of the most ancient languages in the history of mankind. Checked twice a day, in the morning
and the evening, the holder of the piaster was severely punished; four strong pupils would be summoned to hold the 'culprit' [sic] from the feet and the hands to be whipped ten lashes. This practice, however, has stopped in the last two decades as a result of the growing protest of the poor Nubians.

This late measure of official and systematic cultural persecution has caused an outcry by the Nubians in home and diaspora without the interference of the international community, as usual. The Islamo-Arab government, on both the federal and regional levels, has not heeded the growing protest of the Nubians, the motto of the government being that one expressed with finite arrogance by the President Omer al-Bashir in the early 1990s: "We have assumed power with arms; those who want power, or want to share it, should be men and fight for it". Consequently, the marginalized African people of Sudan in Dar Fur, West Sudan, and the Beja in the East have taken to arms one after the other (with prospect of others in the North following them soon) in order to protect themselves from the state-sponsored projects of systematic cultural assimilation, impoverishment and persecution. Before the coup of the Islamic junta in the 30th of June 1898 (?) the war zone was confined to the southern region of the South, Nuba Mountains and Ingassana Mountains. However, the Nubians in the far North have not joined the rebellion yet. The civil war to the marginalized African people of Sudan was not an alternative but rather a matter of necessity when there was no alternative at all; they were pushed into it by an arrogant and stupid regime. Unfortunately this regime now enjoys the Anglo-American support whose intervention presses the fighting groups to reach with it an agreement that does not solve their problem. Such agreements inject new blood in a regime that has outlived its days.
They kill Horses, don't they!

The culling of Sudanese Refugees in Cairo

In 1990, a year after the coup of the Islamic junta, waves of Sudanese refugees swarmed into Egypt in general and in Cairo in particular. That was expected and most of the western countries, which were the prime terminal the refugees sought, firmly locked their doors in the face of them. The western countries did this because of the high cost of supporting the waves of the refugees who everybody knew that they may never go back to the Sudan as they were seeking permanent settlement in the west. On the other hand Egypt offered nothing to them whatsoever. Furthermore there was no work available for them there, even the lowest paid job. However, by 1995, there was about 4 million Sudanese refugees Egypt. That was natural as the doors of Egypt were the only ones open for them. But it was only a matter of a few days until the Sudanese refugees discovered that in fact they fled from the prisons of their own regime to be locked in another prison that is Egypt. The Egyptian government made clear to the western embassies in Cairo that no one of the Sudanese refugees to be given a visa from Cairo. The reason was a quite good one: such an act would increase the flow of the refugees into Egypt.

Then why did the Egyptian authorities open the door for them in the first place? And how did those refugees, while receiving nothing from the Egyptian government, did manage to support themselves? They were mostly families, with women, old folk and children! The answers to these questions will not only reveal one of the worst exploitations of the misfortunes that befall people, but will further reveal the Master-Slave mentality that still characterizes the Egyptian conduct when it comes to Sudan, consequent the whole of black Africa. The forsaken refugees relied ultimately on money transferred to them from their relations, whether from the rich, petroleum Arab countries or from the west. In 1999 in a visit to Cairo, the present writer was shocked to know that it was a common knowledge to every
Sudanese and Egyptian intellectual alike the fact that the hard currency earned by the in-land revenue from the money transferred to the Sudanese refugees was much more than that earned from the Suez Canal. And that was not the whole story. The money which was usually transferred by fax, i.e. to be cashed immediately when the answer-back is received, was held by the banks for months before releasing it. The answer to this delay was that they did not receive the money. This answer was said in the face of the claimers who had the fax answer-back in their hands faxed to them by their relatives as a document to prove that the money was there in Cairo in safes of the Egyptian banks. Holding the money in that way could have never continued for years if it were not okayed by the Egyptian government in its policy to make the best out of the Sudanese calamities. In that visit and in another one earlier in 1994, the present writer left Cairo back to Khartoum without cashing money sent to him from Saudi Arabia. My visits were too short for such a difficult mission; in each one of them I only stayed for one month.

By 1998 the international community and the UN became aware of the Egyptian ghetto set up for the Sudanese refugees. The UNHCR began a programme of resettlement for the Sudanese refugees congregated in Cairo. The biggest diaspora in the history of the Sudan had begun as the refugees were dispersed all over the globe, especially in the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Europe and South America. By 2003 there were only a few thousands of them left in Cairo, whose majority of had already been registered in the UNHCR Cairo office. Those were mostly from southern Sudan, Dar Fur, Nuba Mountains and many other areas of the Sudan. By 2004, with the development of the peace negotiation that were brokered mainly by the USA, UK and Norway that pressurized the rebel groups to reach a settlement with the present Islamic regime, the interest of the UNHCR in the refugees began decreasing to focus on other areas. This gave the Cairo office, which was manned by Egyptians, a free hand in dealing with the situation. It simply resorted to a well drawn plan of faked ineptitude,
pretending to be local staff who did not have any power. However, the international staffs were there and they were all Egyptians. As a result of this hopeless situation, most of the refugees, either headed back to Sudan to try another exit, or out of helplessness resigned by staying in Cairo believing in the meek promises made by the Egyptian staff at the UNHCR office that things would eventually be sorted.

In fact those who continued to stay were the poorest as they did not have any people to send them money to support themselves. They relied ultimately on the UNHCR. Of course they were also the ones with most genuine cases being mostly from the conflict zones of the South, Nuba Mountains, Ingassana Mountains, the Beja in eastern Sudan and Dar Fur in western Sudan. This made them a real burden to the Egyptian society and government which just discovered that those are filthy black Africans infested with Aids and a host of infective disease. So with Naivasha agreement which was reached between the Sudan People Liberation Movement (SPLM) and the present regime in May 2004, the UNHCR Cairo office bluntly told the refugees that their cases had consequently lost their genuineness. It told them to go back to their country as there was no war. The Egyptianized international body pretended not to be aware that the wars were not confined to southern Sudan, itself not yet safe for civilians. The poor of the poor were left to their own in the streets of Cairo, penniless, where they were looked upon with the disgust and contempt typical of an Arab slaver towards a slave who behaves like a free person.

