Without Bitterness

WESTERN NATIONS IN POST-WAR AFRICA

A. A. Nwafor Orizu

Without Bitterness

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

Without Bitterness ranks among the most important books written by Africans. Its impact on political developments in Nigeria in the 1940s and 1950s has earned it a proud place in the annals of Nigerian history. When first published, in 1944 in the U.S.A., it was so popular, both in U.S.A. and West Africa, that it quickly sold out and was reprinted in 1945.

Since then, however, admirers of *Without Bitterness* have been frustrated by the inaccessibility of the book, so this reprint, by Nwamife Publishers Limited, is long overdue. It is also most timely; with the return to civilian government, Nigerians are keenly interested in their political past, knowledge of which helps them to understand the present.

Given the war-time restrictions on shipping, copies of *Without Bitterness* did not reach Nigeria in large numbers till the end of 1945, by which time Nigeria was in political ferment. The expectations of political and economic benefits accruing from Nigeria's generous support of the British war effort were bitterly disappointed by the severe recession and by the grudging reforms of the proposed Richard's Constitution. The general strike of 1945 had effectively welded together the trade union workers and the newly formed N.C.N.C. led by Nnamdi Azikiwe, into a strong nationalist movement protesting against the repressions of the colonial system.

A number of the young men and women involved in this movement were seeking ideological direction and inspiration and, after reading *Without Bitterness*, they proclaimed, with great excitement, that they found therein the philosophy they sought, the philosophy which Orizu had described as Zikism.

What was it that Orizu had written in *Without Bitterness* that so captured the imagination of the politically articulate youth?

The title of the book was taken from a speech made by Emperor Haile Selassie to the League of Nations in 1937, after his country, Ethiopia (Abyssinia, as it was then known) had been invaded and conquered by fascist Italy. "Does not the world realise that I am the last vanguard standing before the citadel of collective security? I shall stand here till my tardy allies appear. And if they never appear, I say it prophetically and without bitterness, the west shall perish."

History proved Haile Salassie's prophecy correct in so far as the failure of the Western world to maintain collective security led to Hitler and Mussolini attacking and nearly defeating the Western world.

Orizu, like all politically conscious young Africans at the time, had been bitterly disappointed at the failure of the Western world to come to the help of Abyssinia and had learnt from that experience the folly of expecting the Western world to help Africa to develop and become independent. As a way of commemorating that traumatic experience, young Nwafor had added 'Abyssinia' to his name. In *Without Bitterness*, Orizu went on to develop the theme that the problems of the post-war world, especially the decolonisation of Africa, cannot be solved with bitterness. He referred to the bitterness which arose from the Treaty of Versailles, and which undermined the peace, as an illustration of the non-productivity of bitterness.

Moreover, bitterness leads to violence, which Orizu deplored; rather, he was profoundly impressed by the apostle of non-violence, Mahatma Gandhi. Orizu regarded Gandhi as his teacher and mentor; indeed it was in an attempt to emulate Gandhism and to create a similar philosophy for Africa that Orizu developed the term 'Zikism'. India had satyagrahism and Africa also needed a philosophy, an 'ism' with an African name or word. Orizu recalls that at first he thought of associating his new philosophy with Herbert Macauley, then the doyen of Nigerian nationalism, and the mentor of Azikiwe himself. But he found the term Macaulianism 'too unafrican.' He went on to coin the word 'Aggreyism' to describe a more conservative philosophy, then selected Azikiwe as an example of the new radical African nationalist doing for Africa what Gandhi was doing for India. Orizu made that comparison clear - "Gandhi has finally pointed out to India that necessity for a line of complete unanimity in the fight against British imperialism". Orizu's philosophy of Zikism will do the same for Africa.

Orizu emphasized that Zikism - "is not just a list of the ideas of Mr. Nnamdi Azikiwe. The author is but little concerned with the personality involved. Even Mr. Azikiwe himself does not know the full implication of the word Zikism as the author uses it". Zikism demanded that African colonies be given the same freedom and responsibility as the Western nations. But Zikism insisted that political independence be associated with democratic government which would provide true economic independence

and a social welfare state. Furthermore, as defined by Orizu, Zikism was also a philosophy which stressed the universal brotherhood of man, humanism and rationality.

It was not only the contents of the book but the well-known facts about the author which inspired admiration and respect among Africans. Orizu had studied privately for the Cambridge School Certificate and then decided to emulate the example of Azikiwe and study in the U.S.A. He thus became the 14th West African, the 10th Nigerian and the 8th Igbo to go to the U.S.A. to study.

Orizu did his B.A. degree in Lincoln and Ohio State Universities in 1942, majoring in political science, and obtained a Master's degree in Public Law and Government at Columbia University in 1944. He played an active part in university student bodies, especially those of foreign students, and in 1940 he, Mbonu Ojike, K.O. Mbadiwe and John Karefa Smart of Sierra Leone, founded the African Students Association. Kwame Nkrumah was the first president and Orizu succeeded him. His involvement in African student activities brought him into close contact with leading Black American personalities who were in sympathy with African aspirations.

Orizu was much influenced by the Black Americans' quest for education to raise their status and power and also by the Marcus Garvey movement which promoted the return of Black Americans to Africa. Orizu paralleled the Black Americans' quest for education with his own desire for African youths to be educated in America with the same facilities and privileges as other foreign citizens of other countries enjoyed in the U.S.A. In the absence of any such help coming from any colonial government in Africa on behalf of the African students in America, young Orizu singly and empty-handedly, determined to found an international organisation to secure scholarships for deserving African students in various American Universities.

In 1943, Orizu founded the American Council on African Education. This was a foundation to raise money for scholarships for Africans to study in U.S.A. Orizu had seen that education was the key to the development of Africa; while he himself had worked his way through university, he wanted to make it easier for many more Africans to study; what Orizu called a 'mass movement' of Africans to U.S.A. In order to introduce his ideas and the council to the American people, Orizu accepted invitations to write for Black American journals. He was contributing editor

of the famous Negro Digest of Chicago 1944, and 1945, and associate editor of the Pittsburg Courier which was the largest circulating Black American weekly in the United States from 1944 to 1946.

To raise money for the council and to propagate his ideas on African independence, Orizu embarked on a lecture tour throughout U.S.A. In the course of these activities, Orizu was received at the White House by President Roosevelt and on another occassion by Mrs. Roosevelt. Orizu also met other leading Americans such as Wendell Wilkie, Henry Ford 11 and Eileen J. Garret, world-famous author and owner of a publishing company, Creative Age Press.

During his lectures, Orizu referred to a manuscript he had written titled *Without Bitterness*. Various publishers expressed interest but Orizu refused to release it unless they were prepared to contribute to the American Council on African Education. It was Mrs. Garret of Creative Age press who agreed to Orizu's conditions and offered the Council office space at 11 West 44th Street, New york. Royalties from the book when it was published in 1944 were immediately transferred to the American Council on African Education.

The book was favourably reviewed in a number of leading newspapers in the U.S.A. including the **New York Times, Christian Science Monitor, New Republic.** The famous Africanist W.E.B. Dubois, reviewed the book in the **New york Herald Tribune** and, commented:

> "An unusual book, written by an African for readers in America and written with far more understanding of both African and world problems than such writers usually exhibit."

The Chicago Law Bulletin praised Orizu's vigorous scintillating style and a mind brilliantly cut, a mind widely informed by the best from many cultures.

The New Yorker wrote, "A sincere and interesting book... about Africa, the state of its civilization, its past, its future..." So well-respected was *Without Bitterness* that in 1948 Orizu was conferred an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws by Lane University, Jackson Tennessee, "for his trenchant presentation of the case for African Liberation to the Western world in his book *Without Bitterness*, and for his success in establishing for the first time an international institution for awarding scholarships into American Universities, for deserving Africans."

Therefore, the fact that a young Nigerian student had been received

at the white House, listened to by eminent Americans and was the author of a famous book, was a source of great pride and inspiration to young Nigerian nationalists. They were more than ready to listen to what he had to say. So when Orizu himself returned to Nigeria in November 1945, he was immediately called upon to give public lectures. The first was delivered in Lagos on November 26th, 1945 and titled "Horizontal Education and African Irredentism." In presenting his educational mission to Africa, during this lecture, Dr. Orizu also interpreted the philosophy of Zikism as contained in *Without Bitterness*. It was at that meeting that several young men such as Mokwugo Okoye, Fred Anyiam, Anthony Enahoro, Nduka Eze, Kolawole Balogun, M.C.K. Ajuluchukwu and Abiodun Aloba decided to subsequently form themselves into the Zikist Movement within the framework of the N.C.N.C.

As one of those young men, Fred Anyiam, testified: "It was the reading of *Without Bitterness* that fired the imagination of impatient youths like Osita Agwuna, Raji Abdalla and Kola Balogun to launch the Zikist Movement."

One of the leaders of the Zikist Movement, Mokwugo Okoye, recalls: "It was to defend and disseminate the message of Azikiwe against his enemies - the colonialists and their local petty bourgeois allies and apologists - that the Zikist Movement was founded, the name having been suggested by Dr. A.A. Nwafor Orizu in his book *Without Bitterness*.

The Zikist Movement played an active part in the N.C.N.C.'s agitation against the Richard's Constitution. But then, frustrated by the absolute refusal of the British government to listen to it, torn by internal dissension and outside friction between ethnic groups, the N.C.N.C. lost its momentum and faltered. It was at this point, 1947, that the initiative was seized by the Zikists who began to advocate the use of violence against the British. The British reacted strongly and had a number of Zikists, such as Mokwugo Okoye, Anthony Enahoro and Osita Agwuna imprisoned.

Orizu had joined the N.C.N.C but was never a registered member of the Zikist Movement. However, Orizu was in sympathy with the Zikists, although they were in fact noted for the bitterness of their feelings against British rule and advocated the use of violence which Orizu had opposed in *Without Bitterness*.

1. Quoted in Olusanya, G.O. The Second World War and Politics in Nigeria, Lagos, Evans, 1973 page 112
2. Mokwugo Okoye, A letter to Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, Enugu, Fourth Dimension, 1979

Orizu remained a politically active member of the N.C.N.C. During the 1949 crisis over the shooting of the miners at Iva Valley Enugu, Orizu championed the miners in the newspaper he had founded in Port Harcourt, "The West African Examiner", and addressed meetings of the miners in Enugu. For this he was detained by the colonial administration, as were several other articulate critics as Jaja Wachukwu and Margaret Ekpo. Orizu recalls that he was released when he threatened to have a cable sent to the New York Office of the American Council on African Education. For, since his return to Nigeria, Orizu had remained President of the American Council on African Education and established a West African branch office in Port Harcourt. Between 1946-1953 over 150 scholarships were offered to students from British West and East Africa to study in U.S.A. Orizu had great admiration for the American system of multi-lateral comprehensive co-educational secondary schools, which system he described as 'horizontal' in contrast to the prevailing British 'vertical' system of segregated grammar schools. In 1950, Orizu put his ideas into practice when he established a comprehensive secondary school in his home town, Nnewi, Eastern Region.

Orizu contested the 1951 elections to the Eastern Region House of Assembly and became the first member for Onitsha. He was elected from the floor of the Eastern House of Assembly to the Central Legislature, and was the first Chief Whip of the N.C.N.C. in both Regional and Central Legislatures.

He was appointed National Political Adviser to the N.C.N.C. and then, in 1960, was appointed to the Federal Senate representing Onitsha Province. In 1964, Orizu was elected president of the Senate and was unanimously re-elected on the 17th February 1965. Then on October 21st 1965, Azikiwe, the President of Nigeria, left the country on sick leave, and Orizu was sworn in as the Acting President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria by the then Chief Justice, Sir Adetokumbo Ademola.

Thus it was Dr. Orizu as acting President who, after the military coup January 15, 1966, announced the handover of the Government of the Federation to the Armed Forces, commanded by Major-General Aguiyi-Ironsi.

During the military regime, Dr. Orizu served the government of the East Central State in several capacities. With the return to civilian government, in 1979, Dr. Orizu has played the role of elder statesman in one of the political parties, a position for which he is supremely qualified.

Without Bitterness

Indeed what is most striking when reading *Without Bitterness*, is the maturity of outlook, the breadth of historical knowledge and the tolerant humanism which Orizu displayed even as a young man of twenty four. Furthermore, it can now be seen that many of the predictions about and insights into the problems of decolonisation in Africa made by Orizu 36 years ago were prophetic in their accuracy. It is noteworthy that the new Nigerian constitution is essentially American and the trend of Nigerian education is towards the 'horizontal' system.

The ideas and scholarship in the book are enlivened by the polished, flowing style of writing which makes reading *Without Bitterness* a perenial pleasure. Indeed, parts of *Without Bitterness* have been included in anthologies of writings by Africans, as well as having been quoted extensively in studies of African political thought and Nigerian history. For beyond being the political testament of an outstanding Nigerian, Nwafor Abyssinia Akwaeke Orizu, *Without Bitterness* influenced the thinking of a generation of Nigerians and its ideas remain relevant and valid today.

NINA MBA
1980

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

Without Bitterness was first published by Creative Age Press in New York U. S. A. 1944. The increased demand for the book and its inaccessibility necessitated the reprinting by Nwamife Publishers Ltd 1980.

Without Bitterness was written at the heat of Africa's struggle against imperialism and in the midst of the second world war, hence the index was not there.

This third edition by Horizontal Publishers includes for the first time, an index which will make it easy for historians, political scientists, patriotic reformers, University lecturers, college students, women activists, researchers, sociologists, anthropologists and futuristic thinkers on African continental and global programmes, to enjoy what Statelite Newspaper commentator described as "Literary Feast" which is contained in what is now more expressly defined as "the African Bible" in the Nigerian Daily Times.

Besides, this third edition is a response to popular demand particularly when it was learnt that an original copy of *Without Bitterness* was recently purchased by a Nigerian at ₦5,000.00. It therefore becomes an obligation to republish it for easier access to many, both here and elsewhere in Africa, Europe and America.

With the rapid return of democratic government all over Africa and Nigeria in particular, the parenial message of this book will become a new source of inspiration, direction and reference to the leaders and the led.

Editor
Horizontal Publishers
1992.

Without Bitterness

WESTERN NATIONS IN POST-WAR AFRICA

by A. A. Nwafor Orizu

Horizontal Publishers
God's Village, Box 48, Nnewi
Anambra State Nigeria

Printed by Ochumba Press Ltd.
27A Owerri Road,
042 - 335716
Asata - Enugu,
Enugu State

Horizontal Publishers,
God's Village, Box 48, Nnewi,
Anambra State Nigeria.

Without Bitterness was first Published in the United States of America by
Creative Age Press, INC.
Second edition in Nigeria by Nwamife Publishers Ltd.
This third edition published in Nigeria by Horizontal Publishers, Anambra State.

© A.A. Nwafor Orizu 1944, 1980, 1992.

All rights reserved; no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews without the prior written permission of the author.

First edition 1944
Reprinted 1945
Second edition 1980
Third edition 1992.

ISBN 978-024-043-1

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF NIGERIA CATALOGUING IN PUBLICATION DATA

Orizu A. A. Nwafor., 1920-
Without bitterness.
1. Africa - Politics and government. I. Title.

JQ 1879.069 1992 1992 320.96
ISBN 978-024-043-1 AACR2

Dedicated to all those who stand for the harmony of all nations *on the basis of equal rights for all, and to my Cousin, Chief J. C. Ulasi and to my friends, Ukpabia Mbadiwe and Nnamdi Azikiwe, three among those who gave me encouragement to go without fear into the world to learn, and speak, and live as a New African.*

Contents

Introduction ix

SECTION I—AFRICA

I. Africa—A People or a Land? 3
II. The Awakening of Africa 13
III. Independent States in Africa 22
IV. It is Not in Our Star 59

SECTION II—NIGERIA

V. Nigeria—A Leading Protectorate Nation 69
VI. The Nigerian Government Before the British Came 111
VII. British in Nigeria 127
VIII. Reflections on the Future of Nigeria 144

SECTION III—IMPERIALISM IN AFRICA

IX. What Price Christianity in Africa? 160
X. Imperialism as Africa Thinks of It 175

SECTION IV—AFRICA AND DEMOCRACY

XI. The African View of Democracy 191
XII. The Democracy We Want 213
XIII. Independence for West Africa 223

SECTION V—CONCERNING ENGLAND AND AMERICA

XIV. What England Means to Me 241
XV. America—The Daughter of Untrammeled Intelligence 254
XVI. The Rôle of the Negro in Post-War Africa 278

CONTENTS

SECTION VI-ZIKISM

XVII.	Zikism-A Universal Philosophy	287
XVIII.	Zikism-A Social faith	302
XIX.	Economic Zikism	316
XX.	Political Zikism	326
XXI.	Religious Zikism	336

SECTION VII-BEYOND ANIMALISM

XXII.	The Tragedy of the Limited View	345
XXIII.	The Citizens of the World	362
XXIV.	Without Bitterness	372
	Appendix I-The Atlantic Charter	381
	Appendix II-Christian Nations in Post-War Africa	382
	Appendix III-The Children's Charter	384
	Appendix IV-Colony or Protectorate?	386
	Index	396

Introduction

I ARRIVED in America early in 1939 as a vagabond. I mean that I was intoxicated with the old-world feeling for travel. Lin Yu Tang aptly described this spirit by saying that "A true traveler is always a vagabond, with the joys, temptations, and sense of adventure of the vagabond. . . . A good traveler is one who does not know where he came from."

And such were my sensations during those early days of 1939 when I was in Lagos, the last port of my departure from Nigeria. Telegrams were pouring in from relatives and friends in the interior, while those who were there in Lagos with me were singing: *Chuku binyelui ka ayi we zue ozo* (God be with you till we meet again) in welling tears, as our ship was leaving the sun-baked shores of Nigeria. They were all waving their hats and looking on the departing ship with a mixed feeling of disappointment and joy, because it was in those days of expectancy when the world was pregnant with the symptoms of the approaching war. Security in traveling was so uncertain that those of us who left our African homes to seek education in America were considered especially adventurous and disastrously ambitious—if not careless of our lives.

But, like a vagabond, I was unconcerned about tomorrow. My whole self was consumed in the thrill of adventure—to be going in a time like ours to Europe and America. I was quite conscious of my limited knowledge of the world, but I have always been eager to understand more about humanity. I was then very naïve about certain moral issues of our age, and my faith in man had only begun to be shaken from its roots as a result of what took place in Ethiopia and Manchuria. I was perplexed also with what was seething in Europe itself. I knew vaguely that there was some-

thing wrong, even in England, but I was too little informed to reflect on this awareness with intelligence. At the same time, began to question Christianity in the form of an organized church. There was a wide-spread rumor in Africa that the Pope of Rome blessed the sword of Mussolini to kill other human beings and to demolish Ethiopia. This notion imposed a heavy burden upon my idea of God. From childhood, my parents had seen to it that I was brought up as a Christian, and until I decided to go into the world, I had earnestly endeavored to emulate Christ. I had learned how to live in solitude if necessary, how to pray in separate places, and how to withdraw myself from people during moments of meditation. But that was all. I knew I could not conquer my deficiency by living in the cultural vacuum of Nigeria, nor could I make real progress in the process of future learning unless I became a vagabond, exploring the hostile and friendly world, and accepting there all kinds of treatment from others.

It was still in this vagabond spirit that I stepped on the soil of the United States in February, 1939. The first significant thing I saw, even before the ship anchored, was the Statue of Liberty. An American friend on board pointed it out to me, and started to eulogize its symbolic significance. Briefly, he went through American history, beginning with King George III and the revolutionary fathers—mentioning George Washington and Patrick Henry—to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I was particularly impressed by the first part of the story which dealt with the United States and England. And I was doubly impressed when I heard of Patrick Henry, whose famous speech originally inspired my love for the American tradition of "Liberty or Death!"

Once disembarked, the scales fell from my eyes. I realized suddenly that I was about ten thousand miles from home; that I had neither father nor mother here, and that there were no brothers or sisters with whom to talk. It was a strange realization; but I was careless of that. My concern was centered on the great events of the day, and on the moral underscoring of human actions in their relation to our social goal in this world.

About the time of my entrance into an American university,

Chamberlain's England declared war on Germany. Munich had failed, Poland was invaded. Although concerned with the physical agony through which human beings were going, I consistently asked myself such questions as these: What is the cause of all this unrest in a "civilized" world? How does all this affect Africa? Is my Africa a part of this movement, a cause of it, or a forced partner? Then I finally asked: What is Western Civilization, and what does it really mean in terms of war and peace? Is civilization synonymous with the ability to make war or the ability to live in peace?

Sometimes I tried to become indifferent, but I grew to learn that in the final analysis, "the heart knows no neutrality." Accordingly, I was forced into speculation about the reason for another war—in the last analysis a mere extension of the First World War. I was aware that people of my age belong to an unfortunate era. We are children born in the midst of war, because, so far as I am concerned, the war of 1914 has not ended. We are still fighting that war, and unless the world comes to its senses, the same war shall yet be resumed soon after this phase is over. It is the war between *chains* and *freedom* and nothing else—it is a great revolution against those political, economic, and social concepts which are opposed to the true freedom of man. It is a thirst for freedom from economic inequality, race prejudice, and imperialism.

All this proves that there is something wrong in human reasoning relative to man's ends and means. Our imagination and evaluation must be wrong. Such a universal limitation must receive a universal reorientation of our ideas and ideals, for one cannot find the explanation of these wrongs in one thing alone. It is not only in race prejudice or imperialism or inequality. It is in all that, but it is yet more complex than that. We would better admit that we are renascent barbarians who need schooling, and that our idea of "civilization" should be more clearly defined and understood—*or else* Spengler's pen will some day prove mightier than our sword.

Concerning the method of attaining a durable peace itself, I can have nothing new to add. Nevertheless, as an African, I feel that there is something about Africa, in its relation to the world-peace,

which in a great measure plays an indispensable part in the whole struggle. More than 75 per cent of imperialistic aggression occur in Africa. "A place in the sun" is in Africa. After this war, practically all Asiatic countries will be free from European domination. And consequently, all eyes of ambition will be on Africa!

This book has therefore been written for two reasons: In the first place, as a vagabond who threw himself into Western society without much thought of my origins, I discovered, through human intercourse, that there is no real and natural bitterness among races and nations. What exists is a human tradition of inertia and prejudice, based on miseducation fostered by nationalist culture and special interests. It is a commonplace fact that a German woman can fall in love with an Indian, and vice-versa, without reference to race. On a national scale, China and the United States can join to fight Japan, and Englishmen who are white can join black Senegalese to fight the Germans, and so forth. Race, nation, and creed have meaning, but there are certain things that supersede them. Things like economic, intellectual, and social interests —fundamental principles—are in a great many cases among the factors which know no race or nation. With that conviction, this book is written for those who have the courage of their convictions, who have grown beyond race and nation—for those who will join me in a humble suspension of our preconceived judgments about other peoples and other countries. I refer to those who would be men enough to acknowledge frankly that as social engineers we have failed tragically, but who feel that there is a great hope that a persistent and honest effort to discover our fundamental errors would help us in making tomorrow better.

In the second place, the book is written to bring Africa to the consciousness of the world in relation to our past, our philosophy, and our political heritage; our obscurities and glories, our beauty and ugliness, our sensitivity and mellowness, our curiosity and indifference, our hospitality and friendliness, the depth of our culture, the antiquity of our origin, our rise and decline—our shame and our pride. I write it in a simplicity of mind and in a frankness of spirit, so that the Western world may know that

Africa is indignant with European imperialism as it has been, as it is, and as some *planners* still want it to be. It is a warning that the soul of man in Africa is awake, and resolves to be free now and forever. But our determination to be free does not indicate that we are bitter against any race or nation. It is simply that we have a legitimate program for African Irredentism, which we shall carry through *without bitterness*.

In the effort to sustain such a program without bitterness, it is necessary that Africa and the Western world be ready to make a united program which will educate each other in what our different cultural backgrounds entail, and on what basis our future relations could be adjusted without conflicts.

This is a serious matter, for I have noticed that behind the calm disposition of the millions of the African peoples today lurks a deep spirit of discontent and revenge. Some leaders in the West may not listen now, but their sons and our sons may understand what I mean in the next twenty-five years. My purpose, therefore, is to find some means to offset the growing revengeful spirit in Africa. The conflict is bound to come, because the planners of our post-war world do not seem even to consider Africa in terms of human beings with a dignity of their own.

Let me not be misunderstood as threatening any other nation. I am saying rather that I believe that the African destiny is the same as the destiny of the Western nations, and that the only way we can achieve a real success is through collective planning.

My proposal in this book is to repudiate the old ideas that Africa is a jungle, and that there are only tribal states incapable of self-government. In other words, Africans must be accepted as they are in their particular environment, and they must be judged in the light of their own cultural and political traditions. It will be a mistake to continue to look upon Africa as a mere European property.

The direct approach to the problem is by provision for educational and economic opportunities whereby the growing youth of Africa will reinforce themselves that they may cope with the forces of life in our industrial age. By such a program, we shall

direct the trend of revengeful spirit that is growing in Africa into a spirit of mutual confidence and friendliness.

The people of Africa have a great fear when they realize that in all important post-war planning Africa, as a people—as persons who want to live decently in freedom—are not mentioned. Such plans as there are only suggest what portions of the continent would go to one European country or another. It is alarming that while African people are so invaluably coöperative in this war, no due consideration is given to their future.

The feeling of fear and alarm among Africans must be made clear to the planners of peace, or else we shall build another peace edifice on mere sand.

We can see our civilization grow further; if man can be educated to conquer his physical world, he can also be educated to become a good social engineer. Africa, with her philosophy of *zikism* which is universal in scope, beckons the Western world to the fact that our battle is one—a battle against man's inhumanity to man—which can be fought victoriously if we will plan to treat others as we wish them to treat us. We shall all be free or all slaves: there are no alternatives. It is for this reason that I consider it an axiom that our way to a durable peace is to plan our future *without bitterness*.

Without Bitterness

METHODS DISCLOSED

SECTION I—AFRICA

CHAPTER I

Africa—A People or a Land?

During my trip through England to the United States I remembered that I left Nigeria in the month of January which falls within the West African *harmattan* season. The *harmattan* is the brightest of all Nigerian seasons. During this time all important traditional festivals, reunions, ceremonies, dances, and holidays take place. The climate is rather dry, somewhat cool, invigorating and exciting, and there is an occasional wind which blows from the Sahara Desert laden with fine particles of sand. It is not comparable to American winter nor to its summer, but is somewhat more like its fall. People's skins are parched and the trees shed their leaves, while the crops are all ready for harvest. The best of African fruits, the *udala*, are all ripe, hanging in bunches on the stems, having turned a clear red not unlike American apples. Flowers blossom and dance as the northeasterly wind takes its course. All of the streets are cleaned white under the force of the wind. Green trees yield their leaves. The excessive equatorial humidity vanishes during the *harmattan*. The echo of the church bells and of the festival dance music of Africa pervades the air For the Christians, the Christmas festival inspires a new zest for joy. Nature and all natures work: the whole people, the animals, the trees—all seem to have a rendezvous with life. Young brides are given in marriage; parents buy new clothes for all their children; sweethearts interchange gifts because everybody is celebrating the holidays; husbands get new things for their wives and travelers roam from one section of the country to the other; even the domestic guinea fowls of Northern Nigeria find romance

while yielding the millions of eggs on which the whole country depends for its local consumption and export. Indeed, jubilation is in everything, and all partake of the romantic drama of the season.

It was from this atmosphere that I slipped away for the United Kingdom in January, 1939, knowing full well—as I have always been instructed—that I was leaving a "dark continent" for a bright Europe. My expectation was great. I was thrilled that at last I was to see a "non-dark continent," some place even brighter than the *harmattan* season of West Africa!

We arrived in Liverpool in the night, and I went to bed in a friend's home. In the morning, I was quietly but anxiously waiting to see nature at work in "bright" England—to hear, for example, the singing of birds as I used to hear them in Nigeria—but all was different. I looked at my clock and it was eight o'clock; I peeped through the window expecting to see a bright, sunny morning beckoning me to wake up cheerfully as I did in Africa; but the atmosphere was gloomy. I looked at my clock again to assure myself that it was not in the midst of the night, that it really was five minutes past eight. I jumped out of bed and listened. I heard the grudging noise of moving vehicles, but I could hardly see them from the window. I called my host to know what was the matter, because this could not be the England that I had heard so much about—its brightness in contrast to my dark continent. My friend smiled humorously, and said: "My brother, this is fog. Don't you know England is famous for its fog?" At once I recalled that England is a foggy place, but not having seen fog such as that, I had been slow to connect my theoretical knowledge of geography with this practical experience.

The argument arose in my mind at once: why do the people from such a country impress us in a romantic and bright country like Nigeria with the fact that our Africa is a "dark continent"? Then I questioned myself: does the word "dark" here not refer to the absence of that radiant energy from the sun called light? Or does a European refer to Africa as a dark continent because of its long remoteness from modern western civilization? If so,

should not the African call Europe and America "the dark West," because, from all the evidence of history, Europe and America in their "backward" stage, in ancient times, were long remote from the high civilizations of Africa and Asia? But restricting my argument to the question of "darkness" as meaning the absence of light, I know that the larger portion of Africa is within the tropics, and that Europe is farther removed from this tropical paradise. It is evident, therefore, that comparatively, Europe is more of a "dark continent" than Africa.

It is to this continent of Africa—old as the West is young, romantic as the West is indifferent, bright as Europe is dark, charming as the West is gloomy, amiable as the West is sinister, cultivated and gracious as the West is dynamic and efficient, mystical as the West is scientific, religious and other-worldly as the West is aggressive and acquisitive—that we must turn our attention in looking for the dominant chords in the complex whole of its life's orchestra—is it a land or a people?

Africa is the second largest of the six continents on our globe. On the east it is linked with Asia by the Isthmus of Suez. On the north it is separated from Europe by the Mediterranean Sea; on the west it is bounded by the Atlantic Ocean; on the east by the Indian Ocean and the Mozambique Channel, which lies between the continent and the island of Madagascar; and on the south by the Atlantic Ocean. The Gulf of Aden and the Red Sea form the two estuaries which separate Africa from Asia. The greatest length of Africa is 5,000 miles, that of the United States of America is 1,900 miles. The greatest width is 4,600 miles; that of the United States, 3,000 miles. There are 11,262,000 square miles in Africa as compared with 3,026,789 square miles in the United States, and 3,700,000 in Europe. Yet the estimated population is 170,000,000,[1] as compared with 130,000,000 in the United States. There are

[1] I disagree with this estimated population of Africa, basing my argument on the fact that no true census has ever been made with scientific accuracy in the greater part of Africa. Both Europeans and Africans are responsible for this, but I believe that when a proper census is taken, it will be found that Africa contains more than 300,000,000 people.

roughly more than sixty-five different countries or large political units in Africa, as compared with thirty-three in Europe.

Africa is peculiarly known for its regular coastline, which is the reason for its poverty of harbor facilities, there being few or no indentations for natural harbors in such a "smooth" coastline. The mainland is a high plateau, with its highest peak, Mount Kilimanjaro, rising 19,000 feet in Tanganyika, East Africa. The lowest area is the Libyan Desert, which is 440 feet below sea level.

With all the difficulties involved in any accurate classification, we may, from the point of view of physical and more or less cultural division, say that there are roughly six Africas.

(1) *The Northern Coastland*, the inhabitants of which live in an area bordered by the Mediterranean Sea, with a temperate climate similar to that of the southern European countries. This region includes the site of ancient Carthage and Egypt, and has had perhaps the longest recorded history. Today the chief inhabitants are the Arabs, Berbers, Semites, and other mixed races with an advanced civilization and with historical connections with Europe and Asia which have endured for several thousand years. Quantities of olives, papyrus, citrus fruits, grapes, cotton, and rice grow there.

(2) *The Northern Desert Regions*, comprising the Sahara, Libyan, and Nubian Deserts. This territory is a land of sun-baked, parched, and shifting sands, spotted here and there with palmy oases where Arabs and Berbers are mixed with Sudanese. It has been a hot-bed of conflict among these groups. The climate is dry and hot, and some Arab nomads inhabit it, eking out an existence by relying on their flocks and date palms. The highest temperature in Africa, contrary to common belief, is not found in Equatorial Africa, but in this desert region, which, strangely enough, goes from one extreme in the day to the other at night: blistering heat during the day and frosts at night.

(3) *The Sudan* embraces an area from Cape Verde in the northwest to the Nile in the east, and from the southern tip of the Desert Region in the north to the Atlantic Ocean in the south-

west. The climate is essentially tropical. There are different types of forest, ranging from the mangrove-swamp coastal region, through the palmy region adjacent to the coast, to open grasslands fading imperceptibly into the arid region of the desert in the Sahara. It is densely populated. Here is the actual home of the indigenous blacks, capable, skillful, and as much noted for their handicrafts as for their political organization based on tribal structures of a peculiarly democratic and communalistic nature. The countries of this region form the present area of African national consciousness. Here is situated Nigeria, the largest single country ruled by Great Britain except India. There are abundant crops of grain, vegetables, cocoa, rice, peanuts, ginger, cotton, rubber, mahogany, ebony, and coffee in the Sudan.

(4) *Central Africa* is thoroughly equatorial, witnessing torrential rains and excessive heat, with a consequent growth of impenetrable forests. This, too, is the home of the indigenous black man, whose body is seemingly immunized against the cross-currents of all the elements of nature which seem to conspire against man in tropical countries. The population of Central Africa embraces the Pygmies, and some of the Bantus, Zulus, and Kaffirs.

(5) *The Eastern Regionals* contain the ancient kingdom of Ethiopia, Tanganyika Territory, Uganda, and the Somalilands. This area is noted for its unique physical features, which include the already mentioned highest peak of the continent, together with the great lakes: Victoria, Tanganyika, Nyasa, Rudolph, Edward, and Albert, the famous Rift Valley, and the Victoria Falls. They are under the influence of a moderate, occasionally heavy, rainfall, and some areas are favorable for agriculture and pastoral purposes. Europeans find it easier to live in this region than in the Sudan area; hence the Africans there, in obverse proportion to the greater climatic advantages of their land, suffer more inhumanity from the European settlers than do their compatriots on the purely tropical west coast.