The kept coming to the closed doors of UNHCR office every day dragging their feet with empty stomach to stay all the day there in the park of a mosque adjacent UNHCR office until it is time to sleep. On the 29th of September 2005 a group of homeless refugees decided to stay overnight there on the grass of the park. In a few days the number began increasing as there was no where to go to. That was the moment when they decided to campaign a picket at the footsteps of the international body. This prompted
the other refugees who had a shelter to abandon them and join the picket. In one week the numbered exceeded 3000 refugees. A camp committee sprang out of them. They kept the vigil for more than three months, with highly civilized and meticulous organization of feeding, hygiene and sleeping, with places assigned to the women and children along with the old. Neither alcohol nor drunken people were allowed into the camp.

Right from the beginning the Egyptian society and government could not take in the scene of having such affluent area blackened by those filthy Africans. A host of derogatory and abusive language of dehumanization typical of Arabs dealing with Africans was introduced against which the poor of the poor pretended not to have heard them, walking with their heads raised high. While hatred and contempt continued building up against the picket of the refugees, the international office in Cairo completely identified with the Egyptian stand with the high echelon of the inept UN, ironically headed by a puppet black African, turning a deaf year to the moaning sounds of the refugees congregating at its doorstep. As usual, the UN was simply waiting for the refugees to get killed so as to make a well calculated wording of a statement expressing shock and concern and then doing its best to contain the situation (cf. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/4570446.stm. The inevitable killing of the refugees came with a very cynical timing.

Just before midnight of December the 30th 2005, police forces and military troops supported with tanks began gathering and forming a cordon around the refugees camp. A delegation of the committee of the refugees tried to contact the police leadership to enquire about the reason for this cordon with no avail. With the advance of the first hour of the chilling morning the onslaught began by firing water canons (in the early hours of a winter dawn). Then the gendarme stormed the camp with more than 12 thousands, wielding truncheons and stamping people. The only thing the refugees could do as a reaction was performing prayer (Islamic and Christian
as well), with others chanting religious hymns aloud. Chased by human demons which wanted to kill them in their own country, Sudan, and in Egypt, they were only left with one source of help, the Providence. But, alas, they were killed by hundreds.

The massacre caused an international outcry with no condemnation whatsoever to the bold killer. It was well covered by international media. The first move of Egypt was to down play the whole even by falsifying the number of the dead which they delimited down to 29. However, the true number as revealed by counting the dead in the various morgues Cairo's hospital brought the number to about 280. The Sudanese government shocked the free world when instead of condemning the killing of its own citizen, condoned what the Egyptian government did. Later the Egyptian officials revealed that the Sudanese government was informed about what it was going to do and they agreed. That was not all of it. The injured, even the ones with the slightest injury, happened to pass away once admitted to hospitals. Rumours had it that they were literally put down in the theater under anesthesia after having removed any internal organ deemed useful for transplant.

However, the most insulting of it all was the timing. This massacre of Sudanese refugees took place just on the eve of the 50th anniversary of the Independence Day of Sudan. The Egyptian regime could not be more cynical and more vindictive. The message was clear: independence or no independence, you are still our slaves. While the ordinary Sudanese people were fuming with anger and humiliation, the political parties were going out of their way to rationalize what the Egyptians did. The irony was that Egypt was the first state to recognize the Islamic coup d'état of Sudan in June 1989, which plotted to assassinate its President, Hosny Mubarak in Addis Ababa in the mid 1990s. This prompted Egypt to sponsor the political opposition while working tacitly towards taming the wild Islamic regime. All the time dreading the idea of having a democracy in the Sudan, to Egypt a
totalitarian regime in the Sudan is always convenient to deal with whatever the surface ideological differences. When it at last achieved this goal, Egypt ended with having both the opposition and government as friends. The regime is so keen to appease Egypt which poses as a strong ally that can help the Sudan in restoring its place in the international community with no sanctions or international criminal court. The opposition is believed by many Sudanese observers to have so far kept silent from condemning either the massacre of the refugees or the Egyptian occupation of Sudanese land because they have been on the payroll all through the years of their self-chosen exile in Egypt.

Well, isn't it slavery all over again?

**Conclusion:**

This paper concludes by demanding that the systematic and official obliteration of the identity of the Nubians in both Egypt and the Sudan as represented in selling out their historical lands on the bank of the Nile and their oppressing their languages should stop immediately. The Egyptian and Sudanese Nubians must have the right and priority to go back to their historical villages. The two states in Egypt and the Sudan must do whatever possible to protect the Nubians against any encroachment of other ethnic groups into their lands unless it takes place in a natural and peaceful way that does not make the Nubians feel that they are being targeted and endangered. The international community is called upon to offer support and solidarity. This paper draws the attention of this esteemed conference to the fact that selling the Nubian basin in Northern Sudan by this present regime to the Egyptian in order to facilitate the settlement of Arabized Egyptian peasants will turn that region into a civil war zone. The paper urges the conference to condemn this move in its endeavours to enhance peace and reparation.

The paper also demands that this conference includes in its programmes
of reparation the Cairo massacre of December 30th 2005. The paper demands that this conference calls for an independent and international investigation into the circumstances that had lead to the killing of Sudanese refugees. The least that can be done to honour the dead is to know for sure their number. Let us not forget that those people were killed while wearing the badge of the UNHCR. Compensations should be paid to those who suffered, whether by losing a member/s of their family/s or by injury and the traumatic experience. Furthermore, their resettlement should be resumed.

The paper urges this esteemed conference to adopt a resolution to the effect of the points mentioned above. Let us be clear about reparation; there will be no reparation if the grievances have not been addressed.
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USAfrica: A Mortal Danger for Black Africans

A Black Power Pan-Africanist Viewpoint

By CHINWEIZU

Part I: Black African aspirations vs. continental Unification

Is there any black African, whether in the homeland or the Diaspora, who doesn’t want, by yesterday, a Black Africa that is prosperous, secure from exploiters and invaders, and is respected by the whole world, like China or Japan is? That, I believe, is the basic aspiration driving the desire for Continental African Unity, as attempted through the OAU/AU, and now through this proposed USAfrica.