(6) *The Southern Area* is a temperate zone, where, as in the southern states of the United States, the atmosphere is heavily laden with the stench of what might be termed racial cannibalism

between Europeans and Africans, the latter including the Zulus, Kaffirs, and so-called Hottentots, dominant African racial groups. This region, being temperate in climate, the Europeans found very favorable for settlement; but in addition to the climate, the enviable mineral deposits of the area promoted an influx of adventurers and prospectors during and after the middle of the nineteenth century. The settlement there of the Europeans (particularly the Dutch and the British) has brought to the southern portion of Africa one of the world's worst scandals in the unmentionable, inhuman atrocities committed there by alien Europeans against the indigenous peoples.[2]

Africa has four important rivers. In the northeast is the Nile, which flows into the Mediterranean Sea and is the longest on the continent; the White Nile, rising from the Victoria Nyanza in East Africa, joins the Blue Nile, which rises from the Abyssinian mountains at Khartum, and both "ride" through Egypt into the Mediterranean. The Nile is 4,000 miles in length. Next to the Nile is the Congo, 3,000 miles long, rising from the mountains northwest of Lake Nyasa, and emptying itself into the South Atlantic. It too is said to be one of the longest in the world, and flows through the southern half of the western section of Africa. In the northwest half runs the majestic Niger of West Africa, with its source in the Futa Jalon Mountain Range, and its mouth in the Atlantic Ocean at the southern tip of the country of Nigeria. At a point in its upper section, Lokoja, the Niger is joined by its great tributary, the Benue. The Niger is 2,600 miles long. The Zambesi is the shortest of the four rivers, but certainly the greatest in the southeast of Africa. It is 1,600 miles long, stretching from Angola to the Indian Ocean. The Victoria Falls (343 feet) is a cataract on this river in Rhodesia, through which it flows. I have mentioned several lakes on the east coast, but Lake Chad, which lies between Nigeria and the Niger Colony is also worth noting. Lake Chad is shallow but large, and its peculiarity lies in the fact that its shoreline shifts constantly from year to year; yet it has no outlet.

The climate of Africa cannot be expected to be uniform. This

[2] See above.

is true not only because it lies within different latitudes, but also because of other factors, such as variations in altitude, in prevailing winds, and in the influence of the forest regions. On the whole, however, we may safely say that the continent is principally tropical. The Sahara Desert in the north-central section, and the Kalahari in the southwest have no rains, and they cover an area larger than the whole of the United States, with no population except nomads. There are no crops, except dates, no minerals, no game, no incentive for living, and no attraction for speculation except the loneliness which beckons to hermits and the mystery which invites observation of the heavenly bodies.

The whole of the equatorial regions have a generally wet and hot season, interrupted by the *harmattan*, which is short, dry, and cold. In certain areas on the Equator the climate is sub-tropical, such as in Northern Nigeria, which has a long "dry season" (November to April), with a considerable diurnal variation of temperature, and with the *harmattan* wind blowing southward from the Sahara. Other than this, equatorial Africa has a long rainy season from about May to October, with relatively high humidity and a comparatively unvarying temperature for the year. In 1938, 56.68 inches of rain was recorded in Lagos, in the extreme southwest of Nigeria. In Maiduguri, at the extreme north, the average was 28 inches, and at Forcados, on the Niger River Delta, 145 inches. Similarly, French Equatorial Africa near the Gulf of Guinea has one of the heaviest annual rainfalls in the world. As I have pointed out, the extremes in temperatures in Africa are not to be found in the equatorial region, where other geographic factors make most places more livable than could be expected. The hottest places are in the desert regions, where there is only occasional rain in the most elevated spots. In the elevated sections of the east, the climate is also sub-tropical. In South Africa the altitude is quite high, and the climate is therefore congenial to those accustomed to temperate climates.

In most of the equatorial areas the fertility of the soil is high, and wherever agriculture is possible, peanuts, wheat, millet, Indian maize, rice, tubers, and all kinds of vegetables are grown for local

consumption as well as for export. In the north, olives, grapes, and citrus fruits are the chief crops. South Africans raise cereals and livestock for export. On the west coast, grain, garden vegetables, yams, cassava, bananas, cocoa, coffee, rubber, kola, cotton, beni-seed, and ginger are raised in large quantities.

Africa is one of the richest lands on earth, as far as mineral resources are concerned. Gold is found in abundance in South Africa. Johannesburg alone produces more than 40 per cent of the world output. The Gold Coast and Nigeria also have considerable deposits of gold. Diamonds are mined in Katanga (Belgian Congo) and in Northern Rhodesia. The diamond production in this area averages 98 per cent of the world output. Copper is mined in Katanga under modern methods. In the Transvaal, Natal, and Nigeria, platinum and tin are mined. Nigeria and Natal, as well as other sections, have iron and great quantities of coal, and manganese ore is found in abundance in the Gold Coast and Nigeria. The production of oil goes on in the Gulf of Suez, in several northern states, and in the Sahara, and recent research indicates some deposits in the southeast of Nigeria. Morocco and Algeria are the two most productive areas of phosphate in the world. Radium is found "abundantly" in the Congo region. "At present, the Belgium Congo and Canada are practically the only producers of radium." [3]

Numerous specimens of the great animal world inhabit this continent. Most kinds of primates, other than man, are found, such as the chimpanzee and the gorilla. In the cat family are found the lion (in restricted and unoccupied areas),[4] leopard, and panther. Jackals and hyenas abound in most places. Peculiar to Africa are the zebra, the quagga, and the giraffe. Antelopes, eagles, and hippopotami are also found. There are considerable numbers of

[3] Keith and others, *World Mineral and World Peace*, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1943, p. 29.

[4] Some Americans have the idea that lions and other dangerous animals are found everywhere in Africa. The writer, who lived all his life in Africa, had never seen a live elephant or lion until he made the acquaintance of these animals at the Columbus Zoo in Ohio in 1941.

domesticated animals, such as sheep, goats, oxen, dogs, cats, ostriches, camels, donkeys, poultry, canaries, and parrots.

The short description given above gives evidence of the immense importance of Africa to the world. More than three times the size of continental Europe and almost four times as large as the United States and its possessions, the natural resources of this huge land alone qualify it for a position in the forefront of modern states, while its minerals make it both an economic and romantic magnet to less-favored peoples. It is interesting to note that Europe, only a third of Africa in size, has thirty-three different countries, run under a wide variety of governments ranging from the Cæsarist type of autocracy of Germany, through constitutional monarchism in England, to the democratic laboratory of Switzerland. All these are in one small Europe. But that is not all. Not content with these, Europe has as many languages as there are governments, as many cultural varieties as there are languages. Thus travelers through the continent relate the wonderful experiences they encounter as a result of this constant change of thought and speech. Turning to Africa, one can then understand the divisions there. A continent as extensive as it is cannot live in a vacuum. When we talk about tribal divisions in Africa, it never occurs to us that some of the so-called tribes are larger geographically and numerically than some of what Europeans call nations and countries. For example, the Ibo tribe, one of the many in Nigeria, contains more than four million persons, the full equal, in that respect, of Switzerland in Europe. And yet these so-called tribes in Africa are but parts of some of the countries there. It should not surprise us to hear that more than sixty-five separate nations exist in Africa today. Of course, we must also admit that not all of these states are either tribally or linguistically affiliated; some are artificial states created by Europeans, against the traditional divisions of pre-European Africa.

Summarily we must bear in mind, (a) that *Africa is not a country*—it is composed of many countries; (b) that *Africa is not a race*—it composes many races blended together from time immemorial, some dominant characteristics still persisting, in spite of

and not in the absence of complex blendings; (c) that *Africa is not a cultural unit*—there are as many cultural units as there are regions and races; (d) that *Africa is not a linguistic unit*—the languages are legion. Yet in spite of all these apparent differences, there is still that which we can describe as "African," just as there are things European or Asiatic or American, despite all internal diversities in culture, language, and ethnic origins.

CHAPTER II

The Awakening of Africa

No living man can send me to the shades
Before my time; no man of woman born,
Coward or brave, can shun his destiny.

HOMER

FOR THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS Africans have been guilty of the sin of complacency and unconsciousness. They have long been living an equivocal life, yet were unaware of it. The people—their business life, their economic order, their social institutions, their religious convictions, their political philosophy—have been at a standstill, but "the wages of sin is death," and now that death is knocking boldly on the doors of the African nation, the inhabitants seem to be alive to the danger which threatens their own extermination.

The continent of Africa offers unrivaled chances in the great struggle for life. The supply of natural resources is almost unequaled by that of any other continent. But Africa has been rather indifferent to the important commodities of this materialistic age. The people left freely available to Europeans all that makes Europe what it is today. The reason for such complacency can be found in the African's sense of value. He has a deep contempt for things worldly, and worships things otherworldly. But his experiences have been terrible, and as the pattern of suppression and repression takes clearer and clearer outlines against him, the African begins to realize the nature of the national and racial immobilization planned for him.

When a people become thus conscious of their own condition, when a people know whence they have come and where they are standing, and when they have once resolved upon which direction

to go, there is no influence strong enough to keep such forces of human resolution in confinement. When the popular will is sufficiently aroused to resentment and discontent, it will take more than all the oceans and rivers put together to quench the flames of human and spiritual yearnings for a better life.

Like the telegraphic voice of the prophet Micah to the people of Israel, the omnipotent voice of financial and political imperialism, backed by the all-embracing forces of technology and nationalism, warns, by its very nature, the people of Africa to "Arise . . . and depart, for this is not your rest." [1] What will prevent Africa from awakening and wanting to fly above the heavens when all forces around her are looming into the heights of the unknown? Africa understands the soul of the twentieth-century man, who, Spengler said, is "intoxicated" and

> wills to fly above Space and Time . . . free himself from the earth, rise into the infinite, leave the bonds of the body, and circle in the universe of space amongst the stars. . . . Hence the fantastic traffic that crosses the continents in a few days, that puts itself across oceans in floating cities, that bores through mountains, rushes about in subterranean labyrinths, uses the steam-engine till its last possibilities have been exhausted, and then passes onto the gas-engine, and finally raises itself above the roads and railways and flies in the air; hence it is that the spoken word is sent in one moment over all the oceans; hence comes the ambition to break all records and beat all dimensions, to build giant halls for giant machines, vast ships, and bridge-spans, buildings that deliriously scrape the clouds, fabulous forces pressed together to a focus to obey the hand of a child, stamping and quivering and droning works of steel and glass in which tiny man moves as unlimited monarch. . . .[2]

The Berlin Conference of 1885 resulted in the definitive partition of Africa as if it were a chattel for European nations, and by the final act of that conference, the majestic rivers of Africa—the Congo and the Niger—were opened to "the merchant ships of all

[1] Micah, Chapter II, Verse 10.
[2] Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West*, p. 503.

nations equally," [3] But Africa was not there when her home was partitioned and her rivers so magnanimously opened up to the rest of the world!

From then on, the history of Africa has been a history of prolonged invasion and continual disruption of all that belongs to her. The continent has awakened to find incredible "scramblers" knocking at her doors, sometimes in the guise of a friend, sometimes posing as cohorts of goodwill, sometimes coming as fighters and sometimes as merchants, but all trying to weaken Africa's potentialities. For two centuries these spiritless intruders have done their best to keep the hapless owners of the land confused and impotent, while carrying on with their pillage unchallenged. But now the picture is changing and the "lowly native" is awake. Those days of groping in the dark were the days of the old Africa. The African spirit of indifference stands convicted by the results of its own works. Over the stagnant flats of the old mentality roll the stern waves of European imperialism, and from the ground to meet them, the voice of the "New Africa," like that of Abel, cries out to Heaven. That cry constitutes a challenge to our twentieth-century civilization.

The old philosophy of complacency is gone in Africa. There is a new interest in science, in technology, in public education, in commercial enterprise. The dawn of new developments in religion has arrived. The approach of the medieval church has no longer a grasp on the mind of the New African. He is aware that to be a good Christian implies an understanding of the whole physical life as it parallels the spiritual life. He apprehends now, more than ever before, that it is a healthy body that makes a healthy mind—a mind which is sane and moral.

A proof of the new mental alertness of the African people, now that they do understand, is a revulsion of feeling. A magic change has begun to take place. The tide of national discontent is rising in crescendo. There is a new shame and anger for past repression and miseducation; a new love and loyalty for things African; a

[3] Charles G. Fenwick, *International Law*, New York: D. Appleton-Century Company Incorporated, Second Edition, 1934, p. 292.

new faith in African irredentism; a new hope for the offspring of the renascent African. Old concepts in philosophy, religion, and politics are being rebaptized for their assimilation by unteachable humanity. There is a new social consciousness, a new sense of responsibility, a new creative quest, a new capacity for self-abnegation, a new sense of duty, and a new sense of unity. Such an atmosphere in the New Africa may come as a surprise to those who knew the old.

The continent is awake!

The call of an awakened nation has penetrated the chambers of African conventions and clubs, her legislative assemblies, churches, commerce, and even music. Like over-ripe fruits, the old leaders are falling off the tree of African national life, bewildered. New types of leaders, who understand themselves, are rising up from strategic points of the dial-face of a moving nation. These new leaders are impatient of cowardice, intolerant of compromise, indifferent to fear, unfriendly to deceit. They hate imperialism, one-sided exploitation, dictatorship, and inequalities in the social order. They love truth and human brotherliness, they advocate coöperation, they worship real democratic ideals (essentially African), they respect human personality, and they cherish the spirit of independence.

When a great moral and national upheaval like this perturbs the African people, there is no doubt that every child, every woman, every man from all classes, sects, and beliefs will respond to it. All these elements are part of the African soul. They are not foreign. They have been an inseparable part of it from the beginning. The child wants to know the *status quo* of his father; the woman is eager to ensure the economic security and social prestige of her husband; the man wants to secure a better future for his progeny. They all want the "Bill of Rights" in all phases of life.

The church in Africa also responds to this movement. The mosaic current of its views is flowing into a better channel of social purpose, running swiftly toward the achievement of public welfare. The church is no more content with "the life to come" philosophy. It has combined with this a philosophy of "the life

now here." All these factors foretell a salutary future for Africa and the world.

But some of our European and American missionaries, even though they live side by side with Africans, are blind to this trend. They still talk of Africa as if such things as a revolution in national morality and a political awareness do not and cannot exist in the "superstitious" mind of the African. But great accomplishments begin with a minority. They are generally those that are young in mind—those whose spirits are still uninjured by contact with evils of the world. They are burning with zeal for the common-weal for which all great men died. Their imagination transcends the immediate here, and they seek those ends which will contribute to the happiness of all.

As in the period of the "investiture controversy" of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when the boundaries of secular and ecclesiastical authorities were contested between popes and emperors of Europe, the youth of Africa today is wondering about the position of Africa in the scheme of things. Where is African sovereignty invested—in Europe or in Africa? They know that all social reformers were strong-headed, and all those who will follow their example in truth have to participate in the social struggle of their own time. They lived dangerously, and all true social reformers must also live dangerously. They have to condense the unconscious longings of the equivocal masses into concrete and more precise language. Only thus can the position of the people in any social problem be clarified.

The spirit of an awakened people is on the march forward. The voice of nature and humanity is crying aloud for all nations to realize that the spirit of man in Africa is awake; that all men must have opportunity for self-maintenance; that employers and employees in Africa must understand and sympathize with each other. The rest of the world must realize that in Africa, too, man is an end and not a means, and that government of colonial areas in Africa must be abandoned. European traders and industrialists in quest of money are called upon to stop the enslavement of the Africans. They must be reminded that child and woman labor

must be abolished; that ill-paid labor is nearly as evil as physical slavery; that schools should be established for all; that health service, good roads, and better agricultural devices should be provided for the tax-paying citizens; and that African merchants and financiers must be encouraged to acquaint themselves with the outside world.

It is necessary that Europe and America seriously realize this spirit of awakened Africa. The world can run itself into a greater catastrophe if the opinion and feeling of millions of African inhabitants are treated with careless disregard. *It will be an illusion to suppose that the voices of some outspoken Africans are unimportant to the future of the world.*

The warning is clear now that Africa is not satisfied. Africa is grumbling because she has been indescribably injured by Europeans. But she can forgive and forget if other peoples will listen now to the voice of reason and common decency. *The problem of the world today is not that the offended cannot forgive, but that the offender cannot repent.* It does not seem that Europe is ready to change her attitude toward other nations, including Africa. Europe is still a monstrous unit in the future world of peace. In the past, she has formed the chief center of perennial controversy and intrigue. She extends this poison to all countries east and west, north and south of her.

It is regrettable when I recall the invaluable contributions of the immortal souls of such Europeans as Descartes, Hume, Kant, Newton, Darwin, Galileo, Shakespeare, Grotius, Rembrandt, Las Casas, Columbus, Cervantes, Montaigne, Voltaire, Dante, Michelangelo, Goethe, Smith, Einstein, and Rousseau. And who cannot but contrast them with the present incapability and blindness of the rulers of Europe? Albert Viton has well described the British Empire when he said: "That this gigantic empire has not been able to assure the world peace by its own power is due only to the hopeless mental astigmatism and muddle-headedness of its rulers." What is true of Britain is generally true of some of the so-called "great powers" of the continent.

The warning is clear that *African countries want their own in-*

dependence in government, and complete self-government immediately after the war. The *Gold Coast and Uganda are also capable of self-government.* This is true despite imperialistic propaganda which encourages the hasty generalization that African nations are yet immature and inexperienced in the art of government.

It is not democratic to estimate power or political strength in terms of ammunitions and incendiary bombs. If these be the bases of measurements, then some supposedly peace-loving countries can never be recognized in our present world unless they turn evil and destructive. But if the measurement is based on sane development of cultural standards, in terms of social philosophy and social organization, then Nigeria and some other countries in Africa are ready even to lead some brutish states of Europe. This is not a mere lazy argument. It is a stubborn fact.

The warning is clear that Africa is not only dissatisfied and therefore demands her independence, but that she will constitute the most complex problem of our age if she is perpetually held in bondage by the omnipotent hands of the economic and political imperialism of Europe.

It is clear that Africa is opposed to imperialism, and demands democratic coöperation and democratic interdependence whereby all the countries of the world shall become useful to one another, be they European, African, American, or Asiatic.

And it is also clear that Africa is not intending to isolate herself from the increasingly contracting world. She does not mean to reserve her resources only for herself, but she desires access to that which nature deposited for her development. She desires to control her own destiny and to rid herself of want and fear.

Africa is awake, and it is clear that democracy is the mainspring of her utterance. The New Africa intends to advocate the true democracy—democracy without imperialism, without unequal treaties, without unfair exploitation; without mental slavery and without a racial superiority complex; without economic inequalities, bloody wars, or bombs and submarines; democracy rid of the monstrous spirit of nationalism, jingoism, and chauvinism.

Africa challenges the world of "democratic nations" to come to

its senses and behold the animalism which motivates the mind of the "civilized" West as well as the "uncivilized" East. The implications of this war have created a strong sense of wakefulness in the peoples of Africa. The destiny of the world after the war is a common responsibility, just as this war is being fought by all. Our awakening is not an isolated fact. It is an answer to a common "world consciousness" growing large in high places—even in the United States Senate. The bold, commanding type of the handwriting on the wall calling for "international brotherhood" is so bold and glittering that even the eyes of reaction are dazzled.

There are evolutionary stages in the life of any people. There is a stage of national childhood; there is a stage of national youth; there is a stage of national maturity. When maturity is over there is a decline which invites collapse and death. Death brings a new life, and the child begins to grow. Africa has gone through the first three cycles of life. She had been a child and a youth. She had also suffered the pangs of national decline and death. Now she is born again. Just as the oceans are formed out of insignificant streams and rivers; as planets grow out of nebulæ, as the heart develops in the embryo, as the bones fuse after birth; just as sensations and memories are unified into knowledge, and knowledge into philosophy and science, as individuals make families and families develop into clans and tribes and towns and states and nations and a world commonwealth, just as high mountains develop out of flat earth, the wakefulness of the new Africa is gathering momentum in the aggregation of separate items out of the debris of the old Africa, forming into masses and groups and wholes of ideas, sentiments, resolutions, and actions.

The new nations in an old continent are celebrating their new "advent" into the world of integrated civilization—a world of internal complexities and outward calmness. These new nations in Africa, or at least these nations which feel themselves new, were born out of the fire of modern imperialism. They feel within their soul that despite the chains of imperialism they have the freedom to find their own way in the world, to develop their own genius

for social engineering, and to make new friends in the world because they are in love with the human family.

Africa is awakening with the waking world. It is a march toward a common destination. New Africa has a rendezvous with life, and since "to live at all is to live in awareness," the awareness in Africa of her vital rôle in the world is a natural counterpart of her claim to belong to reflective humanity.

CHAPTER III

Independent States in Africa

APART FROM LIBERIA, Egypt, and Ethiopia, all other countries in Africa have been dependencies of some European power since the middle of the nineteenth century, except that the Union of South Africa (a British dominion) has its own Parliament and is therefore self-governing. Southern Rhodesia has a special status. Let us make a quick examination of these independent African states.

LIBERIA

Liberia, a republican state, is somewhat larger than Ohio—about the size of New York State. It covers an area of 43,000 square miles, with an estimated population of 1,500,000. It is situated on the Guinea coast of Africa, between Sierra Leone and the Ivory Coast, and runs 350 miles along the Atlantic shore. Liberia had its beginnings in 1819, and by 1822 a settlement was created at Monrovia for repatriated Afro-Americans, who were sponsored by the American Colonization Societies. In 1837 Liberia made a considerable advance toward centralization of authority, when all of the separate settlements there came into a union, with the exception of Maryland County. Thomas Buchanan became governor. In 1847 a memorable convention was held by the people of Liberia. A Declaration of Independence and a Constitution, modeled upon those of the United States, were drawn up. Great Britain recognized Liberian independence, France followed, and in 1862 the United States accorded its recognition.

According to the Constitution of July 26, 1847, electors must be of Negro blood and landowners. The Chief Executive of the State is the President, elected for a term of eight years. There is a

Senate of eight, elected for six years, and a House of Representatives of fifteen, elected for a four-year term. Any able-bodied citizen from sixteen to fifty years old is liable to military service. According to *The World Almanac* for 1942, there is a militia of about 4,000, and a border force of about 750. Since 1912, the customs have been in the hands of a General Receiver and Financial Adviser from the United States. Commercial accounts are kept in British currency; official accounts are in dollars and cents. The estimated revenues and expenditures for 1941 were balanced at $674,800.[1] The chief exports are coffee, rubber, oil, nuts, raffia, ivory, and ginger. Chief imports are textiles, hardware, glass, earthenware, tobacco, spirits, and rice and foodstuffs.

Owing to some internal shortcomings in natural resources, aggravated by unfavorable international relations, Liberia has gone through every fiscal vicissitude. Several loans have been raised from other countries. Once she borrowed money in London and allowed the British to supervise her customs revenues. In 1912, the outstanding bonds were retired and a new loan was floated, the security consisting of customs receipts, as well as taxes on rubber and other sources. It was then that an American Financial Adviser was installed. United States Army officers made the first attempt to organize a police force. From then on Liberian independence, which was declared in 1847, became shaky. It must be noted here that this quasi-independent status of Liberia came into being only because of its economic backwardness. Other West African countries, such as Sierra Leone, the Ivory Coast, Nigeria, and the Gold Coast, though dependencies, have a far better economic record.

In 1923, Harvey S. Firestone sent experts to investigate the soil and other conditions in Liberia, with the establishment of a rubber industry in view. In 1924, Mr. Firestone requested a concession from the Liberian Government and offered in exchange to improve the Monrovian harbor for $300,000. The government agreed to pay interest of 6 per cent on this investment. An agreement was reached, and Firestone was permitted to choose one

[1] See Parker T. Moon, *Imperialism and World Politics*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1942, p. 110.

million acres at five cents an acre for six years. The agreement was approved by the Liberian Legislature, which also accepted a loan of $5,000,000. In 1926, the government set up a Labor Bureau to supply 10,000 laborers a year to the Firestone rubber plantations, and all Firestone products were exempted from taxation. Since then this American big-business company has had a controlling influence over the economic fortunes of Liberia.

This is even truer and more significant now, in these days of another world war, than it has ever been, for Liberia's two major contributions to the war effort of the United Nations include that of supplying great quantities of natural rubber, which is worth almost its weight in gold at this stage of the war, to the Allies. The other major contribution of this African Republic to the cause of the Democracies is the granting of air-base sites for the bomber, fighter, and ferry-plane services. The importance of this latter contribution can easily be imagined when Liberia's strategic position on the African west coast is considered. That this is fully realized and accorded its just significance by the powers-that-be is signified by the visit of President Roosevelt to the Republic on his way home from the January, 1943, Casablanca Conference, and the return-call of President Barclay of Liberia to the White House and State Department in May and June of the same year.

EGYPT

Egypt is a kingdom at the northeast extremity of Africa, with the Mediterranean Sea to the north and the Sudan to the south. To the west lies Libya, and to the east is situated the Red Sea. The population in 1937 was 15,920,703 and its estimated area was 383,000 square miles. The history of Egypt obviously cannot be traced in this small space, for the Nile Valley and its long history has witnessed sixty centuries of Egyptian drama in the theater of world progress, as well as contributions to practically all phases of culture.

Egypt is practically a rainless country, relying for moisture entirely on the tender mercies of the annual flood of the River Nile.

The Nile, flowing 4,000 miles from the Victoria Nyanza to the Mediterranean, has 960 miles of its course lying in Egypt, where its rise and fall regulates the growth of the crops. King Mena of Egypt, in about 4,000 B.C., is credited with being the first to introduce a scientific system of using the waters of the Nile for irrigation. By his system, the land was cut up into rectangular areas, ranging from 5,000 to 50,000 acres, with banks surrounding each area. During the flow of the Nile, the flood is admitted into the resulting basins to a depth of about three and one-half feet, and is permitted to lie there for over a month, after which it is drained. Seed is then sown on the fertilized land; the subsequent growth is rapid. Many centuries later, in 1820, Mohammed Ali Pasha introduced another system—a system of irrigation which is accomplished by digging deep canals and building dams to regulate and control the flow of the waters, which amounts to a perennial irrigation system. The Gabel Awlia Dam, which was completed on April 25, 1937, measures 16,400 feet, and is the largest dam in the world.

About 80 per cent of the citizens are descended from ancient Egyptians as we know them in history. Ninety-one per cent of the entire population are Moslems, 8.19 per cent Christians, 0.40 per cent Jews. There is now compulsory education for all children from 7 to 12 years old. The University of Al-Azhar at Cairo, founded about 968 A.D., is still flourishing as a center of Moslem education. There is also the Fouad I University, erected at Gaza in 1908.

In recent modern history, Egypt was a part of the Ottoman Empire. She paid tribute to the Sultan of Turkey and obeyed the orders of the representative of the Sultan, who was known as the "pasha," or governor, of Egypt. Of the European powers, France was the first to take a great interest in Egypt, following the emotional explosions of Napoleon, who exclaimed that in reality to crush England, "we [French people] must make ourselves masters of Egypt." Napoleon of Ajaccio, Corsica, who forgot his Corsican patriotism in the whirlwind of the French Revolution, became, through his military feats from Toulon to Campo Formio

(1797) the leading personality in France. After humiliating the Austrians by the Peace of Campo Formio, he found that France had only England still fighting against her. It was owing to this that Napoleon staunchly decided to strike England a blow by occupying Egypt. Egypt at that time was not under the rule or protection of Great Britain, but it was, as it always has been since the dawn of British imperialism, a connecting link between Britain and the precious India. Napoleon struck, but Nelson repulsed him, so that by October, 1779, the defeated French leader was back in France, with the French dream of Egyptian domination wiped out. Nevertheless, the latter continued to count Egypt as an essential part of French international ambition. From 1806 to 1849, Mohamet Ali, who was the Pasha of Egypt, consulted France on progressive educational and irrigational programs.

In April, 1859, the Suez Canal was begun by de Lesseps, a Frenchman, with the permission of the Pasha. It was not until the canal was opened in November, 1869, that Britain's interest became keen. Ismail Pasha, a historically notorious spendthrift,[2] was then head of Egypt under the Ottoman Empire. It was alleged that he was so extravagant that he got his country seriously into debt. His foreign debt steadily mounted. He taxed his people heavily, but it did not help. To make matters worse, the price of Egyptian cotton dropped suddenly when the Civil War in America was over, and this was a further blow to the already embarrassed Pasha. The European bankers thereupon found a pretext to get Egypt into their financial fold. When Ismail Pasha ascended the throne the foreign debt was £3,680, but after ten years of his reign it mounted to £68,497,160. This colossal jump inevitably ruined his credit, and Egyptian bonds were being discounted. It was estimated that he was forced to receive less than £20 million

[2] Future African historians have yet to prove with more scientific accuracy and objectivity whether Ismail Pasha was as stupid in his fiscal policy as the European representatives have presented him to the world. They have to show whether his fiscal difficulties were caused by the unseen hands of European imperial decrees in order to bring Egypt under unquestioned control or otherwise.
See Cave Reports, *Parliamentary Papers*, Egypt, No. 5 (1876).

for bonds the face value of which were some £30 million, in 1873.[3] Pasha's financial problem was so acute that he offered to sell his 176,602 shares in the Suez Canal Company. He first offered it to the French, but Disraeli, then Prime Minister of England, beat them to the gun. He borrowed £4 million from the Rothschild Bank and bought those shares for England.

But the Egyptian king did not stop at this. He wanted more money, and had to turn to the European bankers again. His appeal for more loans from England resulted in Stephen Cave's financial mission to Egypt in 1875. The British Cabinet empowered him to investigate and report on Egyptian financial affairs. His report, in a nutshell, was: (a) that Egypt was potentially quite wealthy, but (b) that to make effective use of the wealth a better method of financing had to be found. This hint brought quick action. A year after Cave's report, an international commission was set up, namely, the *Caisse de la Dette Publique*, composed of English, French, Italian, and Austrian representatives. The Pasha's loans were to be channeled into a general debt of £91,000,000. The commission was responsible for receiving revenues and for paying of interest on the principal, with the Egyptian ruler agreeing not to seek more loans without the consent of the commission.

Under pressure from the English and French representatives, Ismail Pasha repudiated the arrangement, and delegated to the British and French the management of his fiscal affairs. But the problem was still not solved. We have mentioned that Egypt is dependent on the mercy of the Nile. The year 1878 proved to be a bad one because of an insufficient flood from the river for proper irrigation of the land. The ensuing drought ruined the crops and reduced the expected revenue, and there were insufficient receipts to make the payment of 7 per cent interest on the national debt. Naturally the Pasha requested that the interest rate be reduced. To this the bondholders were opposed. They proposed that the original commission, which included other European representatives, be restored, and that the Egyptian financial engine be overhauled. The budget system, taxation, tariffs, and so

[3] See Moon, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

forth, had to be reformed, and the ruler himself had to cede his personal wealth to the State. The idea of having only French and English fiscal advisers was no longer desirable. Nevertheless, Ismail Pasha appointed an Englishman (Wilson) as finance minister, and to the office of Ministry of Public Works he appointed de Bugniers, a Frenchman. But the proposed reforms were rejected, and he refused to yield his personal property. In the face of his stubbornness, the reforms failed, and finally Ismail Pasha dismissed his European ministers, and resumed all of his royal prerogatives.

The British and French then demanded the resignation of the Pasha from his post. When he refused, it was not too difficult to induce the Sultan of Turkey to recall the Pasha. Ismail was dismissed and a new Khedive, who would take orders from the French and the British, was appointed. His name was Tewfik Pasha. From 1879 to 1883, Egypt was under a financial "condominium" by France and England. It was only natural for these European powers to revive their old ideas of "reformation" in Egypt. The budget system was remodeled. Heavier taxes were leveled on wealthier landowners. Instead of insisting on the 7 per cent interest, the new commission reduced to 4 per cent the interest on the general debt. The people of Egypt, even the aristocracy, had no say in these affairs of the country. The result was national discontent. The hitherto cool pot of Egyptian nationalism began to heat from the flames of resentment which finally brought it to the boiling point in the year 1922. Finally, as a result of this national discontent, the aristocracy forced the Pasha to form a parliament, which demanded, among other things, (a) to be granted all parliamentary rights to enable them to manage the affairs of the people; and (b) control of those revenues of the country not allocated for payments on the national debt. France and England, however, would not yield their authority. They jointly declared their intention to support, not the parliament, but the Khedive's authority. Certain reforms for Egypt were desirable, but the powers did not consider parliamentary rights for the Egyptians among those. One of the reforms which they did rec-

ommend was the dismissal of 2,500 Egyptian Army officers, paying them only half of the pensions to which they were entitled. This action released a flood of anti-European sentiment among the people. Ahmed Arabi became the leader of the nationalist movement. This was a threat not only to the joint control of France and England, but also to other Europeans, who feared the repudiation of the foreign debt by the Egyptian nationalist government.

The fateful day came in July, 1882, when Admiral Seymour, commanding the British ships, attacked Alexandria and defeated Ahmed Arabi and his army. Britain fought and conquered Egypt alone. No other European power took part in the action, nor was invited to. To justify this unilateral action, all British officialdom declared its intention to be that of maintaining in Egypt "the sovereign rights of the Sultan, of the position of the Khedive, and of the liberties of the Egyptian people."