Let me give three reasons why the continental union government approach to our aspirations hasn’t worked, won’t work, and is very dangerous for Black Africans.

1. The USAfrica doesn’t have a camel’s chance in the ocean of delivering on the hopes and aspirations which its promoters are encouraging naïve black Africans to invest in it. Simply put, 53 neo-colonial Arab and Black African worms stuffed into a bottle will not yield a black African lion. If you add up 53 zeros, you’ll still have zero!

2. The USAfrica will be, for black Africans, a disaster much worse than even our terrible disunity. If this USAfrica is enacted at the AU Summit in Accra in July, Black Africans would have jumped from the frying pan of disunity into the fire of unity under Arab colonialism. And all Black Africans would quickly find themselves reduced to the terrible condition of the Black Africans under Arab minority rule in Darfur, South Sudan and Mauritania.

In our naïve approach to this matter, we are behaving like nigger monkey who insisted that he and python were brothers because they both
lived on the same island. Nigger monkey rushed to embrace python and quickly ended up united with python all right, but in python’s stomach.

3. Just like the OAU/AU did for the last 50 years, this USAfrica will divert us, for another century, from what we should have done in the last 50 years to achieve our hopes and aspirations as Black Africans.

But what should we have done since “independence” and why did we neglect to do it?

Since Black Africans gained “independence” during the last 50 years, we have lived by the slogan “Seek ye first the political kingdom, and all else shall be added unto you”.

Unfortunately, little has been added unto us except poverty, more poverty, beggardom, social disorder, neo-colonialism under UN Imperialism, the debt burden, AIDSbombing by the USA and the World Health Organization (WHO), and Arab territorial expansion at our expense. Why? The basic reason is that we did not -- as our history demanded, and still demands we do –take as our cardinal guide the slogan:

**Build ye first the kingdom of collective security, and you can, within its ramparts, achieve all your other desires!**

We have failed to build our system for Black African collective security. That is what we must focus on now and build in the next 50 years if we don’t want to be exterminated by our White Power enemies, who have declared, after exploiting us for centuries, that they now want our land and resources without us.

All our historical disasters in the last 1000 years resulted from the basic fact that we were too weak to defend our land, our population, and our cultures from Arab and European invaders. Until we equip ourselves to defend ourselves, our disasters will continue and will multiply until we are exterminated, most probably within this century.
For building the Black Power to protect ourselves, a continental union government is simply irrelevant. None of the great powers of today or before has been a continental state. Britain, France, Germany, Japan, Russia, USA, China, and India -- none occupies a whole continent. Belgium, whose GDP is said to be greater than that of all of the countries of Africa put together, is not a continent. Nor is any of the Asian Tigers. On the other hand, Australia occupies an entire continent. But where is Australia in the league table of great powers? Is it in the G-8? Antarctica likewise is a continent.

So, let us stop deluding ourselves about the necessity for a continental African union government as the means to our legitimate and historically based aspirations.

Instead, let us follow Marcus Garvey the Great, and focus on what we really need to build: a black African superpower that will be a great power in the rank of China and the G-8 countries. As Garvey taught us some 80 years ago:

_The Negro peoples of the world should concentrate upon the object of building up for themselves a great nation in Africa . . . a political superstate . . . a government, a nation of our own, strong enough to lend protection to the members of our race scattered all over the world, and to compel the respect of the nations and races of the earth._

A political program, to be valid and useful, must have a correctly defined constituency and a solution to the cardinal problems of that group. Garveyism does that for Black Africans. Continentalism fails on both counts, which is one key reason why, in its 50 years reign, it has not achieved what we have aspired to as Black Africans.

Whereas Garveyism correctly focuses on our developing the Black Power we need to protect ourselves from all dangers, Continentalism says nothing at all about power, let alone about _Black_ Power. It doesn’t even offer to
create **Black African** unity. Its focus is on unification of the entire continent, which translates into Arab-Black African unification. But since the Arabs have, for 1500 years been white invaders, expropriators and enslavers of Black Africans, Arab-Black African unification is like a unification of nigger monkey with python. The Arabs would naturally love, and eagerly promote, such unification. But isn’t it suicidal for Black Africans to agree to it, let alone campaign eagerly for it—as continentalist Pan Africanists have done for the last 50 years?

For those who do not know about it, below is the Arab Agenda for this USAfrica.

---

**Part II: USAfrica- The Arab agenda**

1] We must never forget that, despite Gadhafi’s rhetoric against colonialism, he and his Arabfellows are colonialists in Africa—white settler colonialists who invaded, conquered, expropriated and have settled on 1/3 of Africa beginning in 640 AD.

2] Gadhafi’s hurry to implement his USAfrica is suspect. He has spent 40 years trying to force Libya’s unification with Sudan, to forcibly annex the Auzou strip from Chad, and sponsoring destabilization in Liberia, Uganda, Mali, Niger etc. Should we trust his intentions? We should be highly suspicious of a project by which he would diplomatically swallow in one gulp all of Black Africa where he has, hitherto, failed to militarily grab bits and pieces.

3] In Gadhafi’s speeches in 2005, where he pushed for the fledgling AU to appoint a Defense Minister, and a Trade Minister etc as matters of priority; and called for a continental army, he also urged the AU countries to compete to host the institutions of the AU/USAfrica. This hurry is all highly suspicious.
Clearly, the Arab countries, awash with oil money and with unlimited back-up from the rest of the oil-rich Arab League, will outbid the poor Black countries, leading to Arab domination of the USAfrica; just as the UN is dominated by the gang of imperialist countries where its key institutions are located—the USA with the World Bank and IMF in Washington and the UN Hqtrs in New York, and Europe with Unesco in Paris, the Maritime agencies in London, and other key agencies in Geneva.