Of course, one can now realize that the British could never have as one of the liberties of the Egyptian people that of parliamentary representation, for otherwise there would have been no war. The Anglo-Egyptian War of 1882 was caused (a) because the British wanted to maintain the Suez Canal as a life-line to India and to the Far East (if the Nationalists were able to hold Egypt for the Egyptians, Britain's position in the international world would become very precarious); (b) because controlling power by the Egyptian Nationalists would have meant the repudiation of the foreign debt (and there were £30,000,000 or more of Egyptian debts in England which the bondholders would not let go); and (c) because the problem of Ireland was acute at this particular time, so that English public opinion was then set against anything "nationalist" outside of England. This explains why even such anti-imperialists as Gladstone could be swayed by the pressure of the bondholders and other interested groups in England. But Gladstone gave a "solemn pledge" to the world that England would never have permanent military occupation of Egypt. This declaration was made August 9, 1880. We shall see as we read how far England kept that vow.

After the conquest, England entered Egypt and started a series of "reforms." The first step was for the people of Egypt to receive a constitution, as framed by Lord Dufferin, and handed down to them as the Constitution of 1883. It was proposed that all authority be put in the hands of the Khedive, and while the Legislative Council and a General Assembly might criticize and advise, their power would be limited solely to the fact that their consent must be received before any new tax be levied. The Khedive was to act through his ministers. The greatest trouble with the scheme was that all of the ministers functioned through the British advisers, who in turn received their orders from the British-Consul-General at Cairo. And, in fact, after the conquest of 1882, Egypt thrived under the guidance of Lord Cromer, who was the British-Consul-General from 1883 to 1907.

Several reforms to facilitate economic progress were made. Railways for easy transportation were built, and bankruptcy was staved off successfully. The water supply was improved. Peasant welfare was provided. In 1913, there was a change in the constitution. The Legislative Council and the General Assembly were amalgamated into one Legislative Assembly. They were now empowered to introduce bills and to discuss them for legislation. As all these changes proceeded, Egyptian nationalism again gained momentum.

After the changes of 1913 came the World War of 1914. Turkey entered the war against England, and in return, England declared Egypt a British protectorate, forgetting that during the War of 1882, Gladstone had declared that England fought that war against Egypt to maintain "all established rights, whether they be those of the Sultan, those of the Khedive, those of the people of England, or those of the foreign bondholders." [4]

The events in Egypt during the World War brought Egyptian nationalism to a climax. The press was suppressed, all national sentiments and grievances were repressed, the Legislative Assembly was abandoned, and Egypt became a factional country, because even nominal allegiance to the Sultan was abandoned. Everything

[4] *Hansard Third Series*, 270, p. 1150. Quotation by Moon, *op. cit.*

became British. This was a most dangerous pouring of combustible oil into the burning fire of national discontent. The consequence was obvious. The World War slogan was "to save the world for democracy." Legitimacy animated the minds of all nations—small and big. Zaad Zaghlul, and other Egyptian nationalists, decided to present their case to a world that had just fought to preserve "democracy." But in Paris, they found that attitude had already changed. They appointed delegates to the Paris Peace Conference to claim their rights, but the British police seized the delegates, exiling them to the island of Malta. There the Egyptians paid a price for their belief in democracy. There they understood the kind of democracy Britain meant when they were fighting the Germans. More than national unrest occurred in Egypt; it rapidly turned into an outright rebellion. Allenby was sent by the British to quench the fire. He failed. Lord Milner tried under a commission, and his commission finally admitted that Egypt should be granted limited independence.

On February 28, 1922, Egypt gained her independence from the British, with the latter retaining the right to defend the Suez Canal and to use Egypt for military operations in so doing; to defend Egypt from foreign interference; to protect foreign interests in Egypt; and to maintain the control of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan.

Thus Egypt became one of the "independent" African states. A constitution was drawn by the people (1925), which made her one of the world's constitutional monarchies. There is a parliament, composed of a Senate and a Chamber of Deputies; two-fifths of the Senators are appointed by the King, the rest by the people. There is a Cabinet and a Premier, both responsible to the Parliament. In 1936, there was an Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of Alliance signed in London. According to the terms of the treaty, England was allowed to maintain for twenty years a military force up to 10,000 men and 400 airplanes at the Suez Canal "till such time as Egypt could build up a force sufficiently powerful to take over such duties." The British were also allowed to use

Alexandria and Port Said as naval bases, and their troops could be moved over Egyptian territory.

When the second World War began, Egypt found it necessary to comply with the terms of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of August 26, 1936, mentioned above. In Article 7 of that treaty, it was said: "The aid of His Majesty, the King of Egypt, in the event of war, imminent menace of war, or apprehended international emergency, will consist in furnishing to His Majesty, the King and Emperor, on Egyptian territory, in accordance with the Egyptian system of administration and legislation, all the facilities and assistance in his power, including the use of his ports, airdromes, and means of communication. It will accordingly be for the Egyptian Government to take all the administrative and legislative censorship necessary to render these facilities and assistance effective."

Under these reciprocal treaty obligations, Egypt immediately threw herself on the side of the Allied nations. On September 7, 1939, Egypt broke off her diplomatic relations with Germany. There has continued, in spite of the 1936 Treaty, an anti-British sentiment in the Nationalist, or Wafdist Party. They are anti-British from the nationalistic point of view. When the war broke out, they were suppressed (but nobody is sure of what may be their influence in the future); enemy aliens in Egypt were rounded up; all military preparedness got under way; censorship and food regulation were established; planes and anti-aircraft artillery were placed on active duty, and played no small rôle in the defense of Alexandria.

On June 12, 1940, Italo-Egyptian diplomatic relations were severed, and Egypt placed at the disposal of Great Britain all her air and naval bases, ports, and lines of communication.

Arguments have been raised as to whether Egypt was not coerced into this war by pressure from Great Britain. Egyptian newspapers were vocal on this point. The fact that the Ali Maher Pasha Cabinet was replaced by Hassan Sabry Pasha "in the interest of national unity" is suggestive of some kind of pressure which cannot be confirmed from any official sources during this war.

Whether Egypt was coerced or not, Lord Halifax denied in the House of Lords that any pressure was put upon Egypt to enter the war. It is pertinent, however, to note that even after September 16, 1940, when Marshal Graziani's army moved against Egypt, some important Cabinet members refused to declare war. Because of this, four Cabinet ministers of the Saadist party resigned under pressure, and martial law was declared throughout Egypt. In November, Hassan Sabry Pasha died, and Hussein Sirry Pasha became Prime Minister, with no change in policy. This new Cabinet was announced on July 31. It contains no Unionist members, nor does it receive the coöperation of the Wafdist (Nationalist) Party.

A change occurred on February 4, 1941, following the visit by Sir Miles Lampson, the British ambassador to King Farouk. On February 2, the Hussein Pasha Cabinet resigned and the Wafdist leader, Nahas Pasha, consented to form a new Cabinet. The Parliament was dissolved, and there was a general election with the Wafdist Party controlling the new Parliament. Egypt went on supporting the war.

No better concluding remarks to this section can be found than the words of Mahmoud Hassan Bey, Egyptian Minister to the United States, who on December 10, 1941, said:

"I can assure you that Egypt has lived up to her treaty obligations both in letter and in spirit, as borne out by the following facts:

"1) In supporting and accommodating the British Forces in Egypt to the best of her ability.

"2) In safeguarding and protecting the lines of communication, thereby contributing to the flow of materials to the front, while protecting the rear of the British Army.

"3) In lending her harbours, aerodromes and communications to the British, thus giving them supremacy in the Mediterranean.

"4) In raising the provisions so vital to the maintenance of British troops, and in linking their supply lines.

"All this Egypt has done whole-heartedly, even to the extent of entailing privation upon the civilian population."

THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

In a discussion of the cultural conflicts in the Union of South Africa it is essential to go back and trace the history of the Union, as the origin of all cultural patterns are found in the traditions established during the history of a country. And for the understanding of conflicts the patterns must first be clarified.

The colonization of South Africa began in 1652, when the Dutch East India Company established a trading station at the Cape to serve as a half-way stop on the route to India. Because of its fertility the settlement attracted colonists from Holland and Huguenot refugees from France. It grew both in size and importance, to such an extent that England later deemed it too valuable to allow it to fall into Napoleon's hands.

This was the beginning of English contact with the Dutch community (by then residents at the Cape for over one hundred years), and the strife between the two may be traced from that point on. The English language, the English settlers, the English missionaries among the Hottentots, the English law freeing slaves (in which all Dutch capital had been invested), and the English policy of appeasing the native cattle raiders along the frontier, so antagonized the Dutch population that the 1830's saw an exodus of great numbers of the population from the Cape.

In search of freedom from British domination, and with the aim of establishing an independent republic, these *voortrekkers*, as the South Africans called the pioneers, set out in their ox-wagons to brave the hazards of "dark," unexplored Africa.

These voortrekkers are the ancestors of about 50 per cent of the South African population, and in this "Great Trek" one finds all the traditions of the Dutch people—*Afrikaners*, as they call themselves. The voortrekkers were extreme Calvinists, and their isolation from any other group emphasized their Calvinism. The Bible was their only book; it was their law and code for life. Moses and Aaron were their heroes, and to the trekkers their travels paralleled the wanderings of the Children of Israel in their search for the Promised Land.

From the Bible they justified their attitude towards the black man. "Hottentots? Hottentots were one's possessions, and there was the end of it. Had not the Bible definitely degraded the descendants of the unfilial Ham? 'Cursed be Canaan. A servant of servants shall he be to his brethren . . . God shall enlarge Japheth and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant . . .'" [5] And so, accepting the word of God as sufficient, the Afrikaners (now *Afrikanders*, English rendition) began to hand on, from that early date, the pattern of treatment of the native South Africans which still predominates today.

As they trekked north they developed the "commando" system, a highly militarized system of units banded together under a leader rather than for an ideal. They met as they advanced northward the Kaffirs, a virile black race, who were being chased south by conquering northern tribes, and it was to deal with these clashes that the commando system was developed.

From these early times in the history of the Afrikaners, their inability to remain united among themselves has been one of their constant handicaps. When the trekkers reached the fertile country in the north, the leaders quarreled among themselves and split to form three separate republics in the three provinces: Natal, the Orange Free State, and the Transvaal. Natal, however, was the domain of Tchaka and his ruthless Zulus, who massacred thousands of these trekkers. Tchaka was subsequently murdered and succeeded by his brother Dingaan, a ruler as dauntless as himself. The trekkers were, however, to defeat the Zulus and the day, the sixteenth of December, is commemorated with religious services throughout the Union as Dingaan's day. Natal was soon taken over by the British and has always been the most British of the four provinces. Even today this is true, and the Dominion Party, the extreme pro-British party, has its stronghold here.

The majority of the Natal trekkers joined the other two republics which had set up their governments following the commando organization. It had a simple structure with the leader, or president, democratically chosen, but with autocratic powers. These

[5] S. G. Millin, *The South Africans*.

people were agriculturalists; they loved large tracts and farms with the freedom these offered, and hated the very idea of trade and industry. They lived under patriarchal domination at home, but all gathered together twice a year camping near the church to celebrate *nagmaal*, the regular religious festival.

The disruption of the two republics came with the discovery of gold and diamonds: diamonds in the Orange Free State and gold in the Transvaal. These two states were soon to be among the highest producers of both gold and diamonds in the world. In 1938 the Union produced 38.6 per cent of the world's total gold production, 12,161,391 fine ounces as contrasted with the 4,243,895 fine ounces produced by the United States, the second largest gold producing country in the world.[6] Between 1921 and 1938 South Africa's diamond output was the second largest in the world, the largest having come from the Belgian Congo, amounting to 41,624,302 metric carats, with the Union's output amounting to 34,958,970 metric carats.[7]

When the discovery of gold and diamonds took place in South Africa in the 1880's, and the richness of the deposits was realized, there was a tremendous influx of population into the two republics. The speculators came pouring in so fast and furiously that the Dutch farmers, or Boers, were completely bewildered by this upheaval in their simple agricultural lives. Towns sprang up over night and the population increased with such alarming rapidity that the Boers feared they might be outnumbered in their own states. To prevent this, President Kruger of the Transvaal attempted to restrict franchise to those people who had lived in the state for fourteen years. This was the most important reason for the organization of the Jameson Raid against the state, a raid having the tacit permission of Cecil Rhodes, the English arch imperialist of the nineteenth century. This raid failed, but was the direct reason for the declaration of the Boer War.

To go into the details of this war is beyond the scope of this work, but by all accounts it was an imperialistic war staged by

[6] *Official Yearbook of the Union of South Africa*, 1940, p. 827.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 850.

Great Britain to win control of the rich mineral resources of South Africa. In justification of the war, it can be said that Great Britain has ever since attempted to make the end justify the means. South Africa was paid sums of money for rehabilitation—a rough estimate being £14,000,000—and vastly larger sums to reinstate industry and commerce and for the development of the country. Apart from the financial payment, the South African states were granted responsible government within the British Empire, culminating in Dominion Status for the Union in 1933, which established it as a sovereign independent state whose only ties with Great Britain are membership in the British Commonwealth of Nations, and allegiance to the same King, who is King both of England and of South Africa.

The Boer War, however, had such an effect on the Boers as to alienate them down through the decades.

The Boer War ended in 1903 and from then to 1910 there followed a movement to unite the four states as four provinces. Its accomplishment entailed a solution of three major problems: the language of the country, the capital, and the native African question. For all three a compromise was reached. South Africa was declared a bilingual country and the Constitution provides that "both the English and Dutch languages shall be the official languages of the Union, and shall be treated on a footing of equality, and possess and enjoy equal freedom, rights, and privileges; all records, journals and proceedings of Parliament shall be kept in both languages, and all Bills, Acts, and notices of general public importance or interest issued by the Government of the Union shall be in both languages."[8] The compromise arrived at over the claims of the Cape, the British province, and the Transvaal, the former Boer Republic, was that Cape Town would be the legislative capital and Pretoria the administrative capital. This means that Parliament meets in Cape Town, but all the administrative offices and the civil service are at Pretoria, a thousand miles away. This is a very wasteful compromise, but at the time seemed the only way to accomplish unity.

[8] South African Act, 1910.

The third problem was the status of the non-European peoples in the Union. These included the native Africans themselves, Asiatics, and the so-called "colored" people, who are mulattoes and are not classified as Europeans. The census of 1911 shows that the population figures were: [9]

European	Natives	Asiatics	Colored	Total non-European	Total Population
1,276,242	4,019,006	152,203	525,943	4,697,152	5,973,394

The real Africans themselves went to the towns, mines, or European farms to seek work. The final agreement was that in the Transvaal and Orange Free State, the former Boer republics, no native African or colored man, with or without education, may vote—a notable limitation. In Natal they have a theoretical franchise, and in the Cape only the male African and the colored man may vote—and then only if they can pass an education and property test—and even in Natal they cannot sit in Parliament. *The Africans and the colored men are the only voters in the Union who have to pass tests.* There does exist in the Union government a department of native affairs which theoretically looks after their interests. This department, with the allocation of white parliamentary representatives chosen by the native college electorate, is how the white man appeases his conscience.

The table given above shows the population of the four provinces of the Union, as of 1911. Between that year and this—a period of 32 years—the total figure has increased 60 per cent, from approximately 6,000,000 to approximately 10,000,000, made up as follows: more than 7,000,000 Africans; some 600,000 mixed stock (or "colored"); 220,000 Indians; and a little over 2,000,000 Europeans, of whom 57 per cent are Boers, 34 per cent British, and 9 per cent other nationalities.[10] The native African population in the Union is thus roughly 70 per cent of the whole.

Let us look briefly at the life of these seven million Africans in its political, economic, and social phases. In legislative representa-

[9] *Official Yearbook of the Union of South Africa*, 1940, p. 1000.
[10] See Albert Q. Maisel, *Africa: Facts and Forecasts*, New York, Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, p. 213.

tion this seven-tenths of a population has as its mouthpiece seven Assemblymen—and these are white men "elected" by the Africans. The white population (see numbers above) is represented by the remaining 146 members of the House of Assembly, together with 32 Senators composing the Upper House of Parliament. As to what 6 or 7 white men can say for 7,000,000 black people, against 146 plus 32 other legislators, who speak for two and one-half million white, the reader's guess is as good as the writer's. However, there are potential aids to assist the reader in estimating the amount of good that a half dozen white representatives can do a suppressed African population of 7,000,000. Here are a few major facts:

I. *Land Ownership.* Citizens of South Africa, the original sons and daughters of the soil, are restricted to "a series of native reserves." In Natal this reservation encompasses 43 per cent of the total land area; in the Cape Province, 8.75 per cent; in the Orange Free State, 0.2 per cent; and in the Transvaal, 3.5 per cent. That is to say, 70 per cent of the population of the Transvaal owns less than 4 per cent of the land, and in the Orange Free State 67 per cent has 0.2 per cent of the land! The bulk of the Union's African population thus lives on land owned by aliens, and pays rent to their overlords for the privilege of being virtual slaves to the latter.[11]

II. *Labor and Labor Legislation.* By this land policy, and the equally spectacular tax system that is its complement, the native African in the Union is forced to work for the Boer farmers and the British and Dutch mine owners. After a while this condition began to benefit the Africans. For they acquired skill both in agriculture and industry, and with it relatively high wages. To nip this most undesirable trend in the bud, the government immediately resorted to "color-bar" legislation, some of which barred all the Africans from the best-paid jobs and from any which a white man might want, and some of which, though not actually embodied in the law, barred them from participation in professional activities and higher education.

Thus a large proportion of the Africans find themselves effec-

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 215.

tively restricted to rural life, with wages for their labor kept down by the legislation noted above. They work for the European owners either as voluntary laborers or as contract hire, or as "squatters" (comparable to "sharecroppers" in the United States). The latter work an allotted area and pay rent either in produce or in labor. The living conditions are, of course, as degraded as the people; the laws, and those who enforce them, see to that.

III. *The "Pass" System.* The pass laws of South Africa, by which "natives" are "kept in their place," form one of the phenomena of the white-against-black struggle of South Africa. In 1809 the Pass Regulations of the Cape Province "drew the line" for the Hottentots there. Later, the Transvaal and the Orange Free State introduced Pass Laws, which helped to insure labor from the Africans for the fast-developing diamond mines. The year 1923 saw the passage of the Native (Urban Areas) Act, controlling the entry of Africans into the cities. By this act it became legal to expel any African from an urban area on the charge that he had failed to keep a job. In 1925 came the Native Taxation and Development Act, which required Africans to carry "night passes" between 9 P.M. and 4 A.M., if on the streets. Finally, in 1937, the Native Laws Amendment Act was passed, which enabled the authorities to transfer what they considered "excess" native labor from the cities to the rural farms, thus providing cheap farm labor. Police were authorized to enter premises and to search without warrant, if they were convinced that an African was working there or as being accommodated otherwise, in contravention of the Native Urban Areas Act of 1923; and in the rural areas Africans must show a pass before they can even move somewhere else. If the employer did not approve of the move, then, of course, there was no moving. A single person may have to carry as many as three passes at the same time, including an area pass, a night pass, and a traveling pass allowing him to move from one place to another seeking employment. Failure to carry these passes may subject the offender to debarment, arrest, incarceration, beatings, and other forms of the blessings of civiliza-

tion. Such, in sketch, is the "whiteman's problem" of South Africa.

THE DOCTRINE OF CONFEDERACY

In *Life Magazine* of December 28, 1942, General Jan Christiaan Smuts, the Prime Minister of South Africa, suggested the grouping of "little" colonies into big units; in his own words: "Thus British colonies in the West Indies or in the Far East or on the African continent could be grouped with larger powers assigned to the group, and corresponding decrease of power exercised in London." He further suggested that these colonies would be helped by a more highly developed "neighbouring commonwealth, such as . . . South Africa, . . ."

According to the *West Africa Pilot* of September 20, 1941, J. H. Mushet, M.P. (South Africa), once wrote: "Among the things South Africa is fighting for is her right to leadership of the Native races on the African continent." Mr. Mushet really referred to all indigenous Africans when he said Native races, for he continued: "How best to recognize and develop the kingdom of Haile Selassie is a matter of which the Union [of South Africa] is closely concerned. Not only have our soldiers earned the right to a big say in the future of Abyssinia, but political and strategic considerations on the African continent demand that the Union Government should be consulted at every stage."

General Smuts was rather quite tactful in his general statement concerning African colonies in *Life Magazine*. But fortunately, Mr. Mushet has made the point clear that the South African Union Government has an aim and "right to leadership" of all of the more than one hundred and seventy million indigenous Africans on the continent. What a grand ambition!

Without belaboring the point, let us also consider what the West African press said about Mr. Mushet's South-African leadership of the Africans in Africa. The editorial in the *West African Pilot* of September 20, 1941, was inflamed. The anger of the writer is evident. Failing to control his resentment, a Nigerian

wrote in reply to Mr. Mushet: "INDEED, the echoes of Democracy [South African Brand] sound very discordant and repulsive. . . . Such nonsense! Such fantastic ideas! Such hokum! That the white people of South Africa of such ilk should claim that because they had sent troops to East Africa, they are therefore entitled to decide the fate of all indigenous Africans, throughout equatorial Africa, is preposterous. In fact, if this view is conceded, then there is no reason why the people of West Africa should not equally claim that because they sent first-class fighting men . . . to East Africa, therefore, they are also entitled to decide the fate of the ethnocentric South Africans." This shows how far the racism of South Africa has created a very serious and collective indignation in other parts of Africa—particularly in West Africa. (Nigerians feel that since Nigeria is second only to India in population in the whole of the British Empire or Commonwealth, South Africa cannot rightfully claim any special position on matters affecting Africa.) People of West Africa resent what they call "South Africanism," for the editorial quoted above continued: "We [Nigerians] must be serious in viewing this issue. It is not a false alarm. It cannot be easily and peremptorily dismissed with official curtness. . . . It is a revelation of South Africanism. . . . South Africans claim that they should have been consulted after the last war with reference to the 'protection' of Africans." Then the Nigerian writer asked: "Were we consulted? Did we not shed our blood in the German Kamerun? Did we not die in German East Afrika? And what was our reward? Was Nigeria made safe for Democracy? South Africa's war aims strike at the root of our freedom and existence and we must not be silent."

According to London correspondence to the *West African Pilot*, General Sir Andrew Cunningham, Commander-in-Chief in the Abyssinian campaign which finally restored the Emperor Haile Selassie, has revealed that, "Until now, all praise was given to the white South Africans and Rhodesians, but it can be revealed that it was the Natives of the Gold Coast, Nigeria, and the King's African Rifles, who broke the backbone of Italian resist-

ance on the entire Kenya and Somaliland fronts after a series of brilliant attacks." He also was able to announce that it was the Nigerian troops who captured the capital of Somaliland; and "these same Nigerian troops" through their "lightning advance" recaptured Harrar, the birthplace of Haile Selassie, and the second largest city in Abyssinia.

With this knowledge that it was the West Africans who "broke Italian resistance for South Africans" in East Africa and with the feeling of the racial evils practiced by white South Africans against indigenous Africans, a human rage throughout Africa was aroused by the gesture of South Africans pointing toward an assumption of leadership over all the citizens of the African continent. One often wonders whether the minority South African whites ever pause to think of the inevitable developments that may ensue as a consequence of the continuation of their insufferable racial atrocities against their numerically superior neighbors. If the League of Nations had the right to interfere with the slave practices in Ethiopia and Liberia, then just as properly it can be strongly suggested that the International Peace Conference should set up a machinery to crush not only all the Nazist practices and doctrines in Germany, but also the similar racial doctrines of South Africa. In a decent world no country should have representatives at the Peace Conference with what amounts to slavery still existent at home. If by the doctrine of confederacy, General Smuts or Mr. Mushet believe that this war is being fought by the Americans, Russians, Chinese, English, and Africans in order that Mr. J. W. Mushet, M.P. (South Africa), shall be given his "right" to become the lord of "the Native races of the African continent," and extend his "Pass System" to the borders of Nigeria, Ethiopia, and other African countries, then we shall ask them to listen to Pearl S. Buck who said: "If the white man does not now save himself by discovering that all men are really born free and equal, he may not be able to save himself at all." [12] This warning is more than pertinent and prophetic for the South African whites.

[12] Pearl S. Buck, *What America Means to Me*, John Day, New York, 1943, p. 19.

ETHIOPIA

Ethiopia, or Abyssinia, is a kingdom in the northeast of Africa. It is bounded on the northeast by Eritrea and a part of Somaliland, on the south by Kenya, on the west by the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. The area of the country is three hundred and fifty thousand square miles and in 1939 the population was estimated to be ten million.[13] Ethiopia has been described as "a mountain garden surrounded by desert." Those who have visited the country lay emphasis on its fascinating climate, which is no less delightful than its peculiar mountain scenery, kept bright by uniform, temperate, summer-day weather and rarefied mountain air. There is a marked difference between the table land and the surrounding low lands. Naturally, the low-land areas are hotter and more inclement.

The geographical position of Ethiopia accounts largely for the continued national handicaps to which the country is subjected, as far as commerce and industry are concerned. Abyssinia's frontiers cover three thousand miles, of which the British controlled about two thousand miles and the Italians eight hundred miles, leaving only two hundred miles under French control. Ethiopia has no direct contact with any sea. The Italian territory of Eritrea and French Somaliland stand between it and the Red Sea in the north. British Somaliland separates it from the Gulf of Aden in the northeast. Access to the Indian Ocean is interrupted by Italian Somaliland on the east. The terminus of its most important railway, starting from Addis Ababa northward, is located in Djibouti, a French seaport. Thus surrounded, Ethiopia has found it practically impossible to develop trade routes which go straight to the sea without running into the territories controlled by one of the European powers. Nothing could be exported or imported without the permission of one of these powers. That is a dark picture for the development of any country, and more so for Ethiopia, which has scarcely passed the stage of feudalism. No

[13] See *The World Almanac*, 1942.

progressive economic life of a nation can be expected where access to the sea is rendered difficult and uncertain by the presence of more powerful economic competitors. If the European powers which surrounded Ethiopia were peaceable and equitable with each other and with Ethiopia, the picture would be different. But we live in a world in which we allow ourselves to indulge in conflicting interests and contradictory economic ideologies. Some nations are autarchic, others are mercantilistic, and like the "Brave Six Hundred," Ethiopia stands in the center while economically there are cannons in front of her, cannons behind her, cannons to her right, cannons to her left, while her people ride with poverty into the valley of death.

Some of the important products are cotton, sugar cane, date palm, coffee; hides, skins, wax, barley, millet (dhurra), wheat, gesho, and tobacco; there are also rubber, and iron which is manufactured into various implements such as knives, hatchets, and spears. Gold, sulphur, potash, coal, and copper are also found. Of all these, the principal exports are hides and skins (from cattle, leopard, monkey, sheep, and goat), grain, coffee, civet, wax, and Abyssinian butter. The main imports are salt, fuel such as gas and kerosene, glass, soap, sugar, building materials, and cotton yarns.

A description of Ethiopia's predominantly mountainous terrain, given by C. F. Rey, follows: "The country for miles seems to have been rent and twisted by convulsions of Nature forcing it into every kind of contoured form. Masses of volcanic rock are piled one on the other—huge clefts and fissures show their raw rough edges as if split with some gigantic axe—brown earth, red earth, black earth, all piled and mixed together, a sort of vast battlefield of Titans. And on to the west rising out of all this chaos is a miniature Abyssinia; hundreds of hills, cone-shaped and pointed, leading on to larger flat-topped hills beyond, typifying on a small scale the mountain ranges and the plateaux which constitute the goal."[14] True to this mountainous nature, the country has heavy rains during the season from June to Septem-

[14] *The Real Abyssinia*, J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, 1935.

ber, followed by a dry season from the end of September to mid-June.

In some areas of Ethiopia, such as in Dirre-Daoua town, life is modern and progressive. There are paved roads, an efficient water supply, beautiful modern homes, and hotels. In other areas may be found a mere aggregation of huts surrounded by bushes. Addis Ababa, the capital, is peculiarly attractive. It is situated at a high altitude, 9,000 feet above sea level, among the Entoto mountains. It is here that the Cathedral of St. George is situated, surrounded by colorful gardens in the center of which the statue of Menelik stands. The Gebbi Palace, which is also the Government headquarters, adds to the attractiveness and importance of this smallish capital, with its sixty thousand inhabitants.

Ethiopia is composed of various peoples. There are about seventy different languages now in use and three hundred dialects. One of the major tribes is the Abyssinians, who form about a third of the population. They live in the northern section covering the provinces or kingdoms of Amhara, Gojam, and Tigre; in the central section they inhabit a part of Shoa. Then there are the different branches of the Galla race, who inhabit large tracts of territory in the south and southwest. On the western borders live those who are more negroid than all others, and who are known also as Shanbala. There are Moslems on the eastern boundary, Ogaden Somalis in the southeast, and the Flasha, who are supposed to be of Jewish descent, in the Semyen district, a very mountainous area. Space will not permit an extensive description of the variety of peoples, languages, and local customs in Ethiopia. One can imagine the extent of these varieties when one realizes that even the Abyssinians, mentioned above, within themselves vary in type owing to intermixtures which took place in the remote past.

Considered as a people, Ethiopians, like other Africans, have been misinterpreted in many ways by most travelers and hasty observers. But there are, of course, also a few patient and penetrating critics who see the people as they really are. The former group sees Ethiopians as cruel, indifferent, uncompromising,

cunning, barbarous war-mongers who hate strangers. The latter group, including writers of an inimical state of mind against foreigners, does not explain the soul of the real Ethiopian about whom C. F. Rey confessed when he wrote: [15] "I am bound to say that my impressions [in Ethiopia] were of the happiest, and during the whole of our sojourn in the country neither my wife nor I experienced even discourtesy, far less hostility, from the many Abyssinians with whom we came in contact, high or low, either in Addis Ababa or during our 'treks' about the country. Politeness and courtesy, indeed, are in my view striking characteristics of these people, and in this opinion I am supported by other travelers who had greater opportunities than I of putting the matter to a test."

I do not intend to enter into either the legendary or the authentic past history of Ethiopia in this short survey. It is undeniable that knowledge of the past helps understand the present for the molding of the future, yet, although it may be highly interesting to speculate how Ori or Aram, one of the thirty-five sons of Adam, reigned in the year of the world 970–1030, i.e., 4470 B.C.; how the Kam dynasty started its reign after the fall of the Tower of Babel, 2635 B.C.; how the Agdazyan dynasty, which ended in 982 B.C., preceded the Dynasty of Menelik, which was ushered in the year after the death of Christ; how in about 1000 B.C. the Queen of Sheba visited Solomon at Jerusalem, and how to Solomon and Makeda Menelik I, the founder of the dynasty which flourishes in Ethiopia today, was born; or how Menelik I removed the Ark of the Covenant from Solomon's Temple and thereby brought to Ethiopia the Tables of the Law as originally received by Moses; surely these are all most interesting, but I do not believe they have place here, not because of their controversial nature, but because they throw no light on our interest in the present-day Ethiopian question, or on the facts of our international relations. Our attention must therefore be directed to a brief survey of the beginnings of the penetration into Ethiopia of the Western powers, and its consequences on the life

[15] *Op. cit.*

of the people. For, isolated and comparatively insignificant as Ethiopia is in the family of nations, there are a great number of inescapable lessons for us to learn from the intrigues of European powers which finally burst into international carnage.

Like other parts of Africa, Ethiopia was a land of mystery to Europeans. Several expeditions, some of which never reached there, were sent to discover the "Land of Prester John," as the Portuguese mistakenly called Ethiopia. So far, there is no true basis upon which to state categorically which of the European nations first arrived in the country. There is, however, the early authentic record (about 1478) of Francisco de Branca Leone of Venice. He was a painter, and some of his handwork is still found in Ethiopia. His personal record, if any, is not available to us. Another traveler was Pedro da Covilham, who traveled under the auspices of the King of Portugal with the aim of discovering the "infinitely wealthy Land of Prester John," supposed to be somewhere in Africa or Asia. Covilham came to Ethiopia in 1490. Don Rodriguez da Lima, a missionary, had remarkable adventures in the country in 1520–1527. A priest, who traveled under Lima, was the first European to give a known recorded account. Christoforo da Gana was another remarkable traveler to Ethiopia, followed later by some more European missionaries, the relics of whose works still remain in parts of the country.

In 1769 James Bruce, an English traveler, arrived and was in the area until 1772. Some other English travelers followed after that. In 1835 the first French explorers visited Ethiopia, and the period of breaking through the seclusionist walls of Ethiopia had started actively.

Great Britain was the first European government to conclude a treaty with Ethiopia. That was engineered by Major Harris during the reign of Sehala Selassie, King of Shoa, Gallas, and Ifat. This treaty of friendship was signed in 1841. As usual, other European powers followed the footsteps of England. In 1843 M. Rochet d'Hericourt concluded a treaty between the France of Louis Philippe and Sehala Selassie. Another important treaty was concluded in 1849 between England and Ras Ali.

The trap was set and the history of the inevitable tragedy of imperialist penetration into that part of Africa began. Ethiopia was unconscious of the possibilities of European power politics and of the principle of "balance of power," which resulted in the encirclement of Ethiopia, a process which has already been mentioned and which needs some examination.

Let us begin by describing the characteristic aims of the European powers particularly interested in Ethiopia. The European powers which concerned themselves with the country were the British, the French, and the Italians. German interest was never very great, except in her activities with Emperor Lej Yasu during the first World War.

The major British interest in Abyssinia has been in relation to the Sudan in the north of the country, and Uganda in the south. For instance, the British did not waste any time in protesting to Ethiopia about elephant and cattle hunting by the Ethiopians across the frontiers in the Sudan and British Uganda. The British, however, had been interested in the problem of "the utilization of the water of Lake Tana and the Blue Nile for the irrigation of the Sudan." In connection with this, the Anglo-Italian Agreement of 1925 can be explained. In this Agreement, the British sought the support of the Italian government in securing the waters of Lake Tana and the Blue Nile for irrigation purposes in the Sudan. Italy sought three major things:

(1) That the British support her attempt to construct a railway across Ethiopia to link up Italian Somaliland and Eritrea.

(2) That the British recognize Italian claims to exclusive dominance in the whole of the area through which the proposed railway would pass.

(3) That the British not oppose economic concessions which Italy demanded in the same zones.

In this Anglo-Italian agreement, the Ethiopian government was not consulted, although, as we see, all that was discussed had a direct bearing on her interests. The Ethiopian government protested to the League of Nations against the proposed encroachment of England and Italy, but their protest was forgotten when

assurances were given by those two powers that the integrity and independence of Ethiopia was not to be disturbed.

The French interest in Ethiopia was also definite. As early as 1839 a mission was sent out to secure a trading post near the Red Sea. That resulted in the alleged purchase of Edd from Danakil chiefs for two thousand dollars. This mission, sent by Cie Nanto-Bordelaise, arranged for the transfer of the territory to the French Consul at Massawa. But owing to the fact that the French government did not ratify the treaty, it was never implemented, and later the area became Italian.

The next effort made by France, however, was fruitful. In 1862, Musha Island, which had previoúsly been in the hands of the British, was purchased by the French directly from the Danakils for fifty thousand francs, and between 1884 and 1885 France obtained French Somaliland. This was accomplished because France had become afraid of the Italian establishment to the north. That transaction, as I have already mentioned, blocked any Ethiopian outlet to the sea in the north.

The later part of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century witnessed the decline of Italian prestige in Ethiopia. For example, on February 12, 1893, Menelik denounced the Treaty of Uccialli of 1889 between Italy and Ethiopia, and only strained relations continued to exist between the two countries. These exploded into the open conflict in which Italy was defeated at Adowa in March, 1896. But as the sun of Italy was setting in Ethiopia, the morning star of France was rising. In 1894 a French company was granted a railway concession from Jubiti to Addis Ababa, and by the Anglo-Franco-Italian agreement of 1906 the French were allowed to carry on railway construction to the east. It has always been the dream of France to draw a line demarking her "sphere of influence" from East to West across the continent of Africa. But in all this France declared—as did the other two powers—that her policy was to maintain the independence and integrity of the Ethiopian government. There is no room here for a detailed story of the Franco-British cross purposes in Ethiopia.

Concerning Italy, we may say that the chief original interests of Italy in Ethiopia have been: (1) exclusive Italian economic oligarchy in western Ethiopia; (2) construction of a railway which will run through Ethiopia, west of Addis Ababa to join Somaliland and Eritrea (all Italian territories); (3) economic concessions in all areas through which the railway runs. But as time went on, Italy became more and more megalomaniacal under Mussolini's regime until the Italian policy frankly repudiated the old principle of maintaining the political integrity of Ethiopia. Italy was no longer concerned with mere concessions. She wanted total control of the country, as a prerequisite to a greater venture in Italo-African empire-building under fascist leadership.

In Cavour's Italy attention was called to the need for Italo-Ethiopian "friendship," and two years after the unification of Italy, correspondence was carried on between Victor Emmanuel II and Menelik, King of Shoa. The serious interest of Italy in Ethiopia was aroused by the bitter experiences of the French occupation of Tunis, and also by the French establishment of Obock as a naval base. The Italians definitely decided not to allow themselves to be duped or overtaken in East Africa. They had started their African Empire in 1880 by the formal possession of Assab which had originally been purchased in 1869 for 6,000 M.T. dollars by Sapeto, an Italian citizen, for the Rubattino Company. But that was all that they accomplished for some time. But later the aim of Italy to make Ethiopia an empire became clear in the field of diplomacy.[16] It will be remembered that Italy was just becoming a strong nation after 1870. It was one of those ironies that Italy, which had just emerged from its long struggle for an *Italia irredenta* should immediately launch a campaign for an *Italia expansione*. It is not logic, but it happened. Italian zest for life and nationalism expressed itself in viewing the French and British expansionist programs with envy and alarm. This emotional outburst was precipitated by the Berlin Congress of 1878 when Tunis, which Italy anticipated getting, was assigned

[16] Compare E. Work, *Ethiopia, a Pawn in European Diplomacy*, The Macmillan Co., 1935, p. 54.

to France. Restless Italy turned her attention to Tripoli and to the Red Sea areas.

After the Italian formal occupation of Assab, there ensued a continuous friction and misunderstanding between Ethiopia and Italy, although Ethiopia was in a state of civil unrest resulting from the conflicts of her rulers. This Italo-Ethiopian friction culminated in the Treaty of Uccialli. It was called the Treaty of "Friendship and Commerce" and was signed May 2, 1889. The boundary lines between Ethiopia and Italian possessions were determined and certain additional areas were assigned to Italy. Menelik also agreed to give Italy a preferential position over other states by granting special privileges. It was Article XVII of this treaty which became the bone of contention between Italy and Ethiopia. The Article reads, according to the translated Italian text: "His Majesty, the King of Kings of Ethiopia, consents to avail himself of the Italian government for any negotiations which he may enter into with the other Powers or Governments." Italy interpreted this clause to mean that Ethiopia had become an Italian protectorate, and should do business with other nations only through Rome. We know that the Ethiopian government thinks otherwise about the Italian version of this article of the treaty. Nevertheless, Italy at that date was under an illusion of diplomatic triumph. Antonelli, who concluded the treaty, was looked upon as though he were a new Pompey riding back to Rome with tribute. And when the Ethiopian representatives visited Italy, the streets of Rome had the atmosphere of a royal reception, for here were the representatives of a state soon to be annexed into a new Roman Empire.

As I said, all was illusion, however, for Menelik was soon to repudiate not only the Italian interpretation of Article XVII, but to denounce the whole treaty in 1893, only four years after it was signed. But during that brief period Italy tried in every way to get the other European powers to recognize her claim to Ethiopia. But the hands of destiny were moving against her. French and Russian influences were creating increasing unrest in Ethiopia against Italy. England was lukewarm about lending help. The

friends of the Triple Alliance were concerned over the trend of events, and Italy was left in anxiety to face the stormy weather raised by her imperialistic diplomacy.

The relations between Italy and Ethiopia became terribly strained. Menelik repudiated the Treaty of Uccialli; the offers of mediation made by other European powers were rejected. The end was an open conflict, and Italy was defeated in the Battle of Adowa in March, 1896.

Italo-Ethiopian relations remained at an impasse until the treaty of 1906, the Anglo-Franco-Italian agreement. Outstanding among other points in that treaty was the fact that these three powers planned to coöperate for their own mutual benefit in East Africa, and declared they would each respect the political integrity of Ethiopia.

Twentieth-century Italy has had two objectives in Ethiopia. One is psychological: to revenge the Italian defeat at Adowa. The other is imperialistic: the persistent policy of *Italia expansione* to which Mussolini gave a new vitality when he declared that "government is not so much a thing to be expressed in territorial or military terms as in terms of morality and the spirit. It must be thought of as an empire—that is to say, a nation which directly or indirectly rules other nations." To this effort fascist Italy turned her attention; she exploited every psychological moment in that weakest period of European morality in which diplomatic relations affecting small nations sank to a new low. She tried to invoke the theory of the white man's supremacy. England knew the gravity of this situation, not only from the national but also from the racial point of view. In the House of Commons, August 1, 1935, Sir Samuel Hoare said: "We in Great Britain and our friends in France have been engaged in a wise and generous policy of eliminating issues between the white and the colored races. We do not believe in the inevitability of these color clashes. We have worked not to dig a gulf but to build a bridge between Europe and Africa. . . . A war that claimed to be a war between the white and black races would throw intolerable obstacles in this path. . . ." Then he continued: "If the Italian Government

have complaints to make against the Abyssinian Government, let them make those complaints in the proper and regular manner."

But it may be useful to recall that during the Great War, Italy had to be bribed in order to desert Germany and join the Allies in 1915. This was accomplished by promising unspecified colonial concessions in Asia Minor and East Africa. Italy regarded this promise as including the long-sought-for Empire—Ethiopia. At the time of the Paris Peace Conference, Italy pressed for the accomplishment of this end, but England was cold.

In the meantime, Ethiopia desired to enter the League of Nations. Italy and France supported her even when England was reluctant. Italy's representative was Count Bonin-Longare who defended the Ethiopian position by saying that the presence of Ethiopia in the League would be a great honor to all the nations since the desire came from "a distant nation [Ethiopia] which had hitherto remained outside the great international movements, but which, by the remarkable tenacity with which it had been able to preserve its religious faith and national character throughout the ages, had acquired titles of nobility to which due justice must be paid." Ethiopia became a League member, promising to satisfy all requirements.

The next episode was the Italo-British "understanding" of 1925 in which Britain under the Baldwin government was ready to let Italy satisfy her age-long ambition to build a railway in West Ethiopia, and achieve the economic domination of that area. The Emperor of Ethiopia protested in 1926 to all the League members through the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. He passionately pointed out that none of the European nations meant any good to Ethiopia. He could cite none of them which did not intrigue "to possess themselves of Abyssinian territory and to destroy their independence." The British denied the Emperor's interpretation that the Italo-British notes meant an economic division of Ethiopia, and Italy gave a similar reply.

A treaty of amity was concluded between Italy and Ethiopia in 1928, however, in which it was agreed, among other things, to submit any dispute which could not be settled diplomatically, to

arbitration and conciliation, and not to use force; they also promised each other to refrain from any action which would endanger the independence of each other.

But Italy was not satisfied. "One of the Italian grievances is that instead of allowing Italy to step in and develop the country, the Emperor has actually been himself attempting to civilize and modernize his own people." [17]

It was necessary now for Italy to find a pretext to pounce upon Ethiopia. It was found at Wal Wal—a frontier where Italian and Abyssinian troops started the incident which led to the final outburst, the invasion of Ethiopia. Ethiopia brought the matter to the League, questioning the right of Italy to be at Wal Wal. Italy made counter demands. First, that her right to be in Wal Wal should not be questioned; second, that Ethiopia render an apology and salute the Italian flag; third, that the Ethiopian government pay indemnity to the Italian government for the Wal Wal incident. The Ethiopian government demanded an arbitration on the whole issue of the frontier, including the Wal Wal incident. She also stated her willingness to accept the findings and decisions of the League's Council. But the whole story is dark if one has time to review all the delays and regrettable negotiations which took place between Italy and other powers, particularly England, from April, 1935, when Ethiopia first requested the Council of the League to arbitrate down to the exile of the Emperor. Lloyd George reprimanded his nation during these half-hearted negotiations with Italy when he asked in reference to Italy and England: "What are they discussing? Are they discussing how they are to prevent Signor Mussolini from destroying the independence of a friendly Power which is a member of the League? Not at all," said Lloyd George. "They are just discussing what measure of economic and strategic and political control can be given to Italy without war. How they can deliver Abyssinia on the cheap to Italy—that is the question which is being discussed."

Between expediency and remorse, appeasement and self-inter-

[17] "Italy and Ethiopia," *International Conciliation*, November, 1935, No. 314, p. 452.

est; between half-measures and callousness, unpreparedness and political astigmatism the Great Powers of Europe left the Lion of Judah and all his peace offensives and prophetic appeals to flee his throne from Fascist cruelty. A great many leaders foresaw the significance of this upheaval. General Smuts said: "There is no doubt that the invasion of Abyssinia by Italy will arouse anxious feelings all over Africa between white and black, and may have serious results." Then he continued: "The African does not yet look on the European as an enemy, but this trouble may raise intense racial and color feeling and make the position of the European much more difficult. It may spread all over the African continent, and you may find that every African will sympathize with Abyssinia."

General Smuts was right. The effect of the Italo-Abyssinian war on the African peoples was electric. In Nigeria, it became a national concern with all groups—both young and old. In fact, the writer's middle name "Abyssinia" was taken after the Italian invasion of that country. It has a definite meaning to him in that it reminds him of what European diplomacy means to the security of Africa. The impression of this affair is strong among Africans, but I believe that the present friendly and helpful coöperation between Ethiopia and the United Nations may help to change the bitter feelings. There is also the hope that the principles of the Atlantic Charter in which America participated may be applied equally to the African nations and may become an incentive towards the promotion of a new confidence in the African that Ethiopia will not become a virtual protectorate of any outside power, either on the basis of the present inter-related help which each of the Allied Nations gives the other or on any other pretext. One may trust that Mr. Atlee was right when he said in his speech in Reading that the British government has done away "with the jingo conception of imperialism" because it has come to realize the importance "of true brotherhood and collaboration with our brethren overseas."

Ethiopia, Manchuria, Czechoslovakia, and other small powers will remain in the history of diplomacy as an eternal echo in the

adamant ears of power politicians. "History always has its comic side," said the editorial in the *Nigerian Spokesman* of October 20, 1943, then it continued: "Yesterday His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie . . . was in exile with no home and with few sympathizers. Today, he is back. . . . Yesterday, Vittorio Emmanuele III of Italy was a proud conqueror, surrounded by the Fascist gang. . . . He was Emperor of Ethiopia. . . . Today he is being hunted by his own 'cousin' Il Duce, and he only retains his throne at the mercy of the United Nations." And then the editorial warned: "Let the fate of Italy and the Italian King remind those who still believe in power politics of the Ides of March . . . the Nemesis of God has no respect for race, colour, creed, or position . . . whatever a man sows that shall he reap. Let Italy be a lesson to all."

This is not an expression of bitterness or of joy over iniquities. I am only stressing that the theme of this book is to point out some of the unfortunate factors which lead to a continued conflict, in spite of human effort to avert wars. The trouble is that some national leaders grow fanatically nationalistic, and the big powers often try to sacrifice the interest of the under dog at whatever cost to the latter, only to find that the interest of all is at stake.

We have read the brief survey of the national characters of the so-called independent states in Africa. These three states are only a small fraction of the states on the continent. The so-called dependencies, protectorates, or colonies form more than 95 per cent of Africa both in population and in land area.

It will be impossible to deal with these dependencies one by one here. But in the next section we shall attempt to deal with the most outstanding of the African dependencies under the British. That is Nigeria. There are reasons for my choosing Nigeria for a detailed treatment. First, Nigeria is the most populated nation under the British Empire outside of India. Second, it is the most important—in population and area and natural resources—in the whole of West Africa which is so important to America today. Third, her political advancement is historic in that it has

been called the laboratory of the Native Administration System in which the African has shown a remarkable political capacity. It may therefore serve us best to deal with Nigeria, and thereby to get an idea of the aspirations of the Africans who are not considered independently in this book.

CHAPTER IV

It Is Not in Our Star

"No mortal life is attained by a changeless fortune."

SOPHOCLES

IN THE GRIM STRUGGLE of men to attain their ends, they are often alone—with none to succor or to hinder. Fortune is a tide. It ebbs and flows, and there is nothing in this our mortal life that can ever be looked upon as determined. If our world is purposive, it is nevertheless inconclusive; if it is mechanical, it is yet in flux. The shaping of human destiny, the creation of a new world, is within the almighty hands of human enterprise.

And what is destiny? Is it an achieved end? Is it an accomplished fact? Is it our colossal imaginations and dreams turned into reality? Is it a preordained event—something that is bound to occur? For instance, was Hitler destined to come, or is he a product of circumstance, and his achievements really the results of German enterprise? Was Napoleon a destined immortal of France, born to conquer and be conquered, or was he an offspring of the French Revolution? Is the white man's supremacy in things material at this stage of social evolution a destiny, or is it a result of the culminated achievements of other races made large by enterprise? Where is destiny? Are the African people destined to be colonial peoples and to be forever content with the share of a dog at the table of international harvest?

No! Destiny is an impartial god—it follows him who wills, attends him who must, joins him who can. There is no destiny if there is no enterprise, no destiny if there is no plan, and no destiny where there is no determined spirit.

Apart from the enduring speech of Wendell Willkie and per-

haps a few others, the many spokesmen of our Allied Nations refer to Africa as of a settled problem—the problem of a people who want to be divided into blocks for colonially ambitious Europeans. To them, the hand of destiny has written on the wall that all peoples love liberty except the Eastern nations. To them, if an Anglo-Saxon or an American talks about freedom, it is understandable. But if an Indian or a Nigerian talks about that same freedom, he is considered a dangerous character, and one likely to become a political prisoner.

I am saying that history does not bear out the belief that the people of the Middle and Far East, of Africa and India, are without a plan and without the yearning spirit for freedom characteristic of any other people. In West Africa, for example, many centuries of active life mark the inhabitants as purposive, creative, ingenious, freedom-loving, until the usual turn of fate finds their aspirations temporarily capsized on the wayside of European imperialism. With the exception of a few, no well-known civilization in the past existed and then vanished without some connection with West Africa.

During the most prosperous days of the Pharaohs of Egypt, when they were not contented with the wealth they commanded, when the metals known to them were few, and when they wanted to expand, the quest for gold drove the Egyptians from the south of the Sahara to the "Land of the Black People," now known as the Sudan. They finally came to Lake Chad on the northeasterly tip of Nigeria, through Burland to the Gold Coast, and "it seems very probable they may also have reached what is now Lagos." [1] Macrizi, in his *History of Egypt*, tells us that during the time of Joseph's stewardship in Egypt, an expedition was sent out which reached as far as Borgu, Northern Nigeria. Joseph's explorers, we learn, invaded Nigeria and conquered some of the rulers, forcing them to give gold and to pay tax. This situation did not last long. The Nigerians rebelled, and even the strongest military leaders from Egypt were unable to subdue them. The Egyptians were

[1] Desmond W. Bittinger, *Soudan's Second Sunup*, the Elgin Press, U.S.A., 1938, p. 40.

driven out of the Sudan area and even "lost some of their own land, which they called Lower Egypt." [2]

The conquering Sudanese mingled with the Nubians (red men), intermarried, and created a mighty kingdom which rivalled Northern Egypt. These mixed black and red men began to assimilate some of the Egyptian culture. They learned to write and to build like Egyptians. From this group, the famous Queen of Sheba sprang and made her memorable trip to see Solomon of Judea. And from this "meeting began the line that fathered Haile Selassie, Lion of Judah," [3] whose country the wretched and atrocious Mussolini invaded in 1936, but who is now back as ruler of his kingdom.

Jewish history, too, is not without the influence of the Sudanese. During the time when the mixed black and red men were flourishing in Lower Egypt, other racial elements came from the East. These new elements were directly connected with the story of the Israelites in Egypt, as detailed in Genesis. They moved gradually from Upper to Lower Egypt and intermingled with the Sudanese from Nigeria, the Gold Coast, and other West African countries. These Jewish elements joined the Sudanese in ruling Lower Egypt, and their prosperity threatened the existence of the Pharaohs in the North. The strong Pharaohs therefore arose and put the Hebrews into slavery. This forced them, after much wandering, back to Palestine.

During the stage of the Sudanese-Hebrew joint life in Lower Egypt, the Sudanese acquired Semitic blood through inter-marriage, and vice versa. Further, when the Hebrews returned to their Eastern home, they were again invaded by Syria and by other Eastern countries. Some of the Hebrews escaped to Adamawa and Sokoto, and into the Niger basin. Probably those in the Niger basin are the tribe now known as Ibo, whose way of life is a distinct, although a slightly modified, version of Hebrew customs and traditions.

Legends and traditions of other tribes of the Western Sudan,

[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 41.

though more particularly of the Ibo, reveal that some West Africans have Egyptian-Hebrew backgrounds, and must have contributed many things to those ancient civilizations. Mr. Bittinger, a white missionary in Nigeria who was convinced of these facts by his personal experience with the people, wrote: "It may be that they [Nigerians] have an even longer heritage than those of us who now seek to serve them." [4]

Turning to the Phœnicians, and beginning with the time when King Hiram of Tyre became a good friend of Solomon, and when both, for the purpose of trade, built boats to sail to the east coast of Africa (whence Solomon gathered his cedars of Lebanon to build his beautiful temple), we find that the Phœnician sailors frequently sailed through the Straits of Gibraltar, turning southward through Madeira and the Canary Islands, to the west coast of Africa.

There is no doubt that they reached the Gold Coast and the Lagos port of Nigeria, and the Cameroons. "It is recorded that at the Bight of Benin where Lagos is now located, they met Egyptians who were mining gold in the interior of Nigeria. . . . They captured some female chimpanzees and took them back to Carthage on the North Coast of Africa, wrongly claiming that they were human inhabitants of West Africa." [5] This is further evidence that West Africa had direct contact with Phœnician civilization.

Before Christ was born, the Greeks established trading centers in North Africa. Through the medium of desert Africans, Greek culture in the form of pottery, architecture, ornaments, and copper and bronze works, found its way into West Africa. The Germans found clay models of Greek architecture in Adamawa, a province of Nigeria. Whether the Nigerians copied from the Greeks, or the Greeks from the Nigerians, is a moot question. The important point is that there *was* some copying, an inescapable phenomenon of human society.

The earliest accurate writings by white men on the Sudan were

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 45.
[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 46.

the records made by the Greek traders and explorers who traveled by permission of the Pharaohs, and of others who were employed in the Pharaohs' armies during the struggle in Nigeria and other West African sections. It is not strange, therefore, that the first maps of the Niger, Benue, Lake Chad, and the Senegal basins (all originally supposed to be a single river with an unknown source and mouth) were made by Homer and Herodotus. These maps, it is unnecessary to point out, were drawn before any Mungo Park or any David Livingstone had left the shores of Europe for exploration in Africa.

We now turn to the Romans after the Punic Wars (246–146 B.C.) in which the struggle for supremacy between Carthage and Rome ended in favor of the latter, and the Romans not only conquered the Carthaginians but deprived them of their holdings in Egypt. North Africa therefore came under the undisputed influence of the Roman political organization. The Romans built roads and established libraries, schools, and other amenities, and their imposition was not confined to Egypt. Some of their generals traversed the desert to the Sudan, which they found to be fertile, being the basin of the Niger. Knowing, as has already been stated, that the Greeks whom the Romans conquered penetrated into Nigeria as far as Adamawa, we have no doubt that some of these Roman generals also reached Nigeria. The Roman influence persisted until the demise of the glorious Roman Empire.

When the Roman Empire collapsed, West Africa was left to herself. It was during this interlude that such distinguished West African monarchies flourished as those of Ghana, Melle, and Songhay. They grew in grandeur and influence for more than two centuries without disturbance from the West. The first modern European powers to come into close contact with West Africa were the Portuguese and the Spaniards. About 1485, Benin City, an ancient Nigerian kingdom which still survives, was visited by the Portuguese. And it was during this period that John Alfonso d'Aveiro established a trading center with the Benins, who, as the Portuguese account shows, were advanced in metal work. An interesting event occurred at this time in Benin Kingdom. When

d'Aveiro asked the King of Benin to become a Christian, the King suggested that if d'Aveiro could provide him with a Portuguese lady for his wife, he would agree to the proposal. "John d'Aveiro returned to Portugal and put this proposition before the women of Portugal as a Christian opportunity or call. At least one woman volunteered, and the contract was carried through. She went out to Benin." [6] From this union some recent Kings of Benin have apparently been able to prove their descent.

The Portuguese traded all along the West African coast for about a century. They found a high degree of civilization prevailing in the West African countries. They noted that political organization, religious life, and the social life of the peoples were of a high order. They visited the Yoruba kingdoms of the South, and may have had some knowledge of the Emirate kingdoms of Northern Nigeria and of the Ashanti kingdom north of the Gold Coast.

It will thus be seen that d'Aveiro came to Benin in 1485, before Columbus discovered America in 1492. This means that while the Portuguese were trading on the west coast of Africa, with its long-established civilization, the North American colonies were yet unborn. England, however, was preparing the conditions that would eventually bring about a demand for slaves to work on American plantations. This demand finally caused the Portuguese to establish a slave trade on the west coast. The inhuman traffic contributed to the setback from which Africa is suffering even today. The Spaniards came after the Portuguese, and other Europeans—the Dutch, the French, and the English—followed in respective order. They initiated a slave trade that robbed Africa of some of her best manhood. The contribution of these Europeans to Africa in that particular stage was entirely negative. They introduced inhumanity, alcoholic liquors, and white men's diseases, all of which have become the "black man's burden." With this turn of fate, Africa became the imperfect child of nature once again. Every white nation, even Belgium, found its slaves on the

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 52.

continent of Africa. From then on, African kings learned that they must surrender their sovereignty or accept deportation. The title "King" was changed to "Chief," so that even now if an African ruler calls himself "King," it sounds ridiculous to the uninformed white observer. The economic resources of Africa have virtually passed completely into the hands of Europeans. A glance into one of the recorded histories of West African kings may enlighten our perspective.

Between the first and third centuries, A.D., the Ghana Kingdom arose, with Walaber and Timbuktu as its chief towns. Black rulers sat on the throne of the Ghana Kingdom—embracing the Niger and Senegal basins. They had banking and postal systems. They had writers and scientists. While their geologists and astronomers were probing into the secrets of nature, discussing the causes of earthquakes and so on, the Europeans were looking at these phenomena as supernatural. In the field of medicine, records show that the first successful surgical operation for blindness was performed about the year 1000 A.D. by a black surgeon. Indeed, the answer is that in the Ghana Kingdom of West Africa, the inhabitants were rich in music and art, engaged in the practice of law and medicine and the construction of buildings and roads, and thoroughly interested themselves in all of those things that have tended to make any people great.[7]

The Kingdom of Ghana ended with its conquest by the Melles. The Melle Kingdom was more extensive than that of Ghana. It could boast of cities and libraries, and its postal system was extensively developed. This was shortly after 1100 A.D. At the time this large and expansive African empire was in its glory, most European nations were still in the feudal stage and living in small social units. According to Bittinger, the following are some of the philosophers recorded who were produced by West Africa during this period: [8]

[7] See Bittinger, *op. cit.*, p. 53; also, Lady Lugard, *A Tropical Dependency*, London, 1905, pp. 78-296.

[8] Bittinger, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

"Abidel Hakem	about	870
El Bekri (*Roads and Realms*)	"	1050
Ibn Said	"	1250
Ibn Batua	"	1303
Abdurrahman Es-sadi (*Tarikk-es-S Soudan*, History of the Soudan)	"	1550
Ahamed Baba	"	1650
Sultan Bello	"	1600"

And the following were some of the famous rulers:

Mansa Musa	about	1280
Sonni Ali	"	1450
Ali Ghajidenie of Bornu	"	1472
Abkia Mohammed Abou Bekr	"	1492 [9]

The famous tour of King Mansa Musa is worth noting in this connection. Bittinger gives a most vivid picture of the event:

"Mansa Musa set out in 1324 A.D. to tour his extensive domains and to visit Mecca. His caravan consisted of no less than sixty thousand persons. The baggage was carried by camels, but twelve thousand slaves formed his personal retinue. All wore tunics of Persian silk and when he rode five hundred marched before him each carrying a staff of pure gold weighing sixty-four ounces. [Was gold worth thirty-five dollars an ounce? If so, this was more than a ten-million-dollar display!] Eighty camels carried each three hundred pounds weight in gold. The value of just his money load works itself out to be more than fifteen million dollars at present gold valuation. Yet it is recorded that because of his generous gifts along the way and because of the heavy expenses of the trip for so large a caravan, he had to borrow money to get home again. His loans were repaid at once. One can but imagine the daily food required by a moving caravan of sixty thousand people slowly touring an area of thousands of miles in extent. Mansa Musa was black. . . . His chief judge who worked under him was white. He brought with him a Spanish architect

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

who built for him a palace at Melle of which, unfortunately, no trace remains." [10]

The Melle Empire succumbed to the Songhai Empire. The Songhai, after years of a vigorous and prosperous reign, eventually came into armed conflict with the Moroccan Kingdom, and was defeated in 1536. The hand of fate showed itself again. The Moroccan King, who was the conqueror, ordered the writers, educators, philosophers, scientists, along with the results of their works brought to Morocco, and most of these records were destroyed. It was estimated that over three hundred books on medical science were abolished. Concurrently, the Mohammedan Turks who conquered Egypt ravaged through to Sudan in West Africa. This closed the glorious phase of West African power. That civilization was to find daylight in North Africa, where it was finally destroyed by the Turks during their slave-trade era. And West Africa was left alone in the early period of modern times.

And Africa, which has known her Pharaohs, which has seen her Ghana and Melle Kingdoms, which knows her Ethiopian Kingdom, which adores the Oba of Benin and understands the language of the Songhai, and whose Obis are yet alive—the Africa of the Ashanti Kingdom—is now branded a people without political organization, a people to go through political tutelage under the A, B, C mandate classification of the white man!

Viewing the situation from a wider perspective, the inhabitants of the East—all those who do not consider themselves white people—are indignant at the white man's assumption of political supremacy. The people of India have revolted, and the Japanese are winning propaganda victories with their talk of an East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere. The Chinese are awake, and let me quote Dr. Sun Yat-sen, who asserted:

"Let us compare the Asiatics with the Europeans. Formerly the belief prevailed that only the white people possessed intelligence and ability. They monopolized everything. We, Asiatics,

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 55-56.

thought that there was no way of acquiring their assets for bringing our nations into wealth and power. Therefore with regard to that question, not only we, Chinese, but all the Asiatic nations had lost heart. In late years Japan has suddenly risen and has become a first-class power in the world for wealth and strength. Since Japan was able to become wealthy and powerful, infinite hopes have sprung forth in the various peoples of Asia. We realize that formerly the prestige of Japan was not greater than that of Annam [French Indo-China, under Japanese rule at present, with an Indian as Mayor of Penang] and Burma today; now Annam and Burma cannot be compared with Japan." [11]

Dr. Sun expressed not only the inner feelings of all the Asiatics, but also those of the Africans. Looking at our past, and observing present developments, Africa and Asia can no longer accept the burden of imagined inferiority. *It is not in our star!* Africa takes heart and faces her world like a man. Let the West be proud to shake hands with its brothers from the East, for we know now that whether white or black, yellow or brown, we have one cause to serve, one God to obey, and one Devil to hate in order to live safely and peaceably in "one world."

[11] Dr. Sun Yat-sen, quoted by K. Shridharani, *Warning to the West*, Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, New York, 1942.

SECTION II—NIGERIA

CHAPTER V

Nigeria—A Leading Protectorate Nation

THE COUNTRY AND ITS PEOPLE

WE HAVE GONE THROUGH what are known as the independent countries in Africa, but we know that these four independent nations form a very small proportion of both the population and territorial area of Africa. It is not our plan to deal with all the territories in Africa in this volume. We are, of course, interested in the affairs of the whole continent and its peoples, but for the benefit of the reader, it may serve a better purpose to deal rather more in detail with one of the so-called protectorates in Africa. In doing so a double purpose may be served. First, it will give the reader an authentic insight into the real life and culture of the indigenous African—his political past and his present aspirations—even though he is supposed to be incapable of governing himself. Second, by a thorough understanding of one specific country, a true evaluation of other African countries under an alien imperialism could be made with comparative ease.

Nigeria, which is more densely populated than the United States,[1] has been chosen for treatment as a leading so-called protectorate nation in Africa, with an indigenous population. Politically speaking, it is the opinion of the author that the Gold Coast nation is at present the most articulate of all the African nations under European rule, and that Nigeria probably comes next. But

[1] Density of population:

Nigeria:	1921—54.86	United States:	1920—35.5
	1931—56.50		1930—41.1

from the point of view of population, area, natural resources, and future possibilities, Nigeria has no equal at present. Taking the whole of the British Empire, Nigeria is next only to India in size.

If we superimpose the whole area of Japan on the surface of Nigeria, it will cover less than half of the latter; the total area of the United Kingdom would cover scarcely a quarter of the same territory; and, to bring our comparison nearer home to American readers, if we suppose the Nigerian land-area to be spread over the United States, it would cover the states of Maine, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida. The fact is that Nigeria represents the largest country in Africa under British protection, and the largest populated country with the single exception of India in the whole British Empire.

Official reports on the population of Nigeria differ; some, like the British government's there, say it is between nineteen and twenty millions, while others put it as high as twenty-two millions. The real fact is that even the English, who claim to do so, do not really know the population of that strange country with its strange family system.

Some of the Nigerians themselves believe that it contains more than thirty million people today—which is a mild claim when placed alongside J. A. Hobson's [2] figures of between twenty-eight and forty-three millions. With every apology to our "official records," it must yet be said that although it is extremely difficult to generalize, the real fact is that in a country where the sole motive for census taking is merely to collect the poll and cattle taxes from the people (and we know that "wherever and whenever the British government was set up over African tribes, the first preoccupation of the Governor was to make the Africans concerned to pay the cost"), no promising method is left untried by the poor peasants to escape the count. We in Nigeria know how impossible it is even for the Nigerian natural rulers

[2] J. A. Hobson's famous work, *Imperialism: A Study*, London, Allan and Unwin, third revision.

themselves, supported by the British government, to get the family heads to give a correct figure of the adult members of the families.

One reason for this is not far to seek. Nigeria in the main is essentially agricultural. Only a very small proportion of the populace receives any kind of wages. There are no industries encouraged on a large scale, except the plantations and mines. In 1938, the plantations employed 2,180, while employment in the mines averaged 30,000. The government-controlled Udi coal field employed 1,600, the Railway 14,000, and the Public Works Department 11,000. This means that in a country containing, for us, about thirty-three million people, its industry can only employ 58,780 of its inhabitants. In addition to the fact that those employed are so few, it must also be realized that the wages are too small to mean anything more than a hand-to-mouth existence. Those working in mines are classified as unskilled laborers, and they are paid between four pence and nine pence in some areas, and between five pence and eighteen pence a day in others (one penny = two cents). The independent farmers in villages and farm areas have two handicaps: they are not encouraged by the government or by any organized groups of their own to improve their technological methods for larger and easier production; and where organizations do exist they are not yet strong enough to have a bargaining power which will enable them to sell profitably. The result is that while they produce too little with a maximum expenditure of human energy, they are also bound to accept a minimum price from their European buyers, who, in turn, fix the price of manufactured goods, sold to the people in any way they please.