If the Gadhafi formula for locating its key institutions is allowed, this USAfrica will become an instrument of Arab colonialism in Africa; and will entrench Arab power over Black Africa.

4] Defense is the last thing a sensible sovereign country surrenders. Note that after 50 years of their merger process, the EU states have yet to do that and appoint a defense minister. Yet Gadhafi wants the AU to start with that! Highly suspicious.

5] The dangers of Arab racism, colonialism and expansionism are evident in Mauritania and Sudan, and should be studied and heeded.

For basic information on that, please go to


6] Gadhafi’s arguments about the potential economic benefits of USAfrica are invalid. Continental size is neither a necessary nor sufficient condition for becoming an economic power. If it was, Britain, Japan, Germany, France, let alone Switzerland and most of the European countries would be economic midgets, and the Asian tigers too. On the other hand, Antarctica and Australia, as continents, would be economic giants. Gadhafi must believe that he is addressing an audience of economic blockheads!

7] Here is Gadhafi’s Lebensraum [Living space] statement at the Arab League meeting in Jordan in 2001:
"The third of the Arab community living outside Africa should move in with the two-thirds on the continent and join the African Union 'which is the only space we have'"

---

Col. Mouammar Gadhafi of Libya, at the Arab League, 2001

It should be taken seriously as a clue to his intentions and what he and his Arabs will set about doing to Black Africa once they have us in their USAfrica trap.

Where will Gadhafi settle his new 100million Arabs from outside Africa? How will he get land to give them? Here is an example of Arab land grab intentions. Back in 1962, as he flagged off his troops to the war front against the Black Africans in South Sudan, the Arab Sudanese General Hassan Beshir Nasr declared:

"We don’t want these black slaves . . . what we want is their land."

That is what the wars in South Sudan and Darfur have been about: seizing land from black Africans. Darfur is an ongoing example of how Arabs seized 1/3 of our continent,

and of how Gadhafi will grab the land to settle his 100million Arabs from outside Africa.

8] There is a vital need to think through the Black African interest, and negotiate in detail to secure its requirements, before agreeing, if at all, to this USAfrica proposal. After it is signed, the Arabs will, predictably, treat as treason any second thoughts and objections to details from Black Africans.

Black Africans must never again repeat the folly of their leaders in 1973, when the OAU lined up behind the Arabs on the oil embargo, in hopes of getting concessions on oil, without any pre-agreed quid pro quo, and got nothing after the Arabs had exploited African support.
9] Because we are convinced that this USAfrica is a cover for Arab colonialism and Arab expansionism in Black Africa, we urge every Black African president in the AU to vote against it at Accra in July. At the very least, they should vote to postpone any decision on it for five years so that a vigorous debate can be carried out by the people, so they can knowledgeably and democratically mandate their presidents on what to do about it. We could take a lesson from the EU process where key stages of the unification have been preceded by plebiscites in each member country.

10] If this USAfrica is agreed this July at Accra, Gadhafi and all Arabs will be laughing at the dumb blacks whom they have easily duped yet again. Don’t forget their view of Blacks, as stated over the centuries, most famously by Ibn Khaldun, Ibn Sena and Osama Bin Laden, as in the following quotes:

Ibn Khaldun, the greatest Arab historian (1332-1406), sees the blacks as “characterized by levity and excitability and great emotionalism” and [says] that “they are everywhere described as stupid” . . . He adds that blacks are “humans who are closer to dumb animals than to rational beings.” . . .

al-Dimashqi had the following to say: “The Equator is inhabited by communities of blacks who may be numbered among the savage beasts. Their complexion and hair are burnt and they are physically and morally abnormal. Their brains almost boil from the sun's heat.”

Ibn al-Faqih al-Hamadhani follows the same line of reasoning. To him . . . the zanj [black Africans]. . .are “overdone until they are burned so that the child comes out between black, murky, malodorous, stinking, and crinkly-haired, with uneven limbs, deficient minds, and depraved passions” . . .

Even such luminaries as Ibn Sina [Avicenna] (980-1037), the most famous and influential of the philosopher-scientists of Islam, considered blacks to be “people who are by their very nature slaves.”
“All African women are prostitutes, and the whole race of African men are *abeed* [slave] stock. Your people are like rats plaguing the earth”

When next you meet an Arab, you should ask what is the Arabic word for a black person; then ask what is the Arabic word for slave; you’ll discover that the words are the same “abeed”. Which is why, when an Arab looks at a black African, what he sees is a slave.

**Now, that is how their language teaches these Arab ‘brothers’ we are eager to unite with to think of us—as slaves!**

And as one traveler in the Sudan observed in 1930:

“In the eyes of the Arab rulers of Sudan the black slaves were simply animals given by Allah to make the life of the Arab comfortable”

**A word is enough for the wise!**

-----------------------------
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This paper is dedicated to the memory of Steve Biko.

One type of struggle we regard as fundamental is . . . the struggle against our own weaknesses.--Amilcar Cabral, [1980: 121]

You must not abandon discussion out of tact . . . There should be no concession where there is a question of establishing a scientific truth . . . Remember we are focused on a quest for truth and not on a sacrosanct idol we must avoid debasing. . . .--Cheikh Anta Diop [quoted in Van Sertima, Ivan 1986: 13]

Professor Diop does have one important desideratum that has yet to be fulfilled. He desires a forum or colloquium somewhere in which an extensive and exhaustive discussion, analysis, and clarification of his ideas can be carried out. He feels that his work and ideas have not had the proper feedback, examination, and testing necessary to properly validate them despite their ever-widening reception. . . . His is a search for truth, not the establishment of a new orthodoxy.--Charles Finch [1986: 230]

Introduction

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

Thirdly, we must understand that getting our Arab and European enemies to pay us trillions of dollars for the disasters they inflicted on us-- by invading, abducting, enslaving, conquering, exploiting, robbing and exterminating hundreds of millions of us-- will be just like collecting rain with a basket unless we first seal up the holes in the basket. And sealing up the holes is the job of self-reparation.

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

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

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

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

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

If we had Afrikan power to stop them, would the World Health Organization (WHO) and its US masters have had unhindered access to our population to AIDSbomb us? Would they have vaccinated 97 million Afrikans with AIDS-infected smallpox vaccines? No enemy can go into China or the USA or Europe to do mass vaccinations: Chinese, American or European power respectively would prevent it. Now, that gives us a glimpse into the basic problem of the Afrikans for the past 20 centuries i.e. **POWERLESSNESS!** – the lack of the power to protect our lands, populations and cultures from alien attacks.

On the other hand, everything on the Afrikan wish list (prosperity, security, dignity, respect, basic needs, an end to racist contempt, etc) requires Afrikan power. Without Afrikan power, Afrikans cannot ensure that Africa’s resources are used
primarily to meet Afrikan needs. The great world powers will continue to extract Africa’s resources for the primary use of Europe and America, thereby denying Afrikans the resources for Afrikan prosperity. Without Afrikan power, Afrikans cannot hold onto their land and lives and resources and cultures. We need Afrikan power to end the kinds of mayhem and ethnic cleansing and Arabisation that are being inflicted on Blacks in Darfur and Mauritania, which are a humiliation for all Afrikans. And the organizing of Afrikan power requires a Pan Afrikanist perspective that can see ECOWAS or SADC as potential sub-continental megastates to be industrialized for the protection of all Afrikans.

But could Afrikan powerlessness possibly be cured by Scientific Socialism, Liberalism, Marxism, Communism, Christianity, Islam, Humanism, Continental Union Government, or by any combination of these and the other decoy solutions offered in the last 50 years by all sorts of saviors of Africa? Were these “-isms” designed, in the first place, to solve the specific problems of Afrikans? After 50 years of chasing these decoy shadows, our plight is worse than before. Perhaps it is time to make a fresh start, to take a new and comprehensive look at our problems and what we need to do to solve them for ourselves.

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

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

The need for self-reparation in Pan Africanism:

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Continentalism

The brand of Pan Africanism which Nkrumah launched in 1958 with his First Conference of Independent African States (CIAS) was dedicated to the political unification of all the countries on the African continent, regardless of race or creed or—surprisingly-- anti-black behavior. Hence, for instance,
Nkrumah, quite amazingly, saw fit to invite to that ostensibly Pan-Africanist, and implicitly anti-colonial, conference the Apartheid South African government of Premier Verwoerd! In his subsequent campaign for what became the OAU and now the AU, Nkrumah relentlessly argued for what may be called Continentalism. He claimed that only by bringing all the countries in Africa under one continental government, could Africans defeat neo-colonialism economically, militarily, diplomatically etc. But, in fact, a close look at his arguments shows that they do not validly imply a continental African government. What he actually argues validly is that the countries created by the European conquest and partition of Africa are each too small to defeat neocolonialism; and that they, therefore, should coalesce into something bigger. But what would be big enough? He does not give any criteria for determining that. He simply asserts, with increasing desperation as time went on and his invalid argument fell on the deaf ears of his OAU peers, that it must be a continent-sized state! He doesn’t consider the possibility that a continent-sized state could be too big or not big enough. In fact, one of his funny arguments actually suggests that what would be required to defeat neo-colonialism is a political union, not just of the African continent, but of the entire Third World – a Tri-continental state that would bring all of Africa, Asia and Latin America under one government. He said: Thus far, all the methods of neo-colonialism have pointed in one direction, the ancient, accepted one of all minority ruling classes throughout history – divide and rule. Quite obviously, therefore, unity is the first requisite for destroying neo-colonialism. **Primary and basic is the need for an all-union government on the much-divided continent of Africa.** [Emphasis added]

Along with that, a strengthening of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organisation and the spirit of Bandung is already underway. To it, we must seek the adherence on an increasingly formal basis of our Latin American brothers. -- [Nkrumah, 1973:335]

**On this argument for defeating a global neo-colonialism, why should it be all countries on the African continent that should unite, and not all countries in the Third World? The argument is really for a Union Government of the entire Third World victims of neo-colonialist divide and rule, a Tri-continental Union Government for all the ex-colonial countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America! On the other hand it would apply equally to a Union Government of West Africa, or East Africa or Southern Africa, or of Africa and the Arab World. Take your pick. Like the other arguments Nkrumah put forward, it contains no specific reasons why the union should be continental in scope and nothing less. Please note that Nkrumah asserts, but doesn’t say why “an all-union government” of the African continent is a “primary and basic need”**.
Cheikh Anta Diop, another passionate advocate for African continental unification, was no better than Nkrumah at specifying why exactly the admittedly larger state required for Africa’s development must encompass the entire continent. When an advocate consistently begs the question, suspicion is aroused that his overt arguments are mere mystifications for something held on other, undisclosed, grounds. The real reasons might be some secret fear or desire. In the case of Nkrumah and Diop, we get a peek at their hidden motive for Continentalism when Diop said, in a 1976 interview:

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

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

**Nkrumah: the roots of his continentalist superstition**

As I pointed out above, Nkrumah’s argument contains no specific reasons why his proposed Union Government must be continental in scope. This lack of Africa specificity was typical of his anti-colonial advocacy. For example, his pamphlet “Towards Colonial Freedom”, which was written in 1942 and published in 1947, closed with the exhortation “PEOPLES OF THE COLONIES, UNITE; The working men of all countries are behind you.” [Nkrumah, 1973:41] In the same vein, the “Declaration to the Colonial Peoples of the World”, a resolution which he wrote, and which was adopted at the 5th PAC
in Manchester, also ended, not with the exhortation “Africans/Blacks of the World—Unite!” which would have been appropriate, but with “COLONIAL AND SUBJECT PEOPLES OF THE WORLD – UNITE”. [Nkrumah, 1973:44] Nkrumah himself seems to have been vaguely aware that his anti-colonial theses were usually not for Africa specifically; for, in commenting, after Ghana’s independence, on “Towards Colonial Freedom” Nkrumah himself said, “Although I have concentrated on colonial Africa, the thesis of the pamphlet applies to colonial areas everywhere.” [Nkrumah, 1973:16 fn]

Why, we may wonder, was he shy of focusing on the specific Ghanaian/Black African situation for its own sake rather than merely using the African situation as a convenience in arguing for the global anticolonial cause? In this eccentric procedure, Nkrumah was unlike Biko whose focus was consistently on black South Africa, his immediate and natural constituency; and also quite unlike Cabral for whom the reality in Guinea was always the focus and who, though no less a Third World internationalist than Nkrumah, insisted that “our own reality is at the centre of a complex reality, but it is the former that most concerns us.” [Cabral, 1980:47] Was Nkrumah perhaps a racial integrationist who was emotionally uncomfortable about being too much identified with his natural, Black African constituency? And, if so, why?