The most serious part of this situation is that there is a definite increase in the unskilled populace, because education is still the luxury of the wealthy. There is no public education established by the British government. There are, of course, a few schools sponsored by the local governments of Nigerian rulers, such as are to be found in Kano, Northern Nigeria, but they are comparatively negligible, as the rulers themselves are also limited

in their power as far as finance is concerned. The rulers are limited because the citizens are too poor to pay appreciable taxes, and even where taxes are paid, the rulers have little access to the budget itself, except in a certain few cases.

All these things complicate the problem of the census. Nigeria is not yet an individualistic society. In cities like Lagos or Port-Harcourt, you may find a phase of Western life, but the greater proportion of Nigeria is still divided into large family units. The heads of the families, being poor for the reasons given above, cannot pay the poll-tax for their dependents. Most dependents, being unskilled and unemployed, cannot support themselves. There is a tendency, therefore, for the family heads not to give the whole number of the family members of taxable age. And for these reasons, the official record, which states that Nigeria has nineteen or twenty million inhabitants, cannot, from all indications, be accurate. (This understating of the population, which has its basis in ill-adapted social factors, is dangerous because it conceals the suffering of more millions of the people, besides concealing potential manpower in cases of national emergency.)

The country is situated 4¼° north of the equator on the Atlantic coast, extending 14° northward, between 2 2/3° and 14½° east longitude. On the north of Nigeria is the French Niger Territory, on the east is the French Cameroons, on the west is Dahomey, and on the south is the Atlantic Ocean.

A conspicuous thing about the relief map of Nigeria is the presence of the letter "Y." The Niger and Benue Rivers, flowing from opposite directions, meet at Lokoja to form the letter "Y." The Niger has its source in Sierra Leone and flows eastward into Nigeria near Dakingeri, through Bussa, and Baro, then southeastward until it comes to Lokoja; the Benue has its source near the Cameroon Mountains on the opposite side, and, flowing westward, enters Nigeria, flows through Yola, Ibi, and Makurdi, until it comes to Lokoja. The two rivers, flowing thus from east and west, merge at Lokoja, and from there flow southward to the Atlantic as one stream. Lokoja is located at the fork of the letter

"Y," and when I stopped there to see this phenomenon, I was greatly impressed to see the triangular formation of a portion of land which grows narrower as it comes nearer to the point where the two rivers merge. The tip of land there, seen from a boat far away, seems like a pointed sword. One cannot imagine how romantic it seems to people in a canoe or boat coming in either on the Niger, or the Benue near Lokoja. The romantic aspect of it is that while coming near Lokoja from the north, the land divides these two rivers. But going farther south, we find ourselves getting into wider and wider expanses of water, until one suddenly realizes that there are two rivers, one brown in color owing to the presence of brown particles of sand from the east and the other of a rather queer combination of brown and green hue, the result of sediments from the west. Here the two rivers join forces and "ride" down together into the Atlantic Ocean with great turbulence and speed, through a water-course marked by falls and rapids.

The fishermen and traders of Nigeria afford a striking example of the results of this Niger-Benue combination. In order to understand this, one has to imagine oneself on the shores, observing endless crews of canoe men coming in from Yola in the east and Baro in the west. They are all sailing to Oritsha to sell their merchandise, such as "alibo" (flour), and it is an interesting thing to see how these two rivers bring these two different groups together at Lokoja to make them the same people. They sing different songs as their canoes move southwards. They cheer themselves up while the tropical sun bends its light on the glittering Niger. The wind blows, and the twigs bend; the waves sometimes rage, but Mother Niger is kind to her children. Life moves. To the right and left are the sun-baked shores beckoning the jolly groups to rest. Night and day they follow the Niger in its course southward, selling their goods to their Nigerian brothers. When they have sold all, they buy new stuff they need and resume their journey homeward. Thus they come and go, year in and year out, Easterners and Westerners, buying and selling,

laughing and crying, and fighting and loving. And there ends the function of Mother Niger—to bring her sons and daughters face to face with one another.

Nigeria has four main physical zones, characterized by different typical forest regions. On the coastline, including the Niger Delta, is a stretch of swampy, mangrove forests. North of the mangrove forest is an area, between fifty and one hundred miles, of what may be called a region of palms. Here there are numerous palm trees growing naturally and wild. Palm oil and palm kernels are produced abundantly. Other useful plants, such as mahogany, oak, rubber, cola, cocoa, and cotton grow there. The staple foods are yam, coco-yams, and cassava. Between this region and the plateau region is an expansive evergreen forest, rather open and without the gigantic trees that are found in the preceding region. Traveling by train from Enugu to Kaduna Junction, one enjoys the scenery produced by this vast evergreen area as one passes through Otoukpom, Makurdi, and Aguyaragu. These exceptionally fertile areas produce abundant yams and other staple local root food stuffs, as well as spices. Going northward as one leaves the Kafanchan areas toward Kano, one observes a remarkable change. The forest becomes more and more open and the weather grows drier and colder. A little way northeast of Kafanchan are the Bauchi Plateau and the Naraguta tin mines. Here lies Jos township, which is supposed to be the Delhi of Nigeria—a health resort. Some Europeans inhabit Jos because the climate is sub-tropical, that is, temperate and sub-tropical—anything but equatorial. Strangely enough, however, Jos never proved very healthy for me during my holidays there. Some of my friends from southern Nigeria who visited Jos made the same discovery: that one man's health resort may mean illness for another.

As one comes up to Zaria and Kano, the change culminates in a perfectly open region with constant winds and biting cold. There are no large trees, and such as are present are few and far between. But there is a wonderful grass-land there, and this region raises the greatest number of cattle in the whole country.

In the months between November and February the climate is dry and cold. People wear overcoats, but they are not apprehensive of the cold weather as people are in America or Europe. There are no snow and no sub-zero readings; yet no Nigerian from the south can understand what Shakespeare means by the "dry contagion of the Night" (in *Julius Cæsar*), unless he has spent an evening in the open area of Sabon Gari, Kano, or in other northern areas, like Zakirai, Rimjin, or Nguru. Nor can one appreciate the benefit of mosquito nets unless one sleeps in one of the train cars in the railway station at Nguru. I had a memorable experience once while I was at the latter place. I cannot tell the number of mosquitoes that surrounded my bed while I lay beneath many blankets and cotton sheets. The only way I can describe it is to say that it seemed to be raining mosquitoes all around my net. Nguru station is not typical of all northern or southern towns so far as mosquito-raiding is concerned, but it is one of the areas in this open forest region at the extreme end of Nigeria. It is also the end of the railway line in the north—or was at the time I was touring Nigeria in 1937—and the sanitation there is very poor.

There is not much rain in this open forest region, as compared with the south, where there is a heavy rainy season between May and September and a hot season the rest of the year, with one modification during the *harmattan* season (November to February), when it is cold, dry, and windy. In contrast with America, however, Nigeria has tropical climatic uniformity. The most striking thing about America's climate is its two extremes; excessive heat in summer and excessive cold in winter. It amazes me to hear radio announcers during the winter say how people die of cold in New York and other cities, and in the following summer I hear again that some Mrs. "X" and Mr. "Y" died of heat prostration. There is no such thing in Nigeria. Extremities of climate are unknown. Even during the winter or summer in America, the temperature fluctuates from day to day, even within the same day. One morning in New York City in the month of March, it was so bright and warm that I was delighted to go out

without an overcoat. But before I returned home later in the day it was so cold that I had to borrow a friend's overcoat to be able to breast the weather. One of my Nigerian friends once remarked that if the American people changed as much as their weather, the law of contract would not mean a thing here. You cannot make a contract with the American weather; you can with the Nigerian. The really hot summer in America is much hotter than normal days in Nigeria, so that any healthy American, healthy in body and adventurous in spirit, can endure easily the ever-tropical Nigerian weather, just as healthy Africans enjoy themselves in America in spite of the extremities of the climate.

Let us turn to the people themselves. Nigeria basically is divided into family units. I think that by family a man in the Western world usually means a man, his wife, and their children. When a Nigerian talks about family, he means something else. He means a group often of related families and individuals who have a common, remote ancestor. Many families in Nigeria can trace their lineage back many generations. These families occupy specific units of land-areas and call them "villages." They may expand into towns.

When you come to a village like Umuezearoli in Onitsha or Ndiakaeme in Ndizuogu, you are really among the members of one family and not among units of individuals who do not know each other, as a person in an apartment building in Chicago is strange to those living on the floor with him.

Peculiarly enough, if you happen to know any one member of any Nigerian family well, you may be able to generalize on the idiosyncrasies of all the members of the family without going too much astray. But in America, every unit of three persons constitutes a different idiosyncrasy, and even among members of the same family, every individual has his own customs. Let us take a simple example. Parents in Nigeria have control over the activities of their children to a certain age, as Americans do. Suppose that an American boy goes to Nigeria, and wants to know what time it is permissible for visitors to call on the homes of his school fellows; he may ask the parents or his friend. If he

is told that ten o'clock at night is considered the last hour a visitor is expected to knock at the door, he can rest assured that that is fairly applicable to all the homes within that village or town—say of five thousand people. In America one family may want you to visit their boy not later than nine o'clock, others may say ten o'clock is "all right," and still some may urge you to come "at any time," within reason. All these units may live in the same building, but have different set rules for living. In this sense, diversity is characteristic of America; conformity is characteristic of Nigeria.

From these family units of hundreds or thousands, you get into tribal units of millions. There are ten major tribes in Nigeria: Hausa, Ibo, Yoruba, Fulani, Kanuri, Ibibio, Tiv, Edo, Nupe, and Ijaw. A few remaining others need not take our attention here. In a strict sense, the term "tribe" cannot be applied to Nigerian people with any technical accuracy. Kano Emirate, just a part of the Hausa tribe, is larger than Belgium and more populous than Palestine. I am only trying here to show what a "tribe" means in Nigeria. Some people in the Western World; when they hear that we live in tribes, conclude at once that we live in such very small, divided units that our society must be anarchic, and, therefore, require some coördination by an alien government. A tribe in Nigeria is an aggregate of political communities or national states with a fairly common traditional outlook on life and a common language. They are large states which can be compared with some contemporary European nations. Tribal organization provided a feeling of kinship among millions of peoples within a geographical area and that may have favorable political advantages. "Politically gifted people do not exist," as Spengler remarks, but one cannot deny the tradition of confidence, simplicity, responsiveness, responsibility, and loyalty inherent in Nigerian tribal organizations. This can be directed to a usefulness in a Nigerian National government as well as in the tribal groups.

Some members of the contemporary Nigerian community migrated into Nigeria in the earlier part of the nineteenth century. There were Brazilians—old traders and settlers from Sierra Leone,

and some West Indians. Their number is not large, and they usually settled in the coastal towns like Lagos. The Brazilians, Sierra Leoneans, and West Indians were originally Africans who had returned home from sojourns in other parts of the world. We do not know from what parts of Africa these groups originally came. Some of them claim to have come from Yoruba and Egba Provinces. The Sierra Leoneans who came from the Aku tribe think that the word Aku comes from the Nigerian word Eko, thus believing that they were originally from the Yoruba, Abeokuta. These groups were welcome on the whole, although there was some antipathy on the part of some Nigerians toward the Sierra Leonean immigrants. That was true in the early days, but those ill feelings do not exist to any appreciable extent now. Some people from the interior of Nigeria still call these small groups of immigrants "Ndi-mili-nnu" ("people from the sea"). They introduced pidgin English into Nigeria, since that was the only language which they spoke. It is usually from this group that one finds non-African surnames among Nigerians, like Davidson, Jones, Thompson, and so forth.

The last group to be considered is the Europeans. There is nothing like European immigration into Nigeria. After 1851, there is no doubt that people from Europe began to take a more and more active part in the economic life of Nigeria, but in spite of their interest, the Europeans never settle down. They have economic influence, but not in the way of settlement as occurred in South or East Africa. In Northern Nigeria, however, there is "the summit of absolute government control not only of minerals but of land and of all dealings therein, not only between natives and non-natives but between natives and natives." It means that the British government of Nigeria directly controls land transactions in Northern Nigeria, but "no person other than a native of the Protectorate shall either directly or indirectly acquire any interest or right over land within Northern Nigeria, without the consent in writing of the High Commissioner."

In 1921, according to the census, there were about 4,000 Europeans in Nigeria. Of these, there were 398 women, 47 children,

2,009 officials, and 1,435 traders, miners, bankers, clerks, and missionaries. Seventeen years later, 1938, the following was the classification of non-Nigerians given for the years 1931 and 1938, according to *Colonial Report—Annual.*

1931

Nationality	*Northern Provinces*	*Southern Provinces*	*Total in Nigeria*
British	1217	2474	3691
Syrian	104	235	339
German	7	258	265
French	38	108	146
Indian	39	96	135
American (U.S.)	91	35	126
Others	329	411	740
	1825	3617	5442

1938

Nationality	*Male*	*Female*	*Total*
British	3926	1661	5587
Syrian	627	191	818
German	459	111	570
French	282	62	344
American	129	156	285
Greek	149	19	168
Swiss	132	22	154
Dutch	75	16	91
Italian	62	6	68
Danish	5	15	20
Others	89	29	118
	5935	2288	8223

Thus the non-Nigerian population increased by more than 50 per cent between 1931 and 1938. There were 126 Americans in 1931, and in 1938 there were 285, more than double the number. Interestingly enough, there were more American women than men in 1938, and the same was true of the Danish people. There were five Danish males and fifteen females in 1938. These numbers may treble and quadruple in post-war Nigeria.

So much for other foreign elements that add to the total inhabitants of the country. It must be made clear that Nigeria is not composed only of rural tribal blocks. There are cosmopolitan

areas where life is like that in any Western city. "In sharp contrast with all the rest of Africa is the fact that more than half the people in southern Nigeria live in towns. Nearly a hundred of these have populations in excess of 10,000 and some are well over 150,000. Originally these towns and cities sprang up as a means of mutual protection, but they have had the effect of producing a highly developed social life, evidencing a high level of citizenship." [8] Lagos or Port-Harcourt, for instance, has practically all the attributes of English or American municipalities, except skyscrapers, subways, and such other not-so-necessary institutions. People live in cities patterned on European standards; the streets of any number of the large coastal and interior towns are paved; buses and taxicabs run throughout the city; radios are installed in homes; telephones ring in public buildings and private homes; both young and old crowd up in front of moving picture theatres; some who feel equal to it attend dances and night functions in numerous social clubs; some drive down to swimming pools and beaches on hot days; here and there are numerous tennis courts spotted with white-clad, fast moving players flashing their rackets after the day's work; young boys and girls, and even some adults, ride on bicycles from one street to another. People of all nationalities, Indians, Syrians, Italians, Americans, English, French, and the rest, find themselves amongst teeming millions of Nigerians who, while enjoying life, seem oblivious to the existence of any other world of men outside the confines of Nigeria.

We have talked about tribal organizations. Let us now examine the social structure of Nigeria. This is difficult to categorize because one cannot just say that such and such is the Nigerian social structure clearly defined, characteristic, regular, and unmistakable. The reason for this is that the country, as has been said, is grouped into those large families called tribes, and each tribe has its own special social organization. An American can readily understand this differentiation when he recalls that customs and social practices in his country differ from state to state and from section to section.

[8] Albert Q. Maisel, *Africa, Facts and Forecasts.*

Diversity in legislation in the American states reflects different social mores. Laws regarding marriage and divorce, regulation of industry, interpretations of felony and misdemeanor from one state to another are but a few among numerous examples of irregularities in the social standards of the various American states. It is the same in the Nigerian state or tribal unit. In treating Nigerian social organization, therefore, we shall employ generalities for the sake of clarity. The Yoruba tribe may have five social classes, whereas among the Hausa there may be only three.

Therefore one sees readily the difficulty involved in describing social organization in Nigeria as such. Before entering into such generalities, let us enumerate some of the fairly common social levels or values recognizable everywhere in Nigeria. (1) Whatever the differences in classification of social strata from one section to the other, the fact is that Nigerians base their social recognition either on heritage, birth, age, title, or military prestige, and not necessarily on wealth. Wealth alone did not in the past create social prestige, and if it is doing so now, it is definitely a Western influence and is not yet fully accepted; (2) all Nigerians accept the function of women as being that of perpetuating the tribe, and of being supreme in the home and master of domestic affairs (in some states they participate in politics); (3) all Nigerians accept both polygamy and monogamy as legal forms of marriage and in some states polyandry is permitted; (4) it is an implicitly accepted fact in all parts of Nigeria that all men, except as a right of opportunity, are not born equal; that politics is synonymous with ethics and religion; and that the family, not the individual, is the chief object in human society.

With these general rules in mind, we may distribute Nigerian society into the following classes: (1) kings, (2) warriors and nobles, (3) commoners, (4) strangers, (5) slaves, and (6) outcastes. These five groups represented Nigerian social classes before the impact of Western civilization. We now find the following distinct classes: (1) "chiefs," (2) the "educated," (3) the illiterates, (4) Christians, (5) non-Christians, (6) strangers, and (7)

outcastes. This second group is still in the mold, and time alone will tell what shape will finally emerge. We shall treat each of the classes briefly.

Kings

In olden days, the idea of a king in Nigeria was conceived in three main ways. In some cases the king was looked upon as a co-partner of gods—a descendant of Heaven. He was God's only interpreter to his people. He might yield his mortal frame when death came but he did not actually die. He went on a long trip to the land of his brothers and sisters—other gods. Other gods occupied the upper regions of the universe; the king owned the place below. Some of these kings went by the name *Igwe* ("Heaven"). Being a god, he had a special, unapproachable, inviolable place in the social organization. His powers were not considered earthly and offense against him was considered offense against God, which the gods would avenge. The populace might use his name for oaths. A dispute could be settled by one of the contending parties swearing *Si-ɲna-ayi* ("in the name of Our Father"). Once that phrase was used, everybody would agree that the swearer was truthful, because he could not be expected to use the king's name in vain. The king might represent a particular god to his people. This god would then be the axis on which the life of the people revolved, and who, in co-partnership with the king, directed affairs for the common welfare of the people.

In some cases, however, the king might not be only a god's representative on earth. His power originated from his being the head of the family. The allegiance of the people was then the allegiance of the members of a family to the father. In such a case the social standing of the ruler was essentially one of paternal importance. It was his duty to decide most family and public cases, impose punishment, enforce order, and furnish the people with facts and figures on matters of tradition and customs. Allegiance to him often deepened with succeeding generations of offspring and with the spread of the family, resulting sometimes in deification of his personality. In such a case, the king became not only

the paternal symbol of the state, but also the god-head of the realm.[4]

In still other cases the king's power might emanate from his military prowess or from any other great physical achievement. He might be the first man to kill a dangerous animal that disturbed the people, or the first man to arrive on certain unowned land, to claim it for, and to populate it with, his people. Onitsha kingdom, treated in the following chapter, furnishes an example of this last category.

We are not neglecting the fact that in some areas people may elect their ruler, but the danger of talking about this election is that it gives a wrong impression to the Western reader. The Nigerian idea of an election was very different from what the American thinks of during the Presidential or Congressional elections, and even further removed from what an Englishman's ideas on procedure is in the election of members of Parliament. Nigerian elections, where they existed, simply meant something like a caucus. There was a handful of men who chose the king and made decisions. For example, the Alafin of Oyo, chosen from the Ochiduwa royal lineage, was "elected" by a council consisting of seven important persons. Both men and women had influence over the choice of a king, but in any case it was hardly a popular election, as the West understands it.

Warriors and Nobles

Next in importance were the warriors. The warriors, as I have mentioned, occupied a peculiar position unlike any other in the realm. Although the king was regarded as the fountain of goodness and the interpreter of and co-worker with Heaven, the warrior, nevertheless, occupied the position of a superhuman being. In morals he was expected to be impeccable in his dealings with his family, friends, and acquaintances. In the battlefield against

[4] For example, the Obi of Nnewi is the earthly representative of the goddess Edo as well as the paternal head of the political state. He is not the chief priest of Edo, but he certainly symbolizes her and reflects her attributes in the material world.

enemy nations, his success was supposed to depend on personal virtues. If he were defeated, it was because the gods were angry at some deviation from personal virtue: falsehood, undue jealousy, conspiracy against the poor or underprivileged, or the like.

Once a soldier set out for the battlefield, there was no turning back until some heads of the enemy were captured. He had either to get a head or lose his own. Any soldier who failed to do so brought perpetual shame and humiliation to his wife and to all the members of the family. They would never excuse him until that humiliation was removed by some brave act. Soldiers were thought to be so superhuman that some believed in the immunity of generals against any bullet. Because they were the sons of the gods of war, the mortal bones and flesh of the warrior were supposed to be molded and immunized against common heat and cold, even against the fatal force of a bullet in flight.

On this background of myth, mysticism, and awe, the warrior took a supreme and unchallengeable place in Nigerian social life. On the death of a king, many slaves had also to be killed for the burial. But that was the end. When a warrior died, however, it was not considered too much to bury him with some of the heads of the *Ogalanya* (the richest nobles of free birth).

Warriors were not to do ordinary dancing with civilians or with cowards who had returned from the battlefield empty-handed. In Ibo, there were two peculiar kinds of music for brave warriors. One was *Odi*,[5] the other *Abia-Dike* [6] (the "orchestra of the brave"). Or they might dance a form of *Egwu-Ota*. Because of the awe and dignity which surrounded the position of the warriors, they could not go round boasting, and the only way to learn about them was through the music of *Abia-Dike* and *Odi*. The moment of this dancing brought an infinite joy to the brave. Whether old or youthful, the brave soldier would step out in a spirit of great pride, knowing that he was representing a great

[5] *Odi* is composed of a middle-sized side-drum and a small or large *Oyo* in conjunction with a little larger drum carried and played by the senior drummer.

[6] *Abia-Dike* is composed of drum, *oyo*, *ekwe*, *opi*, *ufie*, and is played more rarely than *odi*.

soul. He would dance, holding a sword in his right hand and pointing it above to the heavens and to all four corners of the compass where he had fought and conquered, and taken booty. It is a significant moment in the life of a Nigerian warrior. A line from the Ibo warrior-song musicians who played *Odi* for the warrior may be of interest. The drummer usually sang:

Ude Dike na ude ogalanya
Bu n'otu;
Egbue dike welu ogalanya
Gwa aka
Nso adiro ya.

In English translation it means: "The fame of the brave and that of the wealthy noble is the same; when the former dies in the battle it is not against tradition to bury his corpse with the head of the latter." It may appear strange that certain women could dance to this soldier-music, but it is true. It simply signified that women had been to war, too, and had done some conquering of their own. This should give a certain picture of what a Nigerian warrior was. He was so esteemed that he had traditional titles granted him, among which were *Ogbukagha* and *Onumba*, meaning "one man who can kill enemies in the same number as a battalion," and "one who can devastate a nation."

The soldier class in Nigeria could not possibly be separated from the nobles. Many soldiers retired and became nobles, although many nobles were born so or achieved nobility by toil and service to the state. Nobles were the owners of the land and the controllers of the material wealth of the country. They supported the soldiers and the kings. They financed wars and controlled all branches of the government. Where the kings were elective they made the choice and reported to the people. These rules were not, however, regularly and legally defined. They were followed "instinctively."

The Commoners

The commoners naturally were greater in number than were

the kings or warriors, and they had less wealth. Within this class were variations. Some might be very close to becoming nobles, some found themselves midway between eminence and insignificance, and others were at the bottom of the ladder. Among the higher order of the commonalty polygamy was usually a rule, while with the lower it was an exception. Believing blindly in the "inherent inequality" of men, the common man in Nigeria accepted his position as natural, as something preordained. Predestination was a common belief, and nobody blamed anybody else for any condition of any group. All classification came from Heaven.

Stranger Class

The word "stranger" here may be misleading. It did not imply just strangers in the form of visitors to the country. It meant some groups or individuals who immigrated into a tribe or a kingdom for settlement. A piece of land might be given them for a house and plantation. They could pay for this through service or through annual tribute to the head of the family of the landlords or to the head of the state, as the case might be. Once they settled, it was not usual to ask them to leave the place. Soon they began to feel the atmosphere of their adopted home, and eventually would join in the common life of the people.

The distinction was that they could not participate actively in politics, but, unless they originally came from an established outcaste group of another tribe, there could even be intermarriage between them and the people. They had all the protection which any other citizen could expect, but did not enjoy all social privileges in kind, since they were not full-fledged citizens. Apart from their limitation in political participation, they were occasionally discriminated against in actual social affairs, such as ceremonial dances and religious celebrations. No one would be disposed to play games with them or to contest with them in wrestling matches. All of these discriminations were not regularly observed, and there was always some overlapping in them, depending largely on the connections of the strangers and how long they

had remained in the state. After about four or five generations the distinctions largely disappeared except in political participation.

Strangers could become influential in the tribe after a long period of establishment, but never so much as to have access to the Royal Staff, as the slaves even could in some areas. In cases where intermarriage might bring their descendants near the throne, it was usually carefully avoided by some previous arrangement before the death of the ruling king. Strangers played important rôles in financing wars and in enlarging the population of the family (or tribe) to which they had become attached. Here it must be noticed that in some areas in Nigeria the state did not own the land, though it might have the right of eminent domain. All lands were apportioned to families, and should a family offer land to a group of immigrants, the latter submerged themselves in that family and became a part of them—though with qualifications.

Slaves

Originally there were six reasons for the establishment of slavery in Nigeria:

1. As a means of increasing the family population, since all social prestige was to be sought in one's family and its influence. The larger the family, the more influence it wielded.

2. As a means of lasting security for individuals who wanted to attach themselves to a larger family unit for the assurance of security and freedom from want.

3. As an indication of wealth on the part of the slave owner, who in turn used the slaves for the expansion of his economic life.

4. As a means of securing faithful servants to perform domestic tasks since there was no free labor.

5. The slave might be a free-born beautiful girl who allowed herself to be given to the army of a powerful enemy in order to avert invasion. In Ibo such a girl was called *Nwa-eji-gbo-agha*.[7] (In contemporary Nigerian Ibo, a very handsome person is most effectively described as one who looks as if he could be used as a

[7] *Nwa-eji-gbo-agha* means a son- or daughter-exchange in place of active warfare.

gift to avert enemy invasion: "*Odi ka ageji gbo agha.*" To a youngster, lad or lass, this is still a flattering compliment.)

Such a boy or girl could well have been the favorite of the king, of an important feudal lord, or of a warrior. It was all the same; he or she was marked for life. If a girl, she would be married off at once, but her stigma was not removed by that one act. Sometimes her son would be an anomaly in the scheme of things—not free, not slave. Now and then in private gossip you would hear people saying: "*Egili nne ya gbo agha*"—"his mother was given to us to avert war." Nobody would dare tell him about it or to make a joke of it, yet he would continue to be an anomaly.

Slaves might be a group of captives from the battlefield. Here we must say that one type of slave was not treated like another. Some received "more favored" treatment such as the *Nwa-eji-gbo-agha*, but captive slaves fared rather badly. Since they did not come originally to enlarge the family or to attach themselves willingly, nor yet as the voluntary alternative to war, they had an entirely different relation towards their masters, and vice versa. We cannot describe their condition as easy. It was from them that the first choices were made in selecting slaves for a burial or as a sacrifice to a god. Never were they trusted.

On the whole, the social conception of slavery in that country differs somewhat from that of the West. Nigerians did not look on a slave as subhuman, either on the basis of color or other biological attributes. A slave could rise from the bottom to the top. His property belonged to him once acquired; his rights were well protected once he settled; his descendants might continue to be slaves, but the free citizens did not make it a rule to cast this fact at them in social affairs; it was enough that they had no voice in the government—which was not surprising, since the common people as a whole, even the free citizens, never thought it their direct function to take an active part in government, except occasionally in Civil Assemblies. Only the lords and warriors duly constituted influenced the kings or councils. If and where the slave became rich or militarily important through industry or prowess, he took active part in government; he could wield influ-

ence indefinitely. The classical example of the slave Ja Ja, of the House of King Pepple, who later emancipated himself and became the King of Opobo, a state near his former master's domain, is well known. He was exiled from Nigeria by the British Government in 1885.

The Nigerian idea of slavery, then, was not that of a lower human order. The treatment of this unfortunate class was not glorious, nor was it anything to be proud of; yet it is vitally important to note the difference between the African conception of slave-holding and that of the West. The one was founded wholly and solely upon economic and social necessity, and where it is extant, maintains that essential characteristic. The other, while having a similar economic basis, developed upon a premise of subhumanism, and was animated by, if it did not actually found, the philosophy of race-superiority, which has proceeded great and terrible social crimes in national and international relations.

Outcastes—"Osu"

The most abject class to which one could belong in Old Nigeria was the outcaste class. In Ibo they were called *Osu*. Their number was not very large, and today they are hardly recognized as such.

An *Osu* was one, or a descendant of one, dedicated to a god or goddess. This custom originated in the spirit of sacrifice aimed at abating the anger of, or striking a bargain with, or paying tribute to a god. Suppose that a noble wanted children but had none; a "prophet" might predict that if a man would be dedicated to a certain god, many children would be born. The overpowering desire for children would not allow the man to hesitate in choosing among his slaves a person to be dedicated to the god. Or it might be that a general, upon embarking on a war, would make a bargain with the war-god that in case he came home victorious he would dedicate one or more persons to the god. This reminds us of how, in Greek literature, Agamemnon sacrificed his daughter Iphegenia on the advice of Calchus, the seer, in order to appease the wrath of Artemis, thus enabling Agamemnon to destroy

Troy successfully. If that general in Nigeria came back victorious, he had to take the number of persons promised to the high priest, who would then dedicate them to the god. On the other hand, a man might commit homicide unintentionally, his victim being, say, a person of the clan or tribe. He would not only feel guilty before the law of the land, but would also be much more worried at the thought that he had mortally offended the god of the clan or of the state to which both he and his victim belonged. He would feel that retribution was bound to follow, unless he reconciled the god by giving up another person to the god as a sign of confession and repentance.

Once a person was so dedicated to the god, he was pronounced "*Osu*." From then on he and all his descendants were barred from living the common social life of those around them. They were ostracized from dances, sports, and government; they could not participate in funeral ceremonies or in any other aspects of the common social life. They and their descendants could never intermarry with any other class of the society, unless by mistake. The bar against them was exceedingly rigid. They lived in a different quarter within the environs of the god to whom they belonged, usually near an uncleared area—a jungle—almost existing with the wild animals and birds of those regions. Others of the same human family lived in comparative security and comfort, and even in the luxury of great mansions set in extended grounds and parks, depending upon their class and financial status.

The *Osu* had other strings around his neck: he was not allowed to eat where a free citizen ate; he could not drink from the same cup; he could not use the same chair; he could not dream of walking side by side with the free man on the same street—in fact, the *Osu* was an "untouchable" in practice as well as in theory. Nobody associated with him, nobody enjoyed life with him, none dared quarrel or fight with him. If he got irritated to a point of fighting, the free citizen had to take to his heels. There was a tradition that if a free citizen by mistake, either in playing or fighting, caused a drop of blood to run out of the body of an *Osu*, that free citizen was bound to dedicate another man to the god to

whom that *Osu* belonged. It was mainly to avoid this expensive penalty that every free citizen refrained from association with the *Osu* class.

But the *Osus* had their own way of enjoying themselves. In the evenings they might gather together under the trees to sing songs to the god whom they praised and from whom they asked protection and provision. They had confidence in him, and had no fear of injurious animals that might be around. Like Daniel in the lions' den they could touch the wildest beasts, and, according to their faith, would come to no harm. Their most enjoyable time used to come on the days which the whole state dedicated to the god for traditional ceremonies. On those days all free citizens went to the seat of the god near whose area the *Osus* lived. The two could not mix, but everybody enjoyed himself. The free citizens usually gathered new clothes and abundant food and threw them to the *Osus* as the ceremonies went on, and music was played. This was the best moment in the *Osu's* life.

The *Osus* had no fear of loss of property. Where they happened to have property it was very safe, for no free citizen dared touch what belonged to an outcaste. The institution was not prevalent all over Nigeria. The Mohammedans of the north, for instance, knew nothing about this unfortunate system. The institution is more pronounced among the southern states like the Ibo, and was one of the most barbaric systems in the social development of any people. However, such extreme stratification, as far as this writer knows, has been recorded elsewhere. Any manifestation of race and class prejudice, though not of the same origin, may be classified under the same category. It is not only in India that caste systems exist. Any society which keeps some of its citizens from participation in any social life—religious or otherwise—or relegates them to separate quarters or traveling compartments, contributes to and condones this evil doctrine, if not in theory, at least in practice.

We have gone roughly through the old social classes. Let us now consider briefly the new classifications. For purposes of con-

venience and in terms of generalization, we divide them into six classes: "Chiefs," sub-chiefs or elders and titled lords, the "educated" class, Christians, the illiterate class, strangers and outcastes.

"*Chiefs*"

The term "Chief" is a new political "title" given those who were formerly known as the kings of different states of Nigeria. It was imported into Africa by the British, and is as foreign to the country as are the introducers. No Nigerian political thinker really understands yet what is meant by calling a king of a state or tribe a "Chief." Sometimes they are called Paramount Chief, "Native Authority" or "Sole Native Authority," and so forth. The important fact about this nomenclature is that it has raised a serious question already in Nigeria, and will figure prominently in the future reconsideration of Africa's political structure itself. It may be said that the word gained currency from misunderstanding of words, either on the part of the British or on the part of the Africans themselves. This misnomer has had the most unfortunate consequences. The word "Chief" has no equivalent to any political title of respect in the language of Nigeria. Its use today has some negative effect on the sovereignty of the Rulers of Nigeria both from the point of view of the British and of the Nigerian citizens themselves. Let us follow this argument a little further by tracing the unwritten history of the term "Chief."

At the turn of the nineteenth century—more specifically about 1885—Nigeria came into direct political contact with England. At that time most Nigerian rulers made various treaties with the British, and at that time most Nigerian people knew next to nothing of English! It was interpreted to them. Presumably, the English knew nothing of the various Nigerian languages either; they were interpreted to them.