In the document known as THE CIRCLE, which he drew up soon after the Manchester 5th PAC, Nkrumah advocated creating and maintaining a “Union of African Socialist Republics.” [Nkrumah, 1973:48] These exhortations from the 1940s suggest that Nkrumah was, at heart, a global anti-colonialist rather than a Pan Africanist specifically; in fact, that he was a socialist internationalist, probably a Trotskyite, who found himself at some point obliged to focus on promoting socialism, first in one country, Ghana, and thereafter for one continent, Africa, pending any opportunity that would release him from the “parochialism” of one country or continent, and let him finally become an unconstrained global socialist internationalist. Was Nkrumah, then, basically a universalistic socialist missionary who, as the saying goes, “happened to be black” and who went home to Ghana/Africa to convert his people to socialism? Or was he primarily an African liberationist for whom socialism was a useful ideological tool? This should be investigated as the finding could throw unexpected light on his primary identity, constituency and preoccupations, as well as on aspects of his behavior that have had adverse consequences for Afrikans.

His socialist internationalism aside, there is still to be considered the added factor of Nkrumah’s commitment to “non-racialism”. That was evident in his CPP constitution (1949) which lists among its aims “abolishing imperialism, colonialism, racialism, tribalism and all forms of national and racial
oppression and economic inequality among nations, races and peoples . . .” [Nkumah, 1973:59] Could Nkumah’s “non-racialism”—probably imbibed from the 1930s American socialist milieu with its slogan “Black and white unite and fight!”—have reinforced his devotion to a global, multi-racial anti-colonialism, and helped blind him to any union in Africa that, by excluding Arabs, would be open to the accusation of racial exclusivism? Any black anti-colonialist intimidated by the scarecrow of “racial exclusivism/black racism” into evading the political reality of black skin in a white supremacist world, would not consider, let alone be enthusiastic about, a blacks-only sub-Saharan union, even if that would be enough to defeat neo-colonialism in Africa! If this diagnosis is correct, we owe Nkumah’s advocacy of the continentalist superstition to a combination of the socialist internationalism and the non-racialism he had imbibed from his liberal and socialist mentors in the imperialist world. But the antidote for this particular non-racialist superstition was indicated, even during the integrationist 1960s, by John Oliver Killens when, in his 1965 essay “The black writer vis-à-vis his country” he observed that: Negroes are the only people in this world who are set apart because of who they are, and at the same time told to forget who they are by the very people who set them apart in the first place. – [Killens, 1965:358-359]

A few years later, in the early 1970s, the young Steve Biko, in building his Black Consciousness Movement, developed the much-needed therapy for this superstitious fear. Among other things he correctly argued that integration was a false antithesis to segregation/apartheid, and that the correct antithesis was Black solidarity/unity. For the specific context of apartheid South Africa, he argued: It is time we killed this false political coalition between blacks and whites as long as it is set up on a wrong analysis of our situation . . . [and because] it forms at present the greatest stumbling block to our unity. . . . The basic problem in South Africa has been analysed by liberal whites as being apartheid. . . . For the liberals, the thesis is apartheid, the antithesis is non-racialism, but the synthesis is very feebly defined. They want to tell the blacks that they see integration as the ideal solution. Black Consciousness defines the situation differently. The thesis is in fact a strong white racism and therefore, the antithesis to this must, ipso facto, be a strong solidarity amongst the blacks on whom this white racism seeks to prey. [Biko, 1987:90]

And Biko further observes, quite correctly:

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

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

And Biko drives his point home thus:

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

_Biko’s full critique of integration should be required reading by all Afrikans today._

This Black Consciousness therapy helped to produce a new breed of black freedom fighter in South Africa, the self-confident type, unconfused and uncrippled by fears implanted by false liberal doctrines like integration and non-racialism. It produced self-confident blacks who insisted on doing things for themselves and all by themselves, and who did not feel they had to prove themselves to whites. To see the validity of Biko’s doctrines for Pan Africa today, one needs first to note Biko’s remark that “the black-white power struggle in South Africa is but a microcosm of the global confrontation between the Third World and the rich white nations of the world.” [Biko, 1987:72] More specifically, we should note that the
black-white situation in Apartheid South Africa was a special local case of the
global situation between whites and blacks. We can therefore validly
transpose Biko’s doctrines to the global situation that Pan Africa ostensibly is
struggling to eradicate.

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

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

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

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

When we realize that these so-called independent African states that have
been herded into the AU by Gadhafi are nothing but the glorified Bantustans
of the G8 system of UN Imperialism, i.e. the global system’s version of those
Bantustans of Apartheid South Africa, we can see the aptness of applying
Biko’s remark to all these black heads of state and government in the
fraudulent and useless AU.
My point in this exercise has been to illustrate that we have enough sound ideas within the body of Pan Africanist thought to challenge and correct the false ideas and misguided projects that have crippled us, if only we would collect and study the tradition and use it to correct itself. And I’d like to suggest that we form and equip a collective of our academics to do this job. In the last 50 years, all manner of half-baked ideas have been hurriedly implemented, and even with desperate urgency, while the Pan Africanist intelligentsia failed to cry foul and to subject them to rigorous debate and correction. We must mend our ways. As a contrite act of self-reparation, we must create the necessary organs of unfettered debate and use them effectively henceforth.