This was what happened. Where the people told the British representative that this or that man was the king, the British, instead of using the word king, applied the word "Chief" as an official title. Of course, some of the rulers still retain their original titles, such as the Emir of Kano, the Oba of Benin, and the Obi of

Onitsha; but usually they were dubbed "Chiefs" or "Paramount Chiefs."

The Warrant Chiefs

The confusion is not entirely to be blamed on the British, but the main factors which contributed to the situation were created by them. Take the case of "The Warrant Chiefs"—these were men who were promoted to the position of rulers in Nigeria without regard to their traditional or non-traditional rights.[8] As Buell said: "Because of the World War, the European personnel was reduced to such an extent that no careful studies as to the traditional rulers of the people could be made. . . . But the [British] Government created native court areas without regard to tribal lines and appointed 'Warrant' Chiefs or judges who in many cases were former slaves and who could command none of the respect given by the people to their chiefs."[9] Later the British discovered the unworkability of the terrible political blunder of this institution of the Warrant Chiefdoms, which became particularly well-known in the Eastern provinces. With the introduction of the "Indirect Rule" system in 1927 in most of the southeastern areas, the Warrant Chiefs were gradually eliminated and the traditional rulers started to take their places. At first it was difficult for the British to discover that in southeast Nigeria the peoples had their own forms of government. Hence, they created these Warrant Chiefs to rule, and these opportunists were all glad to be known as "Chiefs." But "Further studies of Nigerian [British] officials and others reveal the fact that at one time there existed among most of the Ibos a clan organization of councils . . . the British Government is now endeavoring to recognize native court areas and judges to conform to this traditional framework."[10] I may add here that still further studies will convince the British that those traditional rulers now called "Chiefs" were in

[8] Perham, *op. cit.*, pp. 202-220.
[9] R. L. Buell, *The Native Problem in Africa*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1928, p. 715.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 716.

reality regarded as kings. One may question why we quarrel over the use of the word "king" or "chief." It is hard to explain. The reasons are both sentimental and rational, and cannot be dismissed as a mere quibble. Words have a very powerful psychological influence upon thought. Imagine for a moment that the *President* be called *King* Roosevelt, without changing his functions in the Constitution. I wonder how many Americans would not die in their quarrel with the word king rather than accept its sinister meaning to the American free thinker. On the rational side, an American may oppose the use of the word "king" for that of president simply because their connotations in political organization and interpretation are different. So it is with the idea of "a king" and "a chief" to Nigerians who happen to know what a king meant in Nigeria—and who know what psychological, and therefore material effects the mere term "chief" has on that previously dignified and sovereign position. In order to make the difference clearer, let us follow the development a little further, and ask ourselves: What relationship does all this have to the social order of Nigeria, which is our interest here? The English language is becoming the common property of the populace. All schools, except the Moslem, teach English as one of the languages, and by now the growing youth have come to understand the actual meaning of the word "chief." Children in Nigerian schools controlled by European missionaries are taught from the beginning about His Majesty the King of England. On British Empire Day, the whole story of the Empire is drummed into the ears of the growing youth. They hear of the King of England but never of the Kings of Nigeria, and are taught to sing "God save our Gracious King," the British national anthem, as a mark of respect only to the English ruler. In consequence, members of the younger generation begin to lose all interest in their own natural rulers, and, not knowing enough of their past, they become thoroughly cynical and disrespectful unless they are immersed completely in a native machinery of government. Even some "educated" Nigerian citizens refer to the natural rulers as "those so-called Chiefs." After all, in the British Civil Service in Nigeria, we have a Chief Clerk,

Chief Accountant, Chief Printer, and other assorted "Chiefs," so that the term carries with it none of that dignity and respect for the heads of venerable political institutions in Nigeria.

It may be said that the British applied this term in order to avoid an "imperium in imperio" within the British Empire. In that sense, and from the British point of view, it is a sort of justifiable political expediency not to use the original title of king for the Nigerian kings. But that is the British point of view. From the Nigerian point of view, and from the point of view of readers interested in understanding the contemporary social order of Nigeria, this term "chief" does not define the real status of the great and honored position of a Nigerian king, which, in the eyes of the people, is sacred, impeccable, and unapproachable; a position that had its roots in Heaven and carried with it all the attributes of dignity and honesty, and stood above suspicion and corruption. Today that position has none of those qualities. There are exceptions, but our present "chiefs" too often are looked upon as politicians and not as paternal mediators. Some of them have lost their traditional hold on, and emotional ties with, the people. They tend to become politicians because they find themselves between two dangerous forces: the military force of the British Empire and the forces of education and miseducation on the part of the citizens. The British deny to the king all the real attributes of sovereignty which would enable him to be an actual Chief Executive in the government of his people. And in order to remain even as a nominal head, though with no real power, he has to please the British. The people, on the other hand, are confused in their thinking. There are some who have read something about Western "democracy," and for that reason have a "sincere" dislike for the "old pattern" of Nigerian monarchial "autocracies." This group in effect gives a welcome to the British at the same time that it declaims against foreign domination. They do not want to build upon the old pattern, but they also reject the present on the grounds that being British it is alien. A ruler, to maintain his position in such a society, has to shake off the philosophy which teaches that politics is synonymous with ethics, for the ethical and religious regard of former times can-

not save him from these powerful pressures. He has to play the game of pressure politics and not of paternal kingship. It may all be resolved into the fact that the ruler finds himself between two seas—on one side are the miseducated citizens owing a half allegiance to the British and a half to the "chief." On the other side is the British government with its pressure to make the "chief" conform to British wishes. This naturally is a great departure in the social philosophy of a people, but few Nigerians ever notice its significance. In Western thought, it is fairly correct to say that politics is not considered a branch of moral philosophy, except in so far as moral considerations affect political parties. In Nigeria, the reverse was true. But the trend is now changing. Conditions are such that now the ruler makes no reference to morals or ethics or religion in his political actions, because he is forced to swim in waters deep with political intrigue and pressure politics.

I do not accuse the Nigerians of a conscious disloyalty to their Natural Rulers. I am simply stating that some social and psychological forces, originating in miseducation, have combined to force the growing youth to ridicule the indigenous political institutions of their country, and to bow down before an alien structure. They have innocently added their numbers to those creating a condition which is changing our kings (now "chiefs") from the paternal and divine defenders of the politico-religious edifice of the people—which they really are—into politicians.

Let me not be misunderstood as defending the "chiefs" blindly. I know that some of them are autocratic—intolerably so. I am not condoning autocracy. My concern here is to ask whether, if our kings are autocratic, it is a "smart thing" for us, as the world observes us, to ridicule their venerable position, when we have no ready symbolic substitute? Or shall we rather convince the rulers to have confidence in us and in all that we have to say, so that we can make them realize that we do not mean to deny them their rights? Can we not teach them that we are living in a changing world in which a new Nigeria must cast off many vestigial political attributes that truly retard progress, and allow a new life and

a new people to take the place of the old upon which it has, however, to rebuild itself?

In actual life, and in terms of Nigerian economy, some of these rulers are very wealthy while others are actually poor, since their rulership may not have originated in wealth but rather in some other of the traditional roots. Some of the wealthy ones live in large palaces, including compounds, harems, servants' and officers' quarters, and quite often, courts and some of these "Chiefs" have numerous wives as did Solomon of old.

Nobles

With the decline of the influence of the kings comes the loss of prestige of the nobles and warriors. Warriors are disarmed by the British and the spirit of aggression on the part of the young warriors is destroyed by Christianity. War is looked upon as evil —even a defensive war. In all the important military centers of Nigeria, the first step taken by the British was to destroy all arms, and in 1890 there was a declaration during the Brussels Conference enforcing a restriction on the importation of arms and ammunition into Africa. Native manufacture was also prohibited. But disarming alone could not have put a stop to the warlike spirit of the Nigerian warriors. The government could not have been altogether successful in the attempt to suppress all the spirit of aggression and the use of guns. What really disarmed Nigeria was the Christian missionary. While the generals and admirals in Europe were receiving their national recognition, by being granted medals and knighthoods and other titles, the brave warriors of Nigeria were being branded "savage barbarians." While the monuments of English soldiers find places in English cathedrals and churches, the Christian missionary taught the gospel of turning the other cheek until every initiative toward repelling an enemy was lost. With this condition in operation, and with the involuntary loss of sovereign powers of the kings, the warrior class has just about disappeared. To talk about war in Nigeria has become taboo. The king's nobles were mostly "recruited" from

the military class and from those that contributed some ammunition and other matériel for the prosecution of war. Now that there is no military class, the number of nobles has declined until the class only exists as a ghost of a past regime. There are still, however, those of the nobles who attend upon the person of the "chiefs," but no one realizes more than they that the substance of their power and prestige has been removed from its venerable abode!

"Educated" Class

Under this new regime in which the military and noble class do not count for much, a new class is emerging to take the place of the old. This is the so-called "Educated" class, or "Intelligentsia." By this is not meant a very highly educated group, schooled under a realistic system; nor am I talking about that purely disinterested elite trained to understand its environment and able to interpret its life in relation to other lives and to evaluate its culture in terms of other cultures. Rather, this class will be traced first to the "foreigner"—that African class which I have mentioned before—the immigrant who came in the early 1850's from Sierra Leone and the West Indies. Not much is written about this group, but it appears that when they came they were able to understand the English language, which Nigerians did not then understand. When the British government came in, its officials made them interpreters, chief clerks, heads of police departments, and so forth. They were first lawyers and business middlemen. They had access to the kings, and thus were something of a go-between for the Europeans and the African potentates. They took advantage of the situation by initiating a system of bribery never known in Nigerian political history. This was made quite easy for them by their unchallenged ability to misrepresent words and even views while acting as "interpreters." When two parties had a case, they were at the mercy of these "interpreters." The party which gave the "interpreters" the greater bribe won the case. The ease with which this was done can be understood. By suppression of evidence, by manipulated emphasis, and by sheer intimidation, these

men wielded a power against which even the "chiefs" themselves were impotent. Instead of trusting their lords and warriors, and the elders who had religious and moral sanctions in such cases, these paramount rulers found themselves at the mercy of the interpreters and clerks and lawyers on whose shoulders the British placed the responsibility of advice and direction in their relations with the indigenous Nigerian governments. But these "educated" lawyers and interpreters, although originally African, knew nothing about Nigerian culture, and they did not care to know. Most of them were Christians, and everything in Nigerian culture, to them, was a sign of heathenism. Their power came from the British, and hence they tended to despise even the Nigerian rulers, whom they could control indirectly in many ways at that time.

As time went on, English schools were established in Nigeria,[11] and young boys attended these with but one ambition: to learn enough to become clerks and interpreters, or employees of European traders. From these "pinnacles" they thenceforward surveyed their ancestral culture with high contempt, obeying no laws and observing no rules but the Englishman's. This contempt for culture and institutions of their own people, then, became the sign of "education." The educated class became a new privileged class—"privileged" because they felt themselves above the "Chiefs," above the elders, above the Nigerian diet, above the Nigerian attire, above the Nigerian form of marriage, above the people's ceremonies, in fact, above Nigeria! Later, this privilege expanded into study abroad, and now the young men who go to Oxford or Cambridge—when they return to Nigeria—become more English than the English themselves. When they talk to the other Nigerians, they say "but this is not the way it is done in London." London becomes the catchword. One has to have an Oxford accent in order to create an impression among the people.

[11] There are 36,626 schools, 380,305 pupils, 240 European and 8,815 Nigerian teachers (of this, 2,678 schools with 135,162 pupils with 51 European and 5,470 Nigerian teachers are supported by the Native Administration) in Nigeria according to Table 8, *Nigerian Census*, 1933. Note that Nigerian Administration Schools are mostly Moslem.

One has to know British parliamentary procedure in order to be acclaimed as cultured in Nigerian meetings.[12] To attend Europeanized clubs in European attire became a sign of greatness. Those able to attend such clubs walk in the streets of Nigeria as if they have just inherited the earth.

This "educated" class now exploits the masses. It has no use for the poor and underprivileged millions of the country. All that its members care about is to have beautiful mansions and many servants to be very respectful to their wives. They apply for jobs from the British Government and they usually obtain them. They are the high-salaried class. Their occupation is usually clerical, but they receive up to £300 and more a year. Not that this is a particularly impressive figure, but they prefer it to returning to a creative aspect of Nigerian life—the reclamation and acceptance of things Nigerian, the construction of new institutions upon the best in the old ways added to new ideas.

The danger from the educated class does not lie wholly in their helping the West stamp out the basis of a people's culture and pride, but rather too in their inability to substitute anything for what they are taking away. Besides, they have influenced the younger generation to think that an educated man is one who best knows how to deal contemptuously with indigenous institutions and the original creative works of his ancestors. Or at his best, an educated man is a "pen-pusher" who depends not on the job he creates for himself, not on his own father's farm developed on modern technological bases, not on the well-established

[12] Sir Hugh Clifford, a Governor in Nigeria, in describing the educated class said: "Men born and bred in British-administered towns situated on the sea shore, who, in the safety of British protection, have peacefully pursued their studies under British teachers in British schools, in order to enable them to become Ministers of the Christian religion or learned in the laws of England; whose eyes are fixed, not upon African history or tradition or policy, nor upon their own tribal obligations and the duties of their Natural Rulers which immemorial custom should impose upon them, but upon political theories evolved by Europeans to fit a wholly different set of circumstances, arising out of a wholly different environment . . ." Address by Governor Sir Hugh Clifford, Nigerian Council, "Address by the Governor," 1920, p. 18.

family system, but on British Civil Service jobs, or on minor clerical positions in European mercantile offices and shops. There one finds a tendency in a people to develop strange mental habits which in reality "denationalize" them.

These people certainly have no language difficulty. They are sons of Nigeria. But the history of Africa—even of Nigeria—is difficult for them to grasp. It is difficult for them to cogitate on native African philosophy and thought. They have no understanding of the forces of history responsible for the cyclical drama of the rise and fall of one nation and another, even as it applies to Africa. On the contrary, to them everything is natural. Nigeria is under the British. The white man has a better culture. That is all. Automobiles, telephones, flying boats in the air, diving engines below the sea, electric fans, battleships. . . . What more? Africa has none!

The "educated" class is in a herculean struggle. The intangibles and abstractions of Nigerian institutions are as far beyond their comprehension as they are to a foreigner. In their heart is a formidable struggle—the clash between their admiration for the approximates of European culture and their moments of yearning for their real Nigeria.

> Sometimes it is a mere elementary conflict between shame and pride, between sheer family loyalty and a critical ashamedness for the present state of things, . . . and between a sincere desire for reform and a mere shallow modernity and worship of the modern witch-goddess, there is . . . only a very thin margin.[13]

The reader may get the impression that all persons with Western education and all the young people with a British education can be viewed as above, or that the Sierra Leoneans and the peoples who immigrated from the West Indies in the early days have deliberately disintegrated Nigerian society. Those would be false accusations. The disintegration was an inevitable effect of

[13] Lin Yutang, *My Country and My People*, p. 13, John Day, New York, 1935.

an unconscious action on the part of our brothers from other places, just as the Nigerians, who imitated this type of education to the detriment of our culture, were only miseducated. Many West Indians have done good pioneering work in spreading European education in Nigeria. We owe a great deal to them. Besides, the process of redemption began in the last decade with the return of Azikiwe to West Africa from America. He came, he saw, and he preached the gospel of mental emancipation [14] through which sons and daughters of Africa learned that an education in book knowledge is not sufficient until they go back to understand the African social order, and, out of that knowledge, to learn how to create a new nation. With this came a changing mind. Earnest young men and women awoke to the problem. They are not legion—yet—but they find it easy to grasp and appreciate the roots of their being. Because they are Nigerians, they at once see and understand, and in their veins and arteries begins to run the blood of renewed pride and confidence. They stand firm, ready to bear the burden of reclamation. They have cast aside the veil of shame in things Nigerian, and with resoluteness the young-in-mind come to the front, ready to bear all that is Nigerian—its shame and pride, its luxuries and privations, its glories and iniquities.

But that does not eliminate the great burden of the so-called "educated" class. Nigeria has a double battle to fight: to educate the uneducated and, more important and more difficult, to re-educate the miseducated.

Illiterate Class

Now let us examine a perfect contrast—the illiterate class. They are a mixture of those who refuse everything Western, and thereby stand aloof from European schools and all that they can offer, and those who have no opportunity for education. The former pour contempt upon all Europeanisms, and the latter form a large majority who just do not have the privilege of going

[14] See Nnamdi Azikiwe, *The Renascent African*. Published by the author, Zik's Press, Lagos, Nigeria. Also see Chaps. XVI-XX of this book.

to school because they have no means and no information. Nigeria, under British "protection" since 1851, has no public education system. For a child to go to school, his parents must pay for everything from the first day the child gets into school until the day he finishes. Under such circumstances, only comparatively well-to-do parents are able to give their children elementary education; to attend secondary school is a rare privilege; and as for college—that is an out-and-out luxury. The net result is that everywhere there are teeming millions of illiterates.

The illiterate mass forms the class of the unskilled laborers. They are of four categories: (1) agricultural workers in the employ of local big farmers with families; (2) agricultural farmers employed by absentee owners who have contracts with the farmer; (3) casual laborers employed by the day at irregular intervals for all sorts of menial jobs, e.g., porterage; and (4) regular laborers employed and paid on a daily or monthly basis. These work on plantations, roads, and trading beaches, while some are truck drivers, store workers, domestics, and so on.

The first group is distinguished by the fact that their wages are usually paid "half in cash and half in kind." Sometimes the farmer may pay the laborer one pound sterling as a lump-sum for the year, and for every day he works, he is fed three times. Several items of luxury may also be given him by his employer, such as cigarettes, tobacco, and palm wine. In a family or village where a mutual understanding is naturally developed, the employer may go further by furnishing clothing and other necessities. This latter group may hardly be called professional laborers, since their activities stop within the family circle; they have homes and farms and families of their own, and they can employ themselves on their own small farms. That is one of the reasons why they earn only a nominal wage.

The second group is more commonly found in transition areas. These are areas where industrial and agricultural aspects of life are at strife. Most of the residents of such transition towns are employed in skilled and semi-skilled jobs; and yet they still like to continue their farming. To do that, they have to employ pro-

fessional laborers or professional farmers to work their farms. The wages here then are much higher than those described above. Instead of about one pound sterling a year, these professional farmers are paid about twelve pounds or even more per annum. They are not treated with the intimacy found in the first group, but they may be fed once a day on working days.

The third group is entirely different. They work for everybody. Some are carriers in the market places. Their wages are not fixed and depend on their ability to pick up jobs here and there. They are the group that carries things even on their heads. Their takings are entirely on a piece-basis.

The fourth group is paid daily wages. They are usually employed by big stores, big farmers, the government, transport owners, and so forth. Their wages vary according to the nature of the work contractually arranged. The wages range between five pence and eighteen pence (ten to thirty-six cents) a day. In a place like Lagos the wages have been fixed at twelve cents a day according to the *Colonial Report—Annual of 1938*. There may, however, be some changes now because of the war economy. All illiterates do not belong automatically to the class of laborers. They may belong to a wealthy family, and sometimes they develop big farms or other industries or are engaged in a commercial establishment. But we are more concerned with the great majority of them who belong to the laboring class.

What is the social, and therefore, political significance of this class? Generally they form the inarticulate mass of people serving the need of the ruthless exploiters of Africa. They are the perfect example of the people living in chronic poverty in spite of the wealth of the country in which they live. Some Africans themselves—both the rulers and the "educated" class help contribute to the debased condition of these people. They form the mass of people who spend their human energy in drawing water, or in cutting grass with hatchets in their hands, or in hewing wood with axes in the age of the machine. They, as Leonard Barnes said in his *Empire or Democracy*, "cannot afford to pay three shillings for a pair of shoes," although Nigeria has surplus

hides and exports leather to Europe. They lack the organization necessary to change their social status. They carry human refuse on their heads. Some of them are "The Night Soil Men" of Nigeria who appear, as a Nigerian daily paper described it, "Every night in the town of Lagos, from 10 P.M. onwards, . . . curious men bearing lanterns and brooms and carrying huge drums on their heads. They move silently about unless they knock at a door and shout 'Open the door.' When they are asked, 'Who is that?' they answer, '*Omise*' [the workman]. And that is all that people know about them. . . . Children run from them and grownups spit after they have passed." This is a mild description of a laboring group in Nigeria who carry human refuse on their heads, not because they are ignorant or because they like it, but because they have no other avenue for existence open to them.

Our concern here is the political significance of this group of people. The fact is that as long as they remain uneducated, unelevated and uncared-for, the political progress of Nigeria along democratic lines is remote. The back bone of any nation in our modern world can no longer be restricted to the few individuals —be they Africans or Europeans. Men at the top may mold national destinies, but the mass of the people are themselves the destiny. They give the destiny of a nation its tangible form. The structure of the lives of the common people must therefore always be the object of serious concern. Leaders make history. The mass of the people are the history. The progressive evolution of the Nigerian political destiny is stunted and will continue to be stunted as long as there is an absence of a strong middle class. At the very top you find kings and nobles and members of the "Educated" class, but in the middle you find practically nothing. At the bottom you find teeming masses—unknown, unremembered, uneducated, yet toiling for all in a silent mood.

Christians

It seems that the earliest recorded activity of the modern Christian missionaries in West Africa was begun about 460 years ago by the Portuguese. It was sponsored by the King of Portugal

when, in 1481, he sent out five hundred soldiers, a hundred sailors on ten ships, and a company of Catholic priests who went to Odana in Sierra Leone. This place is now called Elmina after the Fort St. George d'Elmina which was erected there by the Portuguese. This missionary project, according to Herbert Macaulay, lasted until the year 1725, "After lingering for a period of 241 years . . . the mission was given up and they disappeared altogether from West Africa, making or leaving little or no impression."

In 1751 an English minister of the Church of England, under the auspices of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, came to the Gold Coast. He returned in 1756 after his unsuccessful trip. Following him were the Wesleyans, who in 1796 "solemnly set down" the names of A. Murdoch and W. Patten as the apostles for Africa. The Church Missionary Society of London sent its first missionary to Africa in 1804. They were not so successful at first and they took refuge in Sierra Leone. The first American Missionary established himself in West Africa in 1822. Today there are five American Missionary denominations: Baptist, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Lutherans. In 1828 the Basle Mission reached Accra in the Gold Coast. They have been successful. We could go on tracing the early activities of the Christian missionaries in West Africa or Nigeria, including the works of Bishop S. Adjai Crowther, the first African Bishop, and numerous others, if we had the time and space. Suffice it to say that West Africa has been under European Christian missionary influence for nearly five centuries.

We are primarily interested in the Christian class as such in Nigerian society, and in their social significance, which may be of interest to all. The major result of the missionary work is that there has emerged a definite social unit, or rather social units, in Nigeria, known as Christians—or rather who label themselves as Christians. Much has been already said about the effects of religious (Christian) teachings on Africa and the reaction of the people. We shall, however, mention that the most important thing to be remembered about the significance of this group is that generally the so-

called Christians in Nigeria are miseducated so far as the meaning and the life of Christ is concerned. To an average Christian in Nigeria, Christianity implies to a large extent an abandonment of all of the cultural norms of African society. It means, for instance, that a Christian girl cannot use such original Nigerian cosmetics as *ufie* (a red painting substance like lipstick, but used also on the skin) or *uli* (a bright blue and blue-black fluid for the skin) whereas it is quite Christian to use any kind of cosmetics put in the market by European traders. It means that no noble African shall receive titles of African origin, whereas it is Christian to receive a knighthood from the British Crown, and even our European Bishops may receive such honors as the D.S.O.—a war decoration. It is considered a demonstration of Christian faith for one to change his African name and to take any European or Jewish name on baptism. To use an African name does not quite look Christian to a miseducated African. As a consequence, many Africans are losing contact with their own valuable cultural heritage. Actually all African names have definite historical or social importance in contradistinction to most meaningless European names. I have known some Europeans whose names are Rice or Drinkwater. They sound funny to an African, and they are meaningless when compared with names like Nnanyelu (the Father has given) or Chima (God knows). Of course some Jewish or even European names have meaning—particularly the Jewish. Such a name as Jerubaal is historic in origin. But what meaning has Jerubaal for an African who knows nothing about Baal and whose history and interest has little to do with the biblical history behind the name, except that the knowledge of that biblical story may have some historical analogy for him? I have never heard any Englishman, whether a missionary or not, who baptized his child with such names as Okafor Davidson or Mbonu Chamberlain. But here and there in Nigeria you hear of Julius Maduka or Kingsley Mbanefo. On the part of the European missionaries these things may be quite unintentional and they may not even realize yet the social significance of the development. But the result is tragic, culturally speaking.

There are a considerable number of Christians in Nigeria, as already stated. Europeans have succeeded to a considerable extent in converting the Nigerians. I do not quarrel with their success, since we in Africa do not indulge in religious intolerance. To show how great their success has been, the Niger Mission had three mission stations in 1857, at Gbebe, Onitsha, and Rabba. Now, after eighty-six years, they have missions in thirty-six districts in the Onitsha and Delta Archdeaconries alone. In these districts there are one thousand seven hundred stations with more than two hundred thousand converts. The first Ibo clergyman in the Onitsha Archdeaconry was George N. Anyaegbunam. He was ordained on February 13, 1898, and from then to January 11, 1942, sixty-four Africans have been ordained on the Niger. This is a commendable progress. Other denominations are also making progress. But the problem remains that the cohorts of Christianity must endeavor to enrich and not to disintegrate the culture of the people. Distinction must be made between Christianity as a religious belief on one hand, and the European culture as contrasted with African culture, on the other. Patient study and an objective attitude are essential in making such a condition a reality.

Strangers and Outcasts

In modern Nigerian society it is indeed difficult, particularly to foreigners, to distinguish all these classes as easily as it was in the past. In many cases, therefore, what I have described may seem no longer to exist, because the conditions are not seen and felt in everyday life. But it is still real in the life-blood of the people when the question of marriage and related matters are raised. In olden days in Ibo, when transportation was only by foot, local customs and traditions were carefully observed. Families found themselves much closer, and there was little or no chance or even desirability of mixing with what was considered a lower class. Today, the method of transportation has changed. People find themselves on trains and buses and trucks. Schools

are established [15] for all classes without definite distinction. Intercollegiate matches take place, and boys from all kinds of families mix together. The method of employment in modern Nigeria makes no class-distinction. Men and women of any class meet in their offices from different sections of the country and none cares to know to what caste one belongs. But that tolerance does not extend to marriage. Many forces tend to break down the old ideas of class distinction, but the breaking down of the system is still artificial. In the very life of the Nigerians—both of Christians and of non-Christians—there is an unwilling spirit which revolts against the new trend. Or I may rather say that there is no consciousness among the people as to their present stand in the matter. But to say that they wish to have the class system stamped out *now* is not supported by what happens today when certain people propose to marry the daughters of certain other people. There are few exceptions to this rule—although some renascent Nigerians are living beyond such ignominious social isolation. In an article titled "The Onitsha Caste System," by "Anidinma," published by the *West African Pilot*, Lagos, May 6, 1940, the writer tried to enumerate some of the social evils of the caste system. He emphasized that marriage has been hampered for the sake of perpetuating the class system. It prevents people from marrying those whom they really love. He said: "There still exist in Onitsha, two classes of people: the aristocratic class and those of the plebeian class. The latter are descendants of: (a) People who were either captured or bought as slaves in olden days. (b) Foreigners who have long been domiciled in Onitsha, but whose authenticity of birth cannot be established beyond all possibility of doubt." Then he continued: "No parents of the former class will condescend to give consent to a marriage between their daughter or son and any member of the latter class, whatever might be the financial or social status of the party. Similar, if not greater, aversion is also held for . . . the classes known as '*Osu*,' that is, persons dedicated to certain jujus or their descendants."

[15] Although there are very few schools as compared with the population.

The real but invisible caste system is one of the worst social evils in some parts of Nigeria. There is much to be dreaded from this reproachable social infirmity. To build a social order on caste or on rigid class lines is to invite the flames of crushing discord and the ultimate ruin of the social system. There will be sighs and confessions when the trembling fabrics of that outworn system shall fall into pieces and ruin itself in the blazing spectacle of the new social order. At that time the present order shall be looked upon as a fading image and a sinking sepulcher of the "Old Nigeria."

There is a great hope for the group of outcastes and the so-called strangers. New Nigerians cannot be expected to accept an indefinite confinement within the vacuum of the old relics of a social structure antithetic to progress and morality. Let no one in Nigeria exclude himself as being one of those who do not partake of the prolongation of this system unless he is willing to defeat its protagonists both by words and deeds. I say this because behind our democratic and Christian façade lurks the unconscious power of a rigid class consciousness which expresses itself most vividly on matters of marriage. I do not doubt that in Nigeria some people may be aroused to vituperative indignation by what I have here said. But in the words of Harold J. Laski in his *A Formula for Conservatives*, I shall say to such men that "Above all, they must learn to understand the implications of a dynamic society. Principles and practices cannot be justified merely because they are old. A wise conservative is a strategy of adaptation, not a philosophy of resistance to change."

CHAPTER VI

The Nigerian Government Before the British Came

WITH SOME BACKGROUND of Nigeria and its people we may be prepared now to discuss the political condition of Nigeria before the coming of the British, then we shall see what Nigeria is under British protection, and finally what Nigeria's future could be to Nigerians and to the world.

Our Political Heritage

The name "Nigeria" is, indeed, an English name. What really existed in that part of the Western Sudanese territory were a number of independent national states which were all politically and territorially separate, and in many cases linguistically and culturally different. It will be an unforgivable mistake to give the impression that because Nigeria today is taken as one nation, that, therefore, there was a common political background or heritage in all of the previous national states. But that fact ought not to drive us to the other extreme in which we shall assume that there was nothing in common among these national states. Certainly they have certain cultural traditions in common which have a great deal to do in explaining the ease with which these national states are working together today without such religious or ideological conflicts as one finds in India.

These national states are fairly old communities with evidences of thousands of years of existence. I have already traced our history, and given some concept of our ancient culture. Pre-historically not much research has been done, but, even so, there have been found in Nigeria paleolithic stone implements of the Chellean type near the Bauchi Plateau in the north and in a few other localities. Neolithic celts have been found in most prov-

inces, including the delta region in the south. In the Upper Cross River were found stone circles, and in Oyo Province are found stone monoliths.

With all this claim to antiquity, what is our political heritage? Before this question can be answered satisfactorily it will be necessary to understand what is a "tribe" as distinct from a national or political state in pre-European Nigeria. It can be summarized in this way: "Nigeria" is a new name given to an aggregate of tribes of peoples of the western Sudan in the post-British era. Tribes are large communities of peoples, generally with the same language, living in one geographical area, and having fairly common customs and outlooks on life, but not politically united. Examples are the Ibo or the Yoruba tribes. National states were distinctly political areas, each under a different sovereign power. mutually independent of the other political states, even though such different states existed within the framework of a tribe, such as the Onitsha kingdom, the Arochuku kingdom and the Nnewi kingdom—all members of the Ibo tribe. These national states are not small areas when compared with our modern European states. Let me cite an American missionary now in Nigeria on that. In his own words: "The Nigerian governing or provincial boundaries had been laid down before the intervention of the European. . . . These governing units are of no mean size when compared with contemporary Europe. Bornu alone is larger than Scotland and Wales, and Belgium can be added to take up the difference. Sokoto is as large as Ireland and the Netherlands together. Kano is as extensive as the combined areas of Belgium and Wales; Zaria is larger than the Netherlands and Wales together; Adamawa is about the size of Hungary; and Ilorin is larger than Switzerland." [1]

Note that these areas which Bittinger used for comparison were not tribes. They were national states within tribes, and today the British government, with little variation in the administration, has turned them into provinces with their original

[1] See D. W. Bittinger, *Educational Experiment in Sudan*, Elgin, Ill., 1941, p. 147.

traditional heads at the top under the British Resident. In some areas, these national states were not large enough to become provinces and they have been turned into districts, and some are even small enough to become sub-districts within an artificially made-up province under a British Resident. In case of such an artificial province, there is no Nigerian traditional head of the province, and there would be several kingdoms within a province; and the province, for the purposes of administration, is headed by a British Resident. Owerri Province is an example of this type. The kings of each previous national state within the province become district heads, but with the prerogatives and in some cases the authorities of the past, and, legally, equal in status with the rulers of larger areas. The difference in their power is a matter of size of their territories and not of their ancient prerogatives—just as the Governor of New York with over thirteen million people has equal status with that of Nevada with its population of little over one hundred and ten thousand.

Still the answer has not been given as to what is our pre-European political heritage. That question may be answered by dealing with the general political philosophy and practices of the Ibo tribe.

The most important thing to bear in mind is that in Nigeria as a whole and in Ibo particularly, politics was synonymous with ethics and religion. If there is anything common in our political system, that is it. We shall, therefore, probe into the Ibo political past through its religious institutions which have had direct political significance. We shall deal concisely with *Chiñeke*, *Chi*, *Ana*, *Ofo*, and *Ndi-ichie*.

Chineke

Chineke means *Chi-Onye-Okike* (God Who Creates)—the Creator. The conception of one God is indigenous in Ibo theology. The Ibo believe that "there is a pantheon of high gods," headed by Chineke. Among these high gods are Anyanwu (the Sun) Igwe (the Heaven), Amadi-Oha or Egbe-Igwe (Lightning or Thunder), Ala or Ana (the Earth Deity), Chi (Personality-Abid-

ing God) and to these may be added the artificial Chuku (Long Juju at Aro), Agbala (at Awka) and the Spirit of the Ancestors. The Ibos believe in the existence of one God (not necessarily the Father of Christ) from the beginning. For to an Ibo, Chineke is not one of the ordinary gods that can be worshiped through any animate or inanimate object. Chineke is believed to be above all these, and is considered the Maker of heaven and earth and looked upon as Eze-Elu—the King of the Highest. All other gods are by and large His agents with diverse functions. The kings are also his agents and his earthly symbols, and if the agents fail to perform the functions assigned to them by Chineke, they can be repudiated. The political significance of this philosophy of either-function-or-be-repudiated is that it had a dual relation to the right of revolution against an ill-conducted government. Its importance cannot be over-exaggerated. It also shows the powerlessness of the kings if their religious origin is discarded. There is no law except that which comes from the will of Chineke as expressed through His earthly agents—the ancestors, the kings, and the priests of the lesser gods and goddesses.

Ala or Ana

Ala may be considered the most important deity in the public and private life in Ibo society. The reason why this goddess Ana (the Earth-Deity) is so important in the people's public life is because the word "Ana" has a double meaning. It means Earth in its literal sense, and also means "constitution" or "tradition"—anything affecting the broad principles of the conduct of human relations and political traditions. For instance, when one says that this or that action is constitutional, it means that it is Odi-na-Ana (that which is in the constitution), and unconstitutional actions are said to be Nso-Ana (that abhorred by the constitution). In a royal family, where the principle of succession is by primogeniture, it is considered Nso-Ana (unconstitutional) to have the second or any of the younger sons pretend to the throne. The offense is not only against society but chiefly against Ana, the Earth-Deity. Most criminal offenses are considered offenses

against Ana. The stealing of live chicken or Kola nut are all Nso-Ana. The Earth-Deity is therefore no mean goddess in the conduct of political life.

Chi

An English writer once wrote, "One of the most striking doctrines of the Ibo is that every human being has, associated with his personality, a genius or spiritual double known as his *Chi*." This is a philosophy of a "transcendent self." It is a belief in the parallelism which exists between the temporal and nontemporal aspects of human personality. All that we are, so far as an Ibo knows, is determined by the interaction between a physical man and his *Chi*. Man does not exist without his *Mmo* (soul), but the magnanimity or ignominity of human activities and successes are dependent on *Chi*.

What political significance has this *Chi* philosophy? First, it is a fatalistic view of life. It means that whatever social position one finds oneself in, one attributes it to one's *Chi* and not to anybody else. A slave is a slave because his *Chi* has made it so. The ruling class rule because they have the right *Chi* to put them there, so why envy them? An Ibo man usually asks: "*Igagbachili onye Chi ya nagbachirolu?*" "Will you block the way of one whose *Chi* has not blocked?" An Ibo proverb says: "*Chi onye adi nizu ma onwu egbune ya:* If one's own God is absent from the meeting death will not kill him." Society implicitly believes that all human fate is attributable to one's *Chi*, or "*Ebe onye dalu ka Chi ya Kwatulu ya:* Where one falls, there his own *Chi* pushes him down." On this basis, society has been stratified, and every one has his station in life—kings to be kings, ministers to remain ministers, slaves to continue to serve, and laborers to labor. That is a significant aspect to be considered in thinking of Ibo politics.

Ndi-ichie (Ancestors)

The Ibos believe profoundly that human lives are influenced by their ancestors. The ancestor cult has a great meaning in Ibo social and political life. Ancestors own the land, they guide the

morality of their descendants, they protect them from injury and invasion; it is the ancestors who intervene with the gods in the spiritual world in behalf of the living; they prevent the evil god (Ekwensu) from inflicting catastrophe upon the earth; they come back again in the form of children into the world of the family to which they belonged—that is, reincarnation.

When the soul *(Mmo)* is gone from the body of man, therefore, it goes to the spiritual world, and from there intervenes in human affairs, especially within the family orbit. The living family members can offend the soul of their ancestors *(Ndi-ichie)* by ignoble conduct. There is also a political significance to this concept. The head of a political group owes his authority largely to the fact that he is the representative and mouthpiece of his ancestors. In the Nnewi state of Ibo (which is the author's home), the king is the representative of the first father of the whole state, and he also represents the goddess of that state who is called Edo. There, then, is a combination of patriarchy and theocracy, and it is because of that dual symbolism that the government of Ibo may be described as politico-religious.

Ofo

The *Ofo* is a sacred symbol; it is a shoot or branch of the *Detarium senegalense* tree. The *Ofo* is, indeed, a symbol of truth, but it is more widely recognized as á symbol of authority in family hierarchy. Since the Ibo tribe is subdivided into families, beginning with the individual household with its small family group, and then progressing to a larger clan, the authority exercised by the head of each family is symbolized and authenticized by the possession of the *Ofo*. If there are five groups of large families making up one political state, the elder of each family is the head; he must possess the *Ofo* of his whole family. The king of the state, finally, must hold his own *Oke-ofo* (Super-*ofo*) which ranks above all others. The *Ofo* may be identified with several things.

It symbolizes temporal authority in family leadership and kingship. In these two cases, the *Ofo* is inheritable at the death of the

holder. When the *Ofo* is possessed by priests, it symbolizes the presence of the gods. It is an indispensable instrument through which the priests may worship their gods, and by which the family elders may talk to their ancestors, for it is believed that the spirit of the ancestors and of the gods abide within it. It is a final symbol of truth. Any elder who swears on the *Ofo* is believed to have uttered the final truth. If any important public man makes some decision—political or otherwise—while holding the *Ofo* in his hands, that decision is irrevocable. The political significance of the *Ofo* will be seen also in the fact that a king must possess his *Ofo*, which is in reality the symbol of his authority.

These are some of the many basic concepts of the Ibo politico-religious structure. We shall now deal with how the law was formerly administered.

The Administration of the Law

Assault

The *eye-for-an-eye* principle was the established punishment in cases of assault—that is, when the elders and the king did not intervene. Under the family system any injured person, or any person who had sufficient proof that an act of destructive violence had been directed against his person, could seek aid from his family, who would retaliate against the family of the aggressor. But before this family-to-family open conflict could extend to any degree, the elders and the judges would often intervene and bring the contestants before a local tribunal composed of the elders of both families, and the elders of that particular clan and the witnesses. If the case could be amicably settled there, the king would not be bothered with it; but if the litigants were unsatisfied they could appeal to the king.

Theft

Theft was a serious offense. There were two categories of theft—the first included any that could be interpreted as a crime against the state, the king, the ancestors, the gods, or the owner

of the property. The stealing of a live chicken, the plucking of kola-nut fruit from the kola tree, or the stealing of yam crops from the ground, are the best examples of the first category. In the second category were other groups of theft punishable in different ways according to circumstances, e.g., the theft of a gun, which was considered as a more private injury. All theft was grave, but those of the first category were doubly grave, and the offenders remained the enemy of society as long as they lived. Punishment differed according to the nature and the place of the robbery and the character of the criminal himself. Usually the punishment for those grave offenses was to sell the criminal into slavery, or to remove him from membership in the family since he had incurred the disfavor of all the elements of society—both the living and the dead. It was a great offense against the Earth-Deity—Ana.

In case of a man who stole a live chicken, his offense was against Ana, and if the tribunal proved him guilty, another chicken, yams, food, and wine, had to be sacrificed to Ana in order to purify the criminal. The criminal's family had to provide a sheep, hen, or tortoise, and the elders and the priest would absolve the man from the wrath of the gods through the sacrifice to Ana. The king would be notified when this was accomplished, and the criminal might now be allowed to go home. But usually the family would manage to dispose of him,[2] for as long as he remained in the community, he was a symbol of moral shame to his family and to their descendants.

Adultery

The procedure in the case of adultery differed from other crimes.

If it was committed within the family group, it was settled by the immediate family elders and the *Adas*,[3] and civil action was in most cases avoided—for fear of incurring public humiliation. Adultery was looked upon as an *Alu* (abomination), and not just

[2] Sell him into slavery, but never kill him.
[3] *Adas*—the elder women of the family on the father's side.

a crime or offense against the state. It was also considered *Nso-Ana*, and the Earth-Deity was believed offended.

Homicide

Homicide was considered an offense against the state, Ana, society, and the family of the victim. But the most offended was the god or goddess of the state. In the Nnewi state, a homicide committed within the state territorial boundary was supposed also to be a crime against the goddess Edo—the goddess of the whole state. To appease Edo, the murderer yielded a slave to the goddess and that slave became *Osu*—one dedicated to the goddess. But that was not all. He had to appease the Earth-Deity—Ana—by sacrificing a fowl, or a goat, or some other food prescribed by the priest.

In the very remote past the murderer usually killed himself for having killed another. But he could also flee to a town of refuge in some distant part of the land. In most cases, the family of the murdered, after consulting the *Obi* and his *Ndichie*, could receive some material compensation from the family of the murderer. The murderer went into mourning, often wearing old clothes and remaining unshaven for about two years. He was not allowed to eat or talk with others, and there was a common belief that one could not speak the truth to a murderer: "*Onye gwalu onye gbulu ochu nke bu nne?*" [4] His wife kept apart from him—no one was his friend and comforter. Those punishments and ostracism should indicate clearly how serious it was in pre-British Nigeria for one to kill another, even by mistake. Of course, one could kill one's enemy in warfare. Nor was it criminal to kill a thief or an adulterer caught in the act. But with those exceptions, a homicide bore a heavy penalty.

Before closing this section on indigenous law and its administration, let us describe one other very important factor in the old Nigerian legal procedure. That was the *Iyi* (Oath).[5]

[4] This literally means: "Who can ever talk to a murderer with absolute sincerity?"

[5] It may also be called *Alusi*.

"An Oath is usually the name of a day or place, a person or thing, commemorating a tragic or deplorable event which happened to the ruling head or king of a tribe or nation, and has for that reason been sanctified or deified for the tribe or nation for purposes of adjuration." [6]

The political or legal significance of the oath is that at public trials and investigations the proceedings were frequently opened by an appeal to the gods and ancestors to punish any *Ndichie* who, for any private interest, would express a dishonest opinion, and any witness who would give false evidence. But that was not all. For the litigants must, at the outset of the case, each make a solemn assertion that he would speak the truth. The oath was looked upon as sacred, and the swearer was to be trusted to give true evidence before the tribunal. No plaintiff or defendant would dare to enter a court to state his case before the tribunal without first swearing an oath that what he was about to state was true. The tribunal had reverence for the oath, because "the sacred oath is not to be taken in vain, and whoever takes it has to justify his action before a tribunal." [7] Going further, the author confirmed the legal importance of the oath in judicial procedure when he said: "Oath is the principal means for commencing an action before the tribunal," and I may add that the oath in most cases was the principal means of ending an action before the tribunal. By that I mean that the judges might decide a case by asking one of the parties to swear an oath that his claims were true. If he so swore, he won the case.

Summary—Ibo Political Institutions

Legislation

It may seem strange that we can come to the end of this chapter without any mention of legislation as such; but though the

[6] J. B. Danquah, *Cases in Akan Law*, George Routledge and Sons, London, 1928, p. xxiv.

[7] *Ibid.*

Ibo were almost fanatics about the law, they did not legislate. That statement, of course, may be misleading without using an analogy. The bulk of British law, as we know it, consists of statutes made by Parliament; "but the most important part of it, the ground work of the whole legal system, is Common Law, which exists only in the minds of lawyers, and of which there is no authoritative text. Statutes are only extensions or corrections of Common Law to suit changes in modern life." [8] Now when the Ibo speak of law, they mean an unwritten law (like our Common Law here)—it was never made, yet has always been in force, and exists only in the mind of the people. There was, however, in Ibo, as in Bantu, "one small item of rude legislation" and that is that "After the Civil Assembly [*Ndichie*] has discussed a matter, the [Obi] sometimes issues an order which, while it lasts, has the force of law." [9] For example, in 1922, the Nnewi people discovered that the institution of certain kinds of *juju* dances had social disadvantages to the youth. The Council met, and advised the Obi of Nnewi, Ezeugbo-nyamba I, to decree that those certain *juju* dances, which resulted in poisoning of the youth physically and morally, be abolished. This decree became law, and no one dared repeat the dances without incurring heavy penalties. "The tribe believes that this [Obi's] law is an application of ancestral law to a new condition, just as our [British] legislators believe that their statutes are in accord with Common Law." [10] In the Ibo Judicial Assembly, as in the British Law Courts, former decisions are generally cited to prove the correctness of the present verdict. By this process, every important decision in the Ibo Judicial Assembly of the Obi and the *Ndichie* tended to define the Common Law anew, and served, therefore, to modify the law of the ancestors.

When a new situation arose which presented a new legal problem, the elders and the titled lords met with the Obi and his

[8] W. C. Willoughby, *Race Problems in the New Africa*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1923, p. 99.
[9] *Ibid.*
[10] *Ibid.*

Ndichie to enact a new law to meet the condition; they would then "inform" the gods about the changes. What we might term rules or ordinances were made without reference to the gods. Thus the elders could announce that certain wood was not to be cut in a particular section, under the penalty of a fine, or that the residents of a village should not visit a neighboring town during an epidemic. Such acts were rules and regulations, and required no sanction from the gods.

Legislative powers were not the monopoly of the Obi and the *Ndichie* alone. Seniors in the tribe and even women participated in some measure. For example, if it became apparent that night raids were developing increasingly, the senior members of the community might convene and decide to increase the punishment and request an investigation. They could report their recommendations to the *Ndichie*, who would inform the king. The recommendations would become law, if they were sanctioned by these highest authorities. In a case involving women—say that there was an increasing instability in family relations—elderly women could meet and make decisions of social importance in relations affecting husband and wife, so inform the authorities, and their decisions could be incorporated in the body of the laws if sanctioned. But these meetings of seniors and women were civil assemblies, and were quite different from the Judicial Assembly of the Obi and his Council of *Ndichie*.

Judiciary

We have seen that practically all disputes and offenses could be dealt with in local assemblies of the clan or family, and should there be discontent among the litigants they could appeal to the highest authority—the king and his elders. They served as the Supreme Court. Their decision, having come from the interpretation of the spirit of the ancestors and the gods, could not be revoked or disputed. We have also seen that from the beginning of the trial to the end of court actions, religion was mixed with law. The plaintiff and the defendant took an oath before giving any evidence. The elders submitted themselves to Ana—the Earth-

Deity—before giving their judgment. The law was not based on cold abstract theories of contractual relations; it was not spiritless either with that legal logic which in some cases has validity but lacks the substance of truth. It was a legal system which first of all, like Aristotle's principle, recognized "that man is by nature a political animal. And he who by nature and not by mere accident is without a state, is either above humanity, or below it"; [11] and in Ibo, that state begins with one's immediate family, extends to his clan, his larger clan, his state, the tribe, and finally the country as a whole. Secondly, the basic assumption implicit in the Ibo judicial concept is that *the people must inquire into the validity of law*. They believed, as did the believers in a principle of natural law, "that obedience to law brings *advantages;* disregard of it, *disadvantages*." They obeyed the laws of the family because obedience was conducive to all material and spiritual advantage; it promoted solidarity, understanding, social tranquillity, and personal security. In the third place, the Ibo legal code was synonymous with the ethical or moral codes. You cannot separate them. In fact, there is nothing peculiar or unusual in this system, for "The legal system of Islam, like that of Judaism, is founded on the word of God, or the Koran. The law or 'shariah,' is a part of the religion, not a separate thing," [12] and I cannot imagine any body of laws which did not somehow originate in religious convictions of the people directly or indirectly. Fourthly, because the validity of law was based on its utility, the people, in the past, developed the principle of the right to revolution. Government, to an Ibo, existed as the procurer of peace and the preserver of justice as handed down from the past. And it could be said that the boundary of governmental regulations was not allowed to go beyond general affairs—not into personal. To the Ibo, as it was to William Penn in the seventeenth century, "Government is an expedient against confusion; a restraint upon all disorders." The

[11] *Aristotle's Politics*, quoted by Jerome Hall in his *Readings in Jurisprudence*, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Indianapolis, 1938, p. 5.
[12] J. W. Wigmore, *A Panorama of the World Legal Systems*, Washington Law Book Company, Washington, D.C., 1936, p. 543.

fifth point is that the Ibo law "presupposes conscience." Since there was no attempt then to separate law into a compartment of its own—from a natural to a mental process—the only base for thinking was the conscience. Further, there was a law of evidence, yet it has been observed that the admissibility, relevancy, and sufficiency of evidence in many cases were left to the benevolent conscience of the elders and the king, and, should that be insufficient, an oracle might be approached. Even when appealing to an oracle, the litigants were not interested in the positive aspect of law; they were idealistic—weighing the matter within their consciences with reference to morals and ethical norms. They looked for that which ought to be—that which the ancestors and gods would sanction. But we know that "The Ought remains a pure *a priori* category for the comprehension of the empirical legal material." [13] Our point here is to make it clear that in pre-British Ibo, there was no clear-cut positive legal thinking. There was no positive law. There was customary law rooted in tradition and religion. But it was more than that, for customary law alone presupposes customary morality which tends to formalism—a moral code that is self-contained growing under irrational influences and superstitions, condemning traditional evils but providing no machinery to cope with changing conditions.

The customary Ibo law, however, did grow beyond mere formalism before the British came. For although the Ibo obeyed gods, they reasoned with them in the face of changing conditions. Men decided what social norms would be adequate at each period of social evolution. They would inform the gods of their decisions, and the gods accept them, since ceremonies were performed accordingly. The civilians of the Ibo society possessed what was tantamount to initiative and referendum—and these they exercised through their Civil Assemblies. By this method, the people had an avenue through which they could initiate laws based on empirical logic and not on just what their ancestors wanted or what they

[13] Hans Kelsen, "The Pure Theory of Law," Trans. by Charles H. Wilson, *Law Quarterly Review*, 1934, Vol. 50, p. 474.

believed the gods would approve.[14] We cannot, therefore, end the discussion of the Ibo judicial system by saying that it was only law based on custom. It was that, but it is not contradictory to say that it had also advanced into a rationality consistent with the march of time and human needs.

The Executive

Here again let us not read the English meaning into every term. By the word executive I am referring to the position held by either the Obi and his *Ndichie*, or in some cases by the supreme priest of a god of the state. Their position is comparable to that of the executive in the West, because theirs was the function of executing the decisions made by the Civil and Judicial Assemblies. But they had more power than do Western chief executives, because they were supposed to have the attributes of gods, and constituted a linkage between the living and the dead. They executed the law, but they also played a decisive rôle in both the legislative and the judicial functions of the state. They actually headed all the departments, since there was no theory of checks and balances. We can therefore say that in most of the Ibo states there was a more or less democratic society, but that most of the kings were divine and patriarchal. The principle of primogeniture was prevalent, and the succession was usually hereditary. The authority of the Chief Executive was not based on written constitutions nor on the state militia. His was the function of a trusted patriarch—a father of the people who could secure the confidence of his children because he was divine and temporal as well; he was almighty because he could direct the opinions of the gods. When the signs and omens of tragedy pervaded the social atmosphere, he, the king, could interfere with the spirit world through the priests, and thus avert a pending catastrophe. Being the source of

[14] The Nnewi maxim, "*Madu sili Edo nwelu Nkwo*," literally meaning, "Man assigned the market-day Nkwo to the Goddess Edo," is an Ibo expression to indicate that man in a way could direct the gods in their relation to man, and man is not just god's slave.

authority and the final court of justice, people invariably called him *Igwe* (Heaven), just as the Chinese in the past conceived their emperor as the mandate of heaven. But the whole system was not entirely colored by religious metaphor; there were definite temporal functions of an Ibo king. He was the commander of the warrior groups which defended the nation; he kept order and maintained individual or family rights by protecting property and preventing acts of irresponsibility. But his function in social welfare was meager as compared to what we know of governments in a more industrialized society. His was an agrarian society compartmentalized into self-maintaining and self-conscious family units. In my concluding chapters, we may see why it is necessary to understand what law and order and government meant to the pre-British Nigerians in equating what the future prospects of the Nigerian political order could be.

It was from this political structure that Nigeria was suddenly plunged into British imperialism. It started indeed in 1851, on the coast, and received international recognition in 1885 during the Berlin Conference. But most interior parts of Nigeria saw the British only recently. To the author's own state the British government came only in 1903, and the author's father was the first Nnewi ruler to hold his throne under the British. Before 1903 all Nnewi rulers were independent of any foreign power, either within or without Nigeria. And this was true of most of the other Nigerian states.

Our next consideration will be the examination of the structure of the Nigerian government since the advent of the British.

CHAPTER VII

British in Nigeria, 1851-1943

Lagos

During the latter half of the nineteenth century, practically all European nations saw fit to abolish the slave trade. It was alleged that Lagos, a Nigerian sea port of the Atlantic, was the "slave stronghold." Owing to this allegation, the British found some pretext to bring Lagos under the Union Jack. The answer to the riddle of how, why, and when the icy hands of British imperialism touched Nigeria can be found nowhere but in the alleged crime of Lagos having been the "slave stronghold" of West Africa. The story started in 1851.

The year 1851 was eventful for Nigeria and for the British. The British Secretary of Foreign Affairs was Lord Palmerston. His policy was one of extending British trade to all the corners of the world, and of attacking any force that impeded that program. In order to carry out this policy to its full extent in West Africa, and particularly in Nigeria, Palmerston appointed Mr. Beecroft a consul at the Bight of Benin and Biafra with a residence at Fernando Po. It was said that the King of Dahomey refused to give up his slave trading unless the King of Lagos was first made to stop. Beecroft, therefore, was instructed from London to deal with Lagos vigorously. The King of Lagos at that time was Kosoko, a man of strong and resolute character. He was very sensitive about his personal rights as a sovereign of the portion of Nigeria which he ruled. When the British made their first attempt to see him, he flatly refused to have any dealings with them. He "definitely declined to sign a treaty and said the friendship of England was not wanted."

Beecroft decided that the only way to influence Kosoko was by

a show of force. London supported Beecroft's policy: he was instructed to attack Lagos, and if need be to deport the King and install another who would be "good." Lagos was attacked. After considerable resistance, the British, with the aid of Nigerian opponents of Kosoko, defeated the latter. He was forced into exile, and Akitoya, his uncle, was installed as King.

The Portuguese slave-traders who were stationed at Lagos were suppressed and their barricades were burned. In this attack of 1851, the British had a small force of 357 officers under Captain Jones. There were 650 Nigerians in the service of King Akitoya, the uncle of the expelled King against whom the British fought. This was the sequence of the engagements:

On Thursday, November 25, a British naval attack was made. The Kosokoan Army resisted, and two British officers were killed and sixteen men were wounded. On Friday, November 30, at night, another and more successful attack was made. It was in the course of this engagement that three Portuguese barracoons were burned down. Then, when a British naval expedition arrived in Lagos under the command of Commodore Bruce, consisting of four ships, Captain Jones took over the command. On December 26, 1851, a new attack began in earnest, but there was sharp resistance and for two days there was a stalemate. On the eve of the twenty-seventh of December, 1851, Kosoko left Lagos, and the British occupied it on December 28, with a record of fifteen men killed and seventy-five wounded.

There was no annexation. Akitoya, who helped the British win the war, was installed as King of Lagos. He was pro-British, first because it was the way he could take the place of Kosoko—the deposed king; second, because he was afraid the British might depose him as they had Kosoko. On January 1, 1852, a treaty was signed between Akitoya and the British representative. The chief terms of the treaty were: (1) the abolition of the slave trade, (2) provision for freedom of trade for British subjects, other Europeans not excluded, (3) expulsion of European slave traders, (4) protection of the European missionaries, giving them the right to build churches and schools, (5) a reservation which would allow

France to become a party to the treaty. In February the treaty was signed. According to its terms, (1) Akitoya was given the right to receive 3 per cent customs duty on imports and 2 per cent on exports on cargoes of every ship trading at Lagos; (2) the merchants in return were to have freedom to trade and to establish themselves in Lagos; (3) the King also undertook to see to it that his subjects met trade obligations, and if a Lagosian fell in debt to a European trader, his house and property were to be sold to liquidate the debt; (4) no debtor should be allowed to trade again until previous debts were paid. This commercial treaty was copied by the Austrian, Portuguese, and British representatives.

Akitoya, the King, was looked upon as the independent sovereign of Lagos. The British Consul was there as a representative to see that treaty terms were enforced and British commercial interests protected. There was no proclamation of Protectorate over Lagos following the 1851 conquest, nor were any other parts of Nigeria, which were yet very little known to the British, affected politically. But Akitoya was a king who came to his throne by foreign intervention. He could not possibly have the wholehearted following of the people. The Portuguese were not to accept the conquest by the British in 1851 without any compensation. There were, therefore, some underground movements. By the year 1853, Kosoko, the expelled ruler of Lagos, began an attack which became known as the "Ija Ifaseg boja war." While these events were taking place Akitoya died, and his son, Dosumo, took his place. The courageous Kosoko was finally appeased by the British through certain concessions, and a treaty of peace and amity was signed.

Dosumo was weaker than his father Akitoya, for while the British installed Akitoya in order to penetrate into Lagos, the son was supported with a view to the ultimate cession of Lagos.

To understand the history of the alleged cession of Lagos by King Dosumo, one has to bear in mind that in England the policy of the British government during the middle of the nineteenth century was trade expansionist. The Whig policy was predicated on the belief that British trade must go everywhere in the world.

Lord Palmerston was Premier, and Lord John Russell was Secretary of Foreign Affairs. A decision had already been made in England that Lagos must be possessed permanently, either by peaceful means or by force, so that the destiny of King Dosumo was predetermined in England. The story that he ceded Lagos voluntarily is unfounded. On June 22, 1861, the Foreign Office instructed the Consul on the West Coast on its decision. That official was ordered by London to inform Dosumo of the British government's intention. Naturally, Dosumo and his people refused to cede Lagos by peaceful means. Force had to be employed, as had been expected. The King's house was threatened by landing marines; Dosumo, lacking sufficient strength, was forced to yield. The treaty which was prepared by the British was read for this African King to sign—it was a death warrant, signed under duress. The bewildered King and his four followers put their hands on the paper; Bedingfield and McCoskny represented England. This "treaty convention" was held on board the "Prometheus." In 1862 Governor Freeman arrived. He met fresh opposition from Dosumo, but the latter was appeased by a grant of £1,030 annual pension, and by an assurance that England had no right to the property and lands of the people. This land belonging to the King of Lagos was called a Colony of the British Government after 1851.

This brief review accounts for what is known today as the "Colony of Nigeria," as separate from the Protectorate. The Colony is a small strip of coast land, one hundred and ten miles long by from four to twenty miles wide, in the southern portion of the country. Lagos has long been "the ideal Colony from the Downing Street point of view, self-supporting and self-protecting."

In 1900 the Protectorate area outside of Lagos previously under the Royal Niger Company was taken over by the British government. Hence, in 1906, the Governors of the Colony were made Governors and Administrators of the Colony and Protectorate of Southern Nigeria (constituted May 1, 1906). Sir F. J. D. Lugard (now Lord Lugard) became Governor under this re-

gime in 1912, and in 1914 he made himself Governor-General. He was succeeded in 1919 by Sir H. C. Clifford, who served until 1925. He was succeeded by Sir Graeme Thomson, 1925–1931. Then came Sir Donald Cameron, 1931–1935, then Sir Bernard Bourdillion, 1935–1943, when Sir Arthur Richardson, former Governor in the British West Indies, succeeded him.

The Protectorate

Penetration into the interior of Nigeria was a logical sequence. Although Lagos was occupied, it was at the time clear that the rest of Nigeria was not in any way under British power either in fact or in law. The Emirates of Northern Nigeria, the Obis of Ibo, the rulers of Yoruba and Benin and the Eastern countries were unconcerned in the "Dosumo Affair." They were entirely unconnected with the cession. (Incidentally, that shows how clearly pre-British Nigeria was simply a collection of independent national states.) Just as state barriers hampered early commerce in the United States, so the barriers created by these inland sovereign states had an effect on the trade for which the British came to Nigeria. It was in order to stop any power or powers either in Nigeria or from the outside which might injure British trade that the British came face to face with what we now call the Nigerian Protectorate. The British adopted a policy of gradual penetration. Attempts were made by some of the kings to repel the British. A number of those rulers who showed signs of resistance were attacked, and in many cases were deposed when defeated.

Into the Interior

During the government of the hard-headed Sir Gilbert Carter (1893–1895), expeditions were sent into the interior bent on conquest. The Ijebu Expedition was one of the most remarkable. Later governors, such as McCallum, McGregor, and Egerton, continued this hinterland penetration, applying either forceful or peaceful means depending upon the opposition met.

By 1879, all the British firms, i.e., the West African Company,

The Central African Company, Miller Brothers, and James Pinnock, were scattered all over the coast and the interior along the Niger. They found it necessary to amalgamate themselves for effective action. G. D. Taubman Goldie was the propounder of the combine. On July 13, 1886, a combination was chartered, and was known thereafter as the Royal Niger Company, Chartered and Limited. This combine was empowered to govern the interior parts of the River Niger and all the Northern territories of Hausa and Bornu. Although this power was granted them, their interest was mainly commercial, and they dared not go beyond those areas of their interest, political or otherwise, which were pertinent to the promotion of their trade. But most territories of the country still remained unknown to the British government at Lagos.

The Berlin Conference

In 1885, during the Berlin Conference, Nigeria was recognized by other European powers as a British Protectorate. As the nineteenth century was soon to expire, the inability of the Royal Niger Company to control the interior effectively became too obvious. Discontent among the Nigerians and conflict between the people and incompetent Company officers became great. On January 1, 1900, the Company's power was revoked and Nigeria came under the direct control of the British government. The *Protectorate* was divided into the Northern Nigeria Protectorate and the Niger Coast Protectorate. Both of these Protectorate areas were placed under the British Colonial Office.

These steps, taken after the Berlin Conference, did not stop the sovereign states and their kings in the interior from trying to repulse the British government. We cannot touch the bulky history of Nigerian kings and the early British invaders, but a rough treatment of one of the "episodes" may give us an idea of how the Nigerian hinterland became the British "Protectorate.".

In the northern section of Nigeria, there were powerful Emirate kingdoms whose contact with Europeans through the desert Arabs had been very slight in the past. There were several modern European trade-interested explorers who attempted to open

this area. Prominent among them were: Mungo Park (1796–1805), Major Denham (1822–1824), Captain Claperton (1822–1836), Richard Lander (1826–1830), and MacGregor Laird. Through the effort of these men certain areas were known to the British, and as far back as 1825 the first attempt was made to establish a British Consul at Bornu, in the extreme northeast near Lake Chad. Protests from the Emirs in that area were formidable, and it was only natural that eventually force should be applied in Northern Nigeria, as it had been applied in the South, beginning with the dethronement of Kosoko. As the nineteenth century was coming to a close conditions became more and more critical for the Chartered Company, which was facing not only the antagonism of the Emirates and the people, but also competion from Germany and France, whose penetration by this time could not be ignored. The result was that, although places like Ilorin and Nupe were conquered in 1897 in spite of opposition, the British Government—which wanted to check the ambitions of other European powers in Africa—through the initiative of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, sent Captain (now Lord) Frederick Lugard to Nigeria. There he raised a Frontier Force of two thousand men. In the meantime, an Anglo-German treaty was signed in 1893 and a boundary line was agreed upon. In 1898, an Anglo-French treaty was also concluded, and England became safe from these two European problems. The problem of the Emirate kingdoms, however, was still in the air. The Emirs were dauntless and could not imagine domination by the "white pagans," as they called Lugard and his men. It might be enlightening to examine some of the interesting correspondence that took place between the Sultan of Sokoto—the traditional hero of the Emirs in the Moslem kingdoms of Nigeria—and Brigadier-General Lugard—as he had become. These letters were written while the latter was in his great work of leveling the royal powers in Nigeria according to the orders from Whitehall. The Emirs had refused Lugard the right to interfere in their territories, but Lugard had persisted. He wrote a letter to the Sultan of Sokoto in March, 1901, promising him that the pene-

tration of the British was not "to drive out the Fulani and the Mohammedans," but to see that "they rule wisely and with humanity."

To this the Sultan Musilimin replied in non-equivocal terms:

> From us to you. I do not consent that any one from you should ever dwell with us. I will never agree with you. I will have nothing ever to do with you. Between us and you there are no dealings except as between Mussulmans and Unbelievers. . . . There is no power or strength save in God on high.
>
> This with salutations.

When the Sultan knew that Lugard was preparing a force to attack him, the Sultan wrote again confirming his first letter. This was received by Lugard about June, 1902.

> Seal, Emir l'Musilimin
>
> To Governor Lugard
>
> I have informed you that we do not invite your administration in the province of Bauchi and if you have interfered we do not want support from any one except from God. You have your religion and we have ours. We seek help from God, the Best Supporter, and there is no power except in him, the Mighty and Exalted.

To this letter, a representative of Lugard replied, in February, 1903:

> . . . to the Prince of the Believers Attahiru Emir El Musilimin. . . .
>
> We are coming to Sokoto and from this time and forever a white man and soldiers will sit down in Sokoto country. We have prepared for war. . . .
>
> (Signed) T. N. L. Morland.

Morland's letter aroused all the Emirs concerned. They decided to meet the British army, trusting in God and apparently

oblivious of the trust which Lugard and his men had in the mechanical devices derived from the Industrial Revolution. Much correspondence went round among the Emirs, wherein they arranged with each other as to where to meet and marshal their forces together to face their common enemy. They all decided to meet at Shagari as a base. Here is a part of a letter the Emirs interchanged:

> Greetings, . . .
>
> After salutations I have seen your letters with your orders to us to meet you at Shagari. May Allah assist us and give us victory over the heathen warmakers. If I have an opportunity I will come to you. If not you will see many strong men in my stead if Allah wills. I am the left hand, you are the right hand, in this war with the rebels.
>
> Peace.

It is interesting to read the correspondence between the British officers and the Nigerian rulers and to see how much those rulers resented British interference. To the Emirs of Nigeria, Lugard and his people were rebels, warmakers, and heathens. With them there could be no ground for relationship. Yet when people talk of Nigeria today, too often they sound as if the Nigerian people had voluntarily surrendered their rights and had invited the British to come in. Resistance, however, had continued from the very first.