We cannot blame Nkrumah, Diop and others for their errors. They gave what they thought were the right ideas. But it was for us to have collectively corrected their errors, and we didn’t. We have yet to do for Diop’s ideas what he himself pleaded for. And it is our duty to Pan Africa to do the same for all ideas on offer, even those by prima donnas who are touchy about criticism, or by Presidents who are full of themselves. We must do our duty and politely ask those who resent public criticism to keep their ideas to themselves and not pollute the public space with them. By the way, to throw a cold and sobering splash of comparative reality on this delirious hankering after a continent-sized political union, we should note that the megastates and great powers of the 20th and 21st centuries – USA, USSR, EU, China, Russia, India – are actually of sub-continental, not continental, size. The only actually continent-sized state is Australia, which is not a great power at all! Unless we wish to persist in playing the fool who insisted on walking on a cloud, we should trim our ambition to what is, at least geographically and culturally, possible. Therefore, the project of an African megastate should be guided by the feasibility conditions for putting it in the power league of China, EU, USA, Russia and India, and not by some superstitious craving for continental size.

Other issues in Pan Africanism crying out for self-reparation

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

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

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

Africa, whose construction is currently on the agenda, transcends geographical borders as well as cultural or racial barriers: it extends from both sides of the Sahara; it is white and black, Arab and African, continental and insular; it is a cultural meeting point where successive strata of cultures of Eurasian origin intermingle with indigenous cultures born in the Continent of Africa (Mbeki’s Speech: “I am an African” epitomizes these assertions in that it recognizes all the above assets). The concept of identity fluidity has now become imperative; . . .--“Draft Concept Paper” to AU Intellectuals meeting, Dakar, Oct. 2004, p.7.

On this question of identity, we sorely need to take our cue from Biko and boldly “rally around the cause of our suffering” and, without apologies to our enemies and their integrationist dupes in our midst, define ourselves for ourselves on the basis of our black skin—the cause of our suffering. A continent does not make a people, and so cannot legitimately be used to define or name a people. Ancestry, historical experience and culture are the valid factors for defining a people. Our latching at all unto a geographic name (African) is a seminal error that is spewing unending problems and confusions we could do without, and we should find our way out of it.

As a first step out of that costly error, we must Afrocentrically limit the African identity to those from Africa who have, over the centuries, been singled out as targets for enslavement by the black color of our skins. Hence, whites, European as well as Arab--the very predators who decided to target blacks for racialised chattel
enslavement-- cannot be legitimately included with us, their prey, just because they’ve forcibly made themselves our neighbors on the African landmass. By the Africans, Pan Africanism can legitimately mean only the members of the indigenous populations of Africa who were, for the last 20 centuries, targeted for enslavement by Arabs and Europeans on account of their black skin color. That is the fundamental historical factor. Anybody who is not a biological descendant of these blacks cannot qualify as an African. Perhaps we could make our usage sufficiently distinctive by reserving the term Afrikan for such indigenous populations and their descendants – until we adopt a name for ourselves from an Afrikan language. In which case, we are interested in Afrikans and after that in Afrika their homeland, and not first in Africa, the continent, and then in Africans –those populations of any race whatever that are now located in the African continent, whether black or white, indigenous our exogenous, imperialist predators or their prey. Pan Africanism must therefore, with Black Consciousness rigor, limit its constituency to Afrikans, i.e. Black Africans and their global diaspora and, provisionally, rename itself Pan Afrikanism. Black Consciousness historical considerations aside, it would be scientifically incorrect to define Afrikans without including the biological/racial factor of black color/phenotype, for, as political science assures us:

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

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

Furthermore, just as it is the indigenous Chinese who define who are Chinese, and the indigenous Arabs who define who are Arabs, and the indigenous Europeans who define who are Europeans, so too do we indigenous Africans, a.k.a. Afrikans, have the right and duty to define who are Africans. And if it is in our interest to include a phenotype factor, black skin, in our definition, we must do so, regardless what anybody else thinks. In this regard, we need to note the Chinese example: To the Chinese government, people of Chinese descent, even if citizens of another country, are members of the Chinese community and hence in some measure subject to the authority of the Chinese government. Chinese identity comes to be defined in racial terms. Chinese are those of the same “race,
blood, and culture,” as one PRC scholar put it. In the mid-1990s, this theme was increasingly heard from governmental and private Chinese sources. For Chinese and those of Chinese descent living in non-Chinese societies, the “mirror test” thus becomes the test of who they are: “Go look in the mirror,” is the admonition of Beijing-oriented Chinese to those of Chinese descent trying to assimilate into foreign societies. [Huntington, 1997:169]

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

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

The hosts asked me my positions on global African unity. I responded, and the phone lines lit up! The first caller was a white man who said what a "racist" I was and how offended he was. I let him have it!!! He said that he was an African and that I was not. I said that I was an African and that he was not. I told him that you can teach a parrot to speak but that in the end it was still a bird. I told him that you can dress a monkey in a suit but in the end it was still an ape. I told him that his ancestors came to Africa uninvited, without passport or visa, stole the land, near exterminated whole groups of people, and enslaved and colonized the rest. And now, he wants to be an African! I told him that his pedigree was European, his history was European, his lineage was European, his culture was European, and that he was a European! I guess that you could say that I effectively silenced him, and every other call that I received on both programs, from African and European alike, was extremely favorable! You would have been proud.

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

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

African unity has been the major mantra of Pan Africanism for the past 50 years. Unfortunately, the purpose of the advocated unity has been so vague and unspecified as to leave the impression that it is nothing more than unity for unity’s sake. Worse still, the uncritical welcoming of the Arabist-Imperialist AU suggests that even a unity in an enemy dungeon has become acceptable to Pan Africanism. Since a union in the prison of Imperialism or Arabism is contrary to the Afrikan interest, the concept of African unity has to be re-examined, and its purposes clarified and made consistent with the interest of Afrikans. We need to bear in mind that people do not unite for nothing or against nothing. Our experience in the past 2 millennia suggests that Pan Afrika should be uniting against white domination, by Arabs no less than by Europeans.

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

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

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

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

Obviously, continentalist Pan Africanism long ago abandoned the anti-imperialism that inspired it. Not only has it, from its inception, been an accomplice of Arab expansionism, it also now serves whatever “partner” [read: paymaster] funds its lavish jamborees – be it Washington, London, Brussels or Tripoli. Because unification had become an end- in-itself, had become the supreme goal, it was not asked what precise kind of unity was required as a means to the original, but long since forgotten, anti-imperialist aims of Pan Africanism. Reconfiguring the concept of African Unity so it does not yield a union of neo-colonial Bantustans, but a union of anti-imperialist and anti-Arabist states plus other organs that will serve the Afrikan people is, thus, an important task of self-reparation waiting to be done on Pan Africanism.


One of the glaring omissions from Pan Africanist thinking has been the idea of collective Afrikan security—the concept, the aims as well as the organs for effecting it. For a people whose calamities have resulted from millennia of failure of collective security, this is a most self-damaging omission. Addressing it is a vital act of self-reparation. It probably requires us to insist that each Afrikan state should explicitly declare that the security it exists to ensure is the security of its population, territory, society and cultures from Imperialism and Arabism. Presently, our comprador colonial Bantustans operationally
define security as “internal security” – the security of the neocolonial state apparatus from its victim Afrikan population. This is a crazy carry over from the era of expatriate European colonialism when these states were local agencies of subjugation for their imperialist founders. That needs now to be changed. And having redefined security Afrocentrically, we need to invent organs for implementing it. Since neither the AU nor the UN can ever function as an organ of Afrikan collective security from both Imperialism and Arabism, it is imperative that we organize a **Black World League/Afrikan League** to do that job for us.

5. Afrikan solidarity

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

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

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

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

Before 1970, for lack of Biko’s insight, Nkrumah and Co. threw Afrikans into an Arab embrace that inhibited Afrikans from defending themselves against Arab hegemonists. Since then, by failing to use Biko’s insight to clear their confusions and complexes away, the black governments in the OAU/AU have become, as shown in Dar Fur, like the black father who holds his own daughter down to be raped and battered by his Arab business partner and ‘friend’. That is the role played by the spineless AU presidents who met in Khartoum and Banjul this year without expelling the Arabist government of Sudan from the AU for its crimes of ethnic cleansing and genocide, and without doing enough to precipitate UN intervention to end the scandalous raping and killing and enslavement of black Africans in Dar Fur. In atonement for all that, Pan Afrika needs to acknowledge that Sudan is not an Arab family affair; that it is a theatre of the Afro-Arab Race War, and that the hegemonic Arab aggressors are the great enemy of Pan Afrika. Pan Afrika must, therefore, in contrite solidarity and for collective security, vigorously mobilize support—financial, military, diplomatic, ideological, propaganda etc.- for the victims of Arabist attacks in Dar Fur and elsewhere in Sudan. We must also mobilize support for South Sudan to attain its independence in 2011. That is our task of self-reparation. In fact, Sudan is a serious test of our willingness to undertake self-reparation.

7. Pan Africanism’s ideological deficiency

The ideological deficiency, not to say the total lack of ideology, on the part of the national liberation movements . . . constitutes one of the greatest weaknesses, if not the greatest weakness, of our struggle
against imperialism.--[Amilcar Cabral, 1980:122]
In the light of the weaknesses I have pointed to above, we need to take serious note of Cabral’s observation and, therefore, assemble and test all the ideas of Pan Africanism to see if they amount to a coherent ideology for Afrikan liberation. And if they do not, it is our self-reparation obligation to elaborate them into an ideology with a transformative program for breeding the kind of Black Consciousness activists who can champion the interests and aspirations of the overwhelming majority of Afrikans on this earth. Only by so doing can Pan Africanism be revitalized; re-emerge, as Pan-Afrikanism, from its doldrums; and gain popular following. With these examples, let me leave the weaknesses of Pan Africanism and draw attention to the larger area of our

8. Afrocidal traits:

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

Any shortlist of our Afrocidal weaknesses must include what Nkrumah described as “a lack of malice, an absence of the desire for vengeance for our wrongs”. [Nkrumah, 1973:114]. Though Nkrumah lists this among the admirable traits of the African Personality, we need to take a critical look at it, for it is, in fact, Afrocidal.

Other observers have described it more candidly and in more revealing detail. For example, an American reporter, David Lamb, after 5 years travelling and observing Africans in 48 countries during the late 1970s, said: Given all he has had to endure from the beginning of slavery to the end of colonialism, the African displays a racial tolerance that is nothing short of amazing. He holds no apparent grudge against the European as an individual, and it is rare indeed for any white person to experience even the slightest indignity because of his color. . . . The African has forgiven, if not forgotten.

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

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

But, on the other hand, Lamb notes:

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

And he wondered what makes the African “a fatalist, intent on his own survival but caring little for those who are less fortunate.”–[Lamb, 1985:161-162,164, 235,236]

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

As one female member of the Nationalist party told me, one can treat blacks like dirt for years, cease such treatment, and almost immediately they are willing to be your best friends. This, she explained, is because blacks do not have the capacity either to feel injustices or to remember them. Jews, she stated, are quite [a different matter].– [McKague 1991:93]

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

9. “Black racism”

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

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

Conclusion

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

We must admit to ourselves that there are many things wrong with us, including psychological, cultural and social weaknesses. Otherwise we wouldn’t be in the mess in which we find ourselves, and certainly not for two whole millennia! And we must have the honesty and courage to struggle against our profound weaknesses if we wish to survive, let alone with any dignity and self-respect. But we must note that the things wrong with us are not those harped on by enemy propaganda, namely, our black skins and our so-called IQ. We have no cause for any inferiority complex on account of those decoy issues.
Let me end by inviting all Pan Afrikanists, those who want Afrikanans to survive and prosper, and especially the academics and other intellectuals among them, to follow Steve Biko’s example and develop a comprehensive list of our genuine weaknesses and then focus on discovering and applying whatever remedies are appropriate for them, regardless of white opinion.
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