This practice of deposing kings, destroying Nigerian war instruments, and installing weak rulers, characterized British policy in Nigeria as we entered the twentieth century. One thing was remarkable. The Dosumo affair did not repeat itself. No other Nigerian ruler has been alleged to have ceded his territory to the British Crown. All were under a treaty of reciprocal protection. What happened to King Lo Bengula of Matabele did not happen to the Nigerian kings. Nevertheless, from the north, south, east, and west, the British consolidated their power. Lugard was in the North. He conquered and leveled everything with the imperial force which he had organized in 1908. And

Nigeria today is not unaware of the methods of conquest which have been here described.

The people of Nigeria did have and still have their forms of government in the different states. A frank admission that the greatest obstacle to Nigeria's future is that the nation is not yet industrialized, is necessary. Education, too, is far from satisfactory. There are colleges and elementary schools, but not enough. There are trains and buses, telephones, the telegraph, and other electrical devices, but they are insufficient. There is no appreciable manufacture, if any. Nigeria is still essentially a reservoir of raw materials for manufacturing England.

In 1914 Northern and Southern Nigeria were amalgamated. Several important events then took place. The first practical result was that the development of the country became easier, particularly when the revenue of some richer areas could be diverted to the development of the poorer. This finally put Nigeria on a strong self-supporting basis. The British Imperial grant-in-aid was finally stopped in 1918, four years after the amalgamation. The next striking result of the amalgamation was that it made it possible for Nigeria to give much more help to England in both defensive and offensive actions during the first World War. Soon after the war broke out in 1914, the Northern and Southern Regiments of Nigeria were amalgamated into "The Nigerian Regiment," ready to act unitedly on the side of the British against Germany. Their brave record began in the German Cameroons.

On September 27, 1914, in a sweeping victory, the Nigerian soldiers forced an unconditional surrender of the German troops in Duala. On June 10, 1915, they conquered the Germans at Garna. They invaded Yaunda in 1915. At this point, the pressure of the Nigerian soldiers upon the German Cameroons became overwhelming, and by February, 1916, Germany evacuated Mora, and this last blow left Germany defeated in the Cameroons.

The United Nigerian troops did not stop there. On November 16, 1916, they marched into East Africa, and there proved their courage and suffered heavy casualties. It was estimated, according to *Colonial Report—Annual*, 1938, that over ten thousand

Nigerians and about five hundred British went to East Africa. Some of the Nigerian troops took part in some of the severest fighting in East Africa and they suffered heavy casualties from the enemy. They were on their way to Mesopotamia when the armistice was signed. The soldiers returned, having fought in a war to save the world for democracy. Whether Nigeria gained that democracy or not is another page of history.

The soldiers returned in 1918. The first reward the Nigerians received from the British Government for this voluntary service in their army, which cost them many lives, was direct taxation imposed upon the people by force. The British persuaded Aleke, one of the influential rulers, to enforce this taxation in his area of jurisdiction. The people, tired and impoverished by the pressure of the war just finished, were put into a frenzy by this British demand for taxes. There was some rioting. Railways were destroyed and stores broken into, and a European merchant was killed. Because of this small outbreak, the British killed three thousand Nigerians. An inquiry was instituted, but the findings were never published. The second prize that the Nigerians won from the British for participating in the war was received at Oron by the Efik tribe. There was another uprising in Eket, and to suppress that, many were hanged. An English writer, William N. M. Geary, in his *Nigeria Under British Rule*, substantiated this point when in connection with this he said: "There was much unrest among the Eket people, and a patrol secured several criminals, of whom eighteen were publicly hanged, including one woman, at any rate . . . the truth of these executions was admitted and stated in Parliament July 9, 1923."

Direct taxation has caused not a little uproar in the country. In 1929 the famous Aba Riot, engineered by thousands of Ibo women, occurred.

Let us now examine some of the good results of the war. Some improvements followed the amalgamation, apart from the fact that it helped to unite the Nigerian Regiments. Some measure of progress was made in the business enterprise of the nation. The Lagos water works was completed in 1915, costing about £310,-

000 ($1,240,000). At the end of 1916 the Eastern Nigerian Railway was completed and the Udi Coal Field was developed. It was estimated that the output of coal in 1916 was 25,500 tons and three years later, 1919, it was 137,000 tons. And the trend has been upward since then. In January, 1916, the Jebba Bridge—where the Western Railway crosses the River Niger—was opened, and transportation was increased. Later, the completion and opening of the Benue Bridge—where the Eastern Railway line crosses the Benue at Makurdi—added more impetus to internal trade. Mobility in the country was stimulated, and many Southern Nigerians began to rush to the North and vice versa. Social contact among the different sections of the country was unconsciously promoted by the growing trade relations. The importance of this greater ease of transport can never be overlooked in giving an account of the future of Nigerian nationalism.

It was after the amalgamation of 1914 that Nigeria became a member of the Universal Postal Union. The Eastern Telegraph Company established a cable station, and maintains a wireless station in Lagos. Aviation had come into prominence by 1935, and in February, 1938, air mail service was inaugurated in Nigeria. Sites for air bases have been selected at Lagos, Iokoja, Calabar, Port Harcourt, Forcados, Makurdi, Jebba, Onitsha, and Kano, and since the second World War it is said that about thirty-five air fields have been opened. Telephone exchanges were established in all important cities and towns, and the tendency is to universalize these into small community units. Motor roads, which were started in 1905, now cover the country. There are several fine highways, some that can be used only seasonally, others on a-year-around basis. By 1935, according to *Colonial Report—Annual*, 1938, the Native Administration Governments (Governments under the Natural Rulers in the Protectorate) maintained 15,563 miles of roads, and the Public Works Department of the British Government of Nigeria with its headquarters in Lagos maintained only 3,775 miles of road.

In discussing the educational improvements, we must first note that there have been three conflicting interests in Nigerian educa-

tion: The Nigerian Native Administration, the Missions, and the Education Department of the British Government of Nigeria. Another newly emerging interest is that of the privately owned schools. (For a unified system, a Board of Education was formed in which the first three interests were included. The British Government Director presided at the first meeting, held on March 11, 1932, at Kaduna—the capital of the Northern Provinces.)

Of the conflicting interests, the missionaries were the first to establish themselves. As far back as 1842 the Wesleyan Methodist Mission had been established, and others had followed. The Church Missionary Society (C.M.S.) was started in Abeokuta in 1846. In the same year the United Presbyterian Church came to Calockan, and the Baptists followed in 1853. The Catholics came later, and at the present there are many other denominations, such as the Seventh Day Adventists, the Congregationalists, the Faith Tabernacle, and so on. Each of the denominations, as well as the Salvation Army, has established schools of varying degrees of size and quality.

The multiplicity of missionary denominations was soon responsible for conflicting educational aims. The missionaries do not agree among themselves as to their educational objectives. The missionaries and the government did not agree on the basic ends of education; and the Moslem schools abhor both the government and the missionary penetration. Nor do the founders of the private schools agree with the educational philosophy of all those mentioned above.

To the British government, an educated Nigerian is one who can just read and write and be able to be a good "penpusher" in any of the clerical jobs of the civil service. To the Catholic missionary, the aim of education is to create a human being who understands the insignificance of his being and the magnanimous position of God; a church member who repeats the Ten Commandments in Latin and English with no reference to the vernacular of the people; a repentant sinner who resigns himself to the mercy of God and looks upon the Holy Father as the symbolical telescope through which man has a communion with his

Creator. To the Protestants, the aim of education is to create an individual who obeys law and order, who resigns all worldly riches for a greater reward in heaven. The aggressive and mechanistic sense of the West is considered sinful, and the idea of entering into any government job is considered a crime in Nigeria. The Moslems, of course, have their own inflexible contempt for the barbaric Christians and their form of government and education, so that even now, little success has been achieved in the direction of converting them to an educational system set up by the West.

In 1882, the government passed its first Education Ordinance, but the first British government school was not founded until 1899. From the beginning, the British Government Education Department controlled the curriculum. The most effective means of controlling the educational scheme was by the introduction of the grants-in-aid to accredited schools—schools that must conform in large measure to the wishes of the government.

The educational policy of Nigeria has been very severely criticized by the Nigerians and by some objective critics from Europe and America. The Phelps-Stokes Commission from the United States was helpful in suggesting that the education be adapted to the needs of the Africans, but their recommendations did not go far enough. I agree with Margery Perham that "they [the Commission] did not fully realize the nature of political opportunities open to Africans in a country like Nigeria." Up to now, the educational policy may be defined as a progressively regressive institution without those healthy elements necessary for the creation of a dynamic society. For an educational scheme to be effective, there must be a tendency to build from the known to the unknown. Children must not be started in life with the unknown: foreign languages, foreign history, foreign religion, foreign habits of dressing and eating, and foreign standards of moral values. Rather there must be a consistent attempt to bring the youth face to face with his own culture and with nature around him. Emphasis must be laid on vocational education. The people have been born to create and not to imitate. And there

will be no creation where there is no understanding of the relationship between an individual and his universe.

It does not seem reasonable that Nigerian education should be controlled by outsiders. Experience has shown the results of foreigner-controlled education in a growing nation. Nigeria has a potential power which may yet be released into the international sphere. If any encouragement has been given to the Nigerians, it is not as much as is needed. Even where some Nigerians establish their own schools, they are more or less bound to copy the requirements prescribed by the British government—if they are to be recognized and helped. In the recent University Evening Classes held at King's College, Lagos, for the purpose of pursuing higher studies, the curriculum will illustrate my point. The prescribed courses are described: "Pure and Applied Mathematics, . . . English Language, and Literature, Economic History, British Constitution, French, Roman Private Law, Constitutional Law, English Legal System, Criminal Law," and so forth. The pupils may study Latin and French, but there is no mention of the Yoruba and the Efik—the true Nigerian languages—let alone Nigerian law. I wonder that any true Nigerian considers that a course of study.

National aspiration is one of the natural forces of human experience. It cannot be repressed, but it can be directed. The kind of education that the people have determines their course. Education in Nigeria must be divorced from the chains of compartmentalization. The opposing theories and forces of the missionaries and the government cannot benefit the proper scheme of education.

The British government of Nigeria has failed tragically to provide either public or private education proper for Nigerian citizens. From 1851 to 1942—after ninety-one years—only 8 per cent of the population of Nigeria is literate. Nor can even the 8 per cent of literates be said to be the result of the effort of the British government or of any European missionary alone. A considerable portion came from the Native Administration Schools, and even from privately owned schools. The most effective way

to regenerate Nigeria educationally would be to make the Native Administrative Governments solely responsible for the compulsory and free education of their particular citizens in their respective states, and to allow the Nigerian National Government to establish a Nigerian University.

So much for education in Nigeria. The purpose of this chapter has been to trace the history of the subjugation of Nigeria. But it has intended also to show that the British government has accomplished much that is good, through force of necessity, by amalgamating the Northern and Southern provinces of the country, thus facilitating a more progressive national life. There has followed a comparative economic prosperity and an educational advancement. But we have also seen that even the advance made in the field of education was largely offset by an ill-planned educational scheme. The British educational scheme does not give an adequate place to African culture and psychology, nor does it encourage the training of men and women to come out as independent individuals ready to act for themselves in the diverse fields of trade, commerce, industry, and engineering, all so greatly needed in Africa to promote social welfare.

Among the good things that came with the British is Scouting. There are, as reported in 1943, three thousand Boy Scouts in Nigeria, not counting the Girl Guides. Labor unions have been established with incredible rapidity, although the leader of Nigerian Labor, Mr. Imodu, is now in a British prison under the pretext that his activities interfered with the progress of the war. I wonder what would happen to John L. Lewis if he lived in British Nigeria! Up to March 22, 1943, Nigeria has donated 658,-000 pounds sterling to the British to help her in this Second World War. This sum is cited in the speech of Sir Bernard Bourdillion delivered in Lagos during the Twenty-first Budget Session of the Nigerian Legislative Council which opened on Monday, March 15, 1943. It was reported also that the conquest of the British in East Africa was due largely to the gallant effort of Nigerian soldiers. They participated in the North African campaign, and are evidently taking an active part now in the Middle East, since the

Assistant Information officer in Nigeria reported: "I've recently returned from a visit to the Middle East where I saw some of the Nigerian troops who are serving in that theatre of war."

There ends the history of British-Nigerian relations from 1851 to 1943. The days ahead are unpredictable, but whatever the results of war, there is no doubt that in the future lurks optimism and hope for the Nigerian soldiers and civilians who, with a friendly coöperation, may form an independent African nation.

CHAPTER VIII

Reflections on the Future of Nigeria

IN LOOKING AT THE Nigerian political past, we see that fundamental questions were clearly answered. The Ibo people [1] believe that the power of the government comes from the will of the ancestors and the gods which are under the Supreme Creator; the agents of government execute the will of the gods, but the will of gods and ancestors simply implies the ultimate common weal of the people. These gods' agents on earth are entitled to make laws, but the Civil Assembly can also make regulations and recommend laws, and the laws must be in accord with tradition. The function of the organization of the government lies with the king and his ministers and with important family heads representing the people in family groups. The end of the government was simply to serve the people, to defend them from enemies, either from within or from without, and to assure their security from invasion.

In a nutshell, the real philosophy of government and its *raison d'être* is essentially the same everywhere. Just as all human bodies need the same elements for the survival of the body, but do not use the same chemical process in the mixing of the food elements, so it is that while the goal of all governments in relation to society is essentially the same, the processes through which these goals are sought are different.

For example, the specific way in which Locke expressed his opinion of government-society relationship was in the idea of contract: that the power of the government depends upon the consent of the governed, and that the legislature should have the

[1] All political states in Ibo do not have exactly the same political beliefs, but my assumptions here are based on broad generalizations.

sovereign power. Rousseau, unlike Locke, held that the people and not the legislature should have the sovereign power. To Hobbes, this inalienable and indivisible sovereignty belonged to a beneficent monarch.

But is there not one thing implicit in the whole process of thinking, either of the Nigerians or of the European philosophers —that law is the expressed opinion of the people, whether expressed under the guise of gods or of legal contract? On this broad premise, one can go on to state that in making the law, the objective must be clear that law is the result of the long-cherished customs and traditions of a people, adapted to fit into their particular social needs.

And here is a reaffirmation that obedience to the law is justifiable only in so far as it contributes to the collective interest of the many, and in so far as that law is within the popular mandate of the expressed will of the people. In this sense, law becomes tyranny if it does not originate in the place of its application.

We may then say that the nature of government has two aspects: one which describes what the government is and why it exists, and the other which describes its process and how this process comes into being, and who has the right to organize it for whom. From all this we can deduce that a people organized for exercising authoritative control over the acts of its members constitutes a state. And the mechanism and process of concretizing this general control is government. The activities by which this process is kept going is political activity. Government is not the only institution for social control, but the distinct mark of governmental control is compulsion, and the essential handmaiden of the government is force. Other agencies of social control, such as organized churches, clubs, and schools are persuasive in their approach. Government law has behind it the threat of physical coercion—either you obey the law, or . . . ! Such is the nature of government.

In reflecting on Nigerian governmental reform, it may be necessary to mention some of the essential functions of any modern government worthy of the name.

The Functions of Modern Government

The functions of government may be divided into two major components: (1) Those activities of government which have to do with the local matters within the state—national activities. (2) Those that have to do with the relationship between the state itself and other states—international activities.

National Activities

It is the chief function of government to defend the nation's interest through the care of its citizens. This covers a tremendous sphere, and can be summarized by saying that the national functions of government are essentially:

(1) To regulate commerce within the nation.

(2) To raise, support, and regulate the land, naval, and aerial forces.

(3) To regulate, control, and use the militia.

(4) To establish the rules affecting citizenship.

(5) To regulate the value of coins, coinage of money, and punishment of counterfeiting.

(6) To fix standards of weights and measures.

(7) To establish post offices and post roads.

(8) To guarantee the people the form of government in which they believe.

(9) To grant and protect the rights—civil or otherwise—of all citizens.

(10) To regulate economic activities for the benefit of all.

International Functions

Government has certain national functions which reflect on its international functions, and there are also functions which are strictly international:

(1) Declaration and prosecution of war.

(2) Raising and maintaining the forces to prosecute the war.

(3) Making of treaties with other nations.

(4) Sending and receiving of diplomatic representatives.

(5) Definition and punishment of piracies and felonies on the seas, and breaches of international law.

(6) Judicial power over admiralty and maritime cases, including privateering and captures on sea and land.

(7) Regulation of commerce with other nations.

Functions and Powers

For the effective execution of these functions, government in turn must have certain powers granted to it voluntarily by the people. Some of the powers are defined or delegated, others are implied, and still others, in varying degrees, are inherent in the government of all countries. Power and responsibility are parallel.

The basic and indispensable powers of government may be summarized as follows:

(1) Police power—for regulation and coercion.

(2) Power to lay and collect taxes, duties, and excises—for achieving such other purposes as a postal system, for defense, and so forth.

(3) Power to have its laws accepted as supreme.

(4) Power to choose the means of executing the governmental functions.

(5) Power of spending the national revenue for the public welfare.

(6) Power to levy military and civil draft.

(7) Penal powers.

(8) Power over the currency regulation and coinage.

(9) Power to exercise the right to Eminent Domain.

(10) Power to regulate the economic activities of the people so as to reduce the evils practiced in commercial and trade relations, to regulate public utilities, and to protect labor and employer rights.

(11) Power to provide service that private individuals are incapable of providing.

(12) Power to confer rights of citizenship.

(13) Power to make treaties, participate in international assemblies, and to cooperate in international welfare programs.

All these functions and powers are granted as means to an end —the ultimate end being the welfare of the people; their tranquil enjoyment of life in security within an ordered society. It is a quest for social justice, the curbing of animal passions of man, the conquest of fears from inclement factors of nature to which a single individual, if left alone, may become the victim. Granting this, the function of government justifies its existence, and its existence justifies its powers—when not abused.

But we do not live in a static world. Rather we find that time marches along ceaselessly with constant change. As the time and circumstances change, the instrument for the regulation of the new circumstances changes. On that basis, government and its machinery cannot remain the same under all circumstances. It changes with the gliding tide of social progress. We are forced always to adapt the government—the instrument of social control —to changing needs. This fact has a great bearing on my reflection on Nigerian government, and hence leads to my next consideration.

GOVERNMENT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

The above résumé of the functions of modern government shows that government touches the affairs of the individual in practically all phases of life from the cradle to the grave. Consequently, the conduct of life is no longer left to the families—to parents and elders. That Nigeria is living in a modern world cannot be refuted, and that the principle of adaptation is applicable to her as to any other nation needs no proof. But the political background of Nigeria conditioned by its agricultural economy is a factor to be reckoned with in adapting her to a new life. Care must be taken if the adaptation is not to abrogate and destroy all that is Nigeria. For Confucius said: "Study the past if you will divine the future."

To me, then, the adaptation of Nigerian government to social change will have two facets—one which seeks and treasures the

best that is in the old Nigerian political tradition, and the other which will seek the best in the new principles of government as they exist in other parts of the world. The fusion of these two aspects of civilization will give birth to a new Nigeria—derivative from the past, but ready to divine the future.

The trend of social change in modern Nigeria is the same as in other societies which developed from agricultural, rural, and localized life into industrial, urbanized, and cosmopolitan nations. No more can we go back to relive the kind of life which the old order of things imposed upon political perspective. My views on Nigerian Administration cannot, therefore, be circumscribed by the mysticism and unexamined beliefs and practices of the past. The real thing that exists is the future. The past is only in the memory; the present is temporary, and only the future is real and sure in the realm of existence.

All of the creative, Nigerian, political progress must be premised on a preparation of the present to fit into that future. This assumption makes clear the philosophy behind my reflection. It is there that one shall find the direction of the political changes I propose for Nigeria.

MY FUNDAMENTAL POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

My political attitude is pragmatic. "A pragmatist turns his back resolutely and once for all upon a lot of inveterate habits dear to professional philosophers. He turns away from abstraction and insufficiency, from verbal solutions, from bad *a priori* absolutes and origins. He turns towards concreteness and adequacy, towards facts, towards action, and towards power. . . . It means the open air and possibilities of nature, as against dogma, artificiality, and the pretense of finality in truth." [2]

I recognize the difficulty in applying this philosophy to political science, since political science is one of the social sciences.

[2] William James, *Pragmatism*, Longman's, Green and Co., New York, 1925, p. 51.

Unlike in the natural sciences, it is quite difficult, and sometimes impossible, to eliminate human bias in the social sciences in matters in which we are vitally interested. It is difficult to look upon human actions and behavior with the same ethical neutrality with which we examine geometrical figures. There are some reasons for this: (1) The subject matter of political science or of any other social science is in itself more complicated, because we have more variables to deal with than in biology or physics. We obtain specimens more easily for the study of natural science, and we experiment with a greater freedom. (2) We have to face the subjective difficulty of maintaining scientific detachment in approaching the study of human relations. Only few human beings have attained the calmness and fairness necessary to consider both sides of such a question as political independence for all nations—the inherent capacity of all peoples to rule themselves—whereas in the study of natural science, we can all objectively agree on the structure of ether, the atom, or on the number of light-years in the diameter of the physical universe. There are natural barriers to pragmatic thinking in the realm of political philosophy. Yet, they must not be allowed to impede all our efforts to aim at a specific, concrete, and workable formula. We cannot resort to resignation and despair simply because we have humanly developed biases and "unexamined beliefs"—as Socrates would have called them.

Turning then to the problem of political Nigeria with a pragmatic mind, I see that the most essential thing is to abandon the idea that old things are good because they are old—that any tradition is acceptable on the basis of its antiquity. I have shown admiration for things Nigerian; I have also shown impatience with the "educated class" which I feel is denationalizing themselves by abandoning the obligations of immemorial customs and traditions. Thus I believe my attitude to be healthy and also consistent with a pragmatic outlook, provided that we understand pragmatism as nothing new, but rather as something that works at a particular time in a particular place: something that is free from imitation for its own sake, but rather seeks to understand

that "There can be no difference anywhere that doesn't *make* a difference elsewhere." [3]

This is not closing our door against new trends and new ways. Rather it is pointing out that the intrinsic value of a thing does not lie in its being either old or new. It lies in its present utility, workability, and acceptability. In fact, the intrinsic worth of a thing justifies itself only in its extrinsic values.

Nigerians cannot imagine themselves moving progressively simply because they are quick to reject old political systems and to accept new ones. Pragmatically, it is the ability to infuse the new ideas into the old with a view to stability that marks political ingenuity. The tendency to reject everything that one has is a distinctive mark of political puerility. It is one of the signs of childish illusion—a phobic reaction that makes a child run away from its own image.

I turn to England for my analogy. Can we not say with absolute sincerity and with due deference to opposite opinions, that with whatever their defects, the English have succeeded in the process of evolving a comparatively stable, adaptable, efficient, progressive, and dynamic government? I do not subscribe to the idea that the British succeeded because they are inborn political geniuses. That is ridiculous. "The English as a people are just as unthinking, narrow, and unpractical in political matters as any other nation, but they possess—for all their liking for public debate—a tradition of confidence. The difference is simply that the Englishman is the object of a regimen of very old and successful habits, in which he acquiesces because experience has shown him their advantages." [4] When Spengler said that the Englishman acquiesces in old and successful habits, he was only expressing my pragmatic view of political philosophy. If a habit is old and yet proves successful in any place, the change of that habit on the basis of being old alone, is impractical. In the same way, acquiescence in old, but unsuccessful and useless habits is retrogressive.

[3] Benjamin Rand, *Modern Classical Philosophers*, Houghton Mifflin Company, New York, 1924, p. 836.

[4] Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West*, p. 441.

Where does this argument lead? It leads us to the fact that whatever be the attraction of some political ideologies—democratic, communistic, fascist, or otherwise—modern Nigeria must be reconstructed on the basis of what fits Nigeria as Nigeria and not as British-Nigeria or Europeanized-Nigeria. The political planners have a choice, just as "The Nigerian educator," said Eyo Ita of Nigeria, "must decide between training servants and wage earners for the British masters, and training free citizens who direct their own economic and cultural organization; between training for the Nigerian life and culture and training for the perpetuation of British culture. He must choose between building British and Scottish cities and building Nigerian cities, . . . he has to decide between defining working toward the realization of his purposes and ideals on the one hand and copying the British standard, allowing the British interests and problems to obscure his own and making himself a mere tool for the solution of the British problems, on the other hand."[5] The Nigerian political planner must choose between having a truly Nigerian government unashamedly and having a product of imitation.

My point is that for the whole political problem of Nigeria to be pragmatic, it must be solved by the Nigerians on the basis of practicability and utility. I say by the Nigerians, because only the Nigerians can reflect a Nigerian character upon its political planning. Anything else will be an imitation.

Too much reliance, however, on practices that are Nigerian may be misleading and inconsistent with our thesis of pragmatism. Just as I insist that the Nigerian government must look back more and more in order to recognize the real political culture of the country by allowing the Nigerians and not the British to plan their life, so shall I introduce what I call a pragmatic conservatism for the future.

It is time for Nigerian conservatism to reorient its foundations. Conservatism has expressed itself in many ways—as our descriptive chapters above showed. Nigerian political conservatism depends largely upon various doubtful assumptions of the nature

[5] Master's Thesis, Teacher's College, Columbia University.

of our universe; it depends, in part, upon the belief that the legal postulates of the priests and god-sent kings and departed ancestors are part of the eternal order of nature. In the presence of our present experience, these are not all correct. There is no proof nor logical evidence that kings are god-made—divine; and there is no permanent justification of the assumption that whatever the ancestors have handed down is immutable. That is what Nigerian conservatism has to learn. Another unscientific assumption is that the government that governs the least is the best. That may indeed be right in the light of an agrarian society stratified into class and family-group sufficiency. But certainly it is an out-of-date political theory in our complicated industrial society where some public services which are essentially urgent can no longer be handled by leading families or individuals.

This conclusion entails a reëxamination of the means and ends of government upon the conservatives of Nigeria. It means a new conception of government and of the place of the individual in society. It calls for a drastic departure from a great many vestigial attributes of the Nigerian constitutions. Pragmatic conservatism admits the assumption that adaptation is the first law of life. A conservatism that endures is never dogmatic; its continued existence depends on its response to major expediencies. "A nation does not live solely on the memory of its past achievements; it is able to consolidate its past achievements only by using them as the basis for contemporary success. Once it loses this art it loses the power to maintain that unity of purpose which is the cement of social action." [6]

This explains what I mean—using the past achievements (and not throwing them away) as the basis for contemporary success. This art, if lost, will mean a political wreckage which time cannot mend.

The kings of Nigeria must school their temperaments to give the concessions needed for individual liberty to an ever-growing-free men. British-Nigerian government must be ready to hand

[6] Harold J. Laski, "A Formula for Conservatives," in *1938 Essay Annual*, Ed. by Rich. A. Walter, Scott, Foresman and Co., New York, 1938, p. 11.

over the power and responsibility to the Nigerian kings who represent the people. The citizens of Nigeria—educated or not—must learn the folly of resisting the concentration of political power in the hands of the indigenous government. For their resistance is just as condemnable as is the stubbornness of the aristocrats of the old regime who resist all concessions to the emerging free-thinking mass. For both, by refusing to give concessions reciprocally, only beckon a drastic super-imposition from without.

Much more important, if not most disastrous, is the separatist tendency of Nigerian conservatism. This gloomy habit of separatism is manifested by both old and young groups. The Yorubas still think themselves apart from the Efiks, the Ibos consider their destiny apart from that of the Hausas. That is tribal separatism. Its origin is excusable, but its continuance is intolerable. But too much emphasis should not be laid on this point, lest one lend help to what one wants to prevent—particularly now that there is a definite sign that national consciousness is overshadowing tribal differences. There is, however, a type of separatism which contributes severely to Nigerian sickness today, but those who entertain this tendency try to justify themselves by categorizing their separatist attitude as "differences" between individuals. The separatism to which I am referring has rendered such a great body as the Nigerian Youth Movement ineffectual if not impotent in the present crucial moment in world history. Some critics, choosing to defend what they term their "impeccable position" may condemn me for my point of view, but the fact remains that the Nigerian Youth Movement, up to the time of this writing, has done nothing to prove that their leaders have any real understanding of the trend of world events. Why must Nigerians indulge in separatism? We blame our forefathers for their localism and shortsightedness. Now we practice the worst type of provincialism and blind self-justification! We rationalize our inability to unite by verbal expressions which have no relation to the issues of our national redemption. What will our sons and daughters say about us when they read the history of today and see all the avenues we have open for collective action, and realize that we

have chosen to act as separate individuals or in different groups?

What is our difficulty? The same as everywhere else in the world where a nation is either about to fall or has fallen politically. It is the same curse as beset France on the eve of its last catastrophe. It is the same as corrupted Spain. It was the ill of political China just before 1911—too much emphasis on the person, without any reference to principles and things. Nigerian conservatism must be pragmatic enough to develop coöperation, discipline, compromise, sincerity, patience, continuity, method, technique, and the sense of continual growth. Above all, there must be a common objective which every one must set above the individual. That can be demonstrated in our social faith which expresses itself in *Nzoputa Nigeria* or Nigerian irredentism. *Nzoputa Nigeria* is more than Mr. A or Madam X. "Let not ambition mock their useful toil." Our pragmatic conservatism is a challenge to a spirit of rigid personalism. The spirit that accepts no compromise in great matters that are vital to our nation is doomed.

The backwardness of Nigeria today is not entirely the fault of the British Government. I sincerely think that the Nigerians are more than 50 per cent responsible for the state of things as they are. There is no coördination of thought, no clear-cut objective, no unity, no internal cohesion (although there is no internal civil war), no understanding, and no sympathy among the leaders. The situation is tragic and shameful!

Under all these conditions, what kind of political future do we want? No one can tell. We are not prophets. The most that we can do is to establish possible conditions conducive to a true political stability, and leave the details for the future to shape.

There are several social elements to be reckoned with: The Nigerian kings in separate states which at present are classified under the ill-fated name of "Native Administration," the people of Nigeria themselves including the uneducated, miseducated, and educated classes; the British government and the English. The fate of Nigeria will be determined by the attitude of all these three elements—the Nigerian people, the kings, and the British government.

In a great measure, under the present system in the country, the nature of real changes will depend on the initiative of the Nigerians themselves. The British people will have such a terrible time setting their own house in order after this war that it will be impossible to expect too much from them. From all points of view, it will be unfair for the citizens of Nigeria to depend on any people but themselves to bring about any effective and permanent changes. The success of such progress depends again on the foresight of the Nigerian leaders—their ability to unite and compromise and cling to Nigerian culture itself as a base for any lasting and respectable planning.

The problem of Nigeria is in a way quite simple if approached with sincerity. By and large, Nigeria, by its political tradition and heritage, cannot operate successfully as a strong united nation except as a federal government. We already have what we may call well-defined areas or political states. There may be some necessary changes here and there, but those would come naturally. We already have the heads of states. We do not need to create new ones, but we may need to modernize some of the systems and processes. Any government which is to reflect the character of the people must be of their own making in terms of their own true tradition and practices. A *Nigerian government* modeled by the Nigerian is the only government that can be Nigerian. The citizens of Nigeria must therefore be warned to be on guard against blind imitation of the Western political system, except where it is compatible with Nigerian character and environment.

I am aware of certain things that may come to mind. Some readers will be interested in the problem of universal direct suffrage, elections, representative legislature, responsible executives, and an independent judiciary. It is good to think of all these points and to hope that they come about. But the leaders of Nigeria must for the present concentrate their effort on safeguarding the essentials of democracy rather than those unnecessary details of its machinery which Salvador de Madariaga said "are still defended with bigoted stubbornness as indispensable every-

where although they have failed time and again in all but a limited number of countries."[7] It seems, though, that there are certain specific points on which there need be no compromise in our plan. Whatever the machinery, freedom of thought and action, respect for person, government by consent of the governed, taxation with representation are the matters on which there must be no debate between the people and the government. But other things are a matter of mechanics and should evolve naturally in terms of the Nigerian political atmosphere. I have always thought that the Nigerian political future has a great deal to draw from the United States, although here, too, we have to be careful to distinguish between apparent and real similarities in circumstances.

I suppose that the job of nationalization will be a lot easier if every facility is given to the autonomous regions or states for individual initiative in social planning. It will also be necessary for these states to develop efficient representative legislatures and efficient judicial systems that are flexible and responsive.

From these well-planned state governments, a national government can be formed comprising representatives from ll the states. Unless something like that is planned, we shall never hope to enjoy a real *Nigerian government* created by Nigerians. I simply do not see how we can have what could be called a true Nigerian government, if it is built on the structure of the present British colonial system designed for colonial control from England.

The first and foremost thing, therefore, is to abolish the present British colonial set-up of Legislative and Executive Councils of Nigeria. In its place we must have Nigerian upper and lower houses composed of representatives from the states or from whatever other sub-divisions we see fit to establish, provided that they are based on a standard population figure sufficiently large to make up a political state acceptable to the Nigerian national government.

I do not propose to enter into any details as to the nature of the legislative, judicial, and administrative changes. I cannot do it

[7] Salvador de Madariaga, *Spain*, Creative Age Press, New York, 1943, p. 455.

with any more adequacy and practical approach—while writing from my room at the International House in New York City—than some others, with no proper knowledge of Nigerian political background, who have tried to create a machinery of government based on a knowledge of European political traditions alone. Details will be worked out after a close examination of the practices of different autonomous states. I concern myself with essential fundamentals which can be generally applied in practically all places where people are aiming at what we term government by consent. And Nigerians knew and practiced this before the British came.

One more important point. Some may wonder where I place the British government in Nigeria in my plan for the future of Nigeria. The problem is clear. The British government in Nigeria does not quarrel with the legitimate aspiration of the Nigerian people to be strong and independent of external control. Immediately the present Legislative and Executive Councils are abolished, the next step will be for Nigeria and England to revise their treaty terms and to enter into a new relationship based on an entirely different form of intercourse—one consistent with the idea of coöperation and reciprocity. I do not believe that Nigeria will be any less coöperative with the British, or vice versa, if such a condition is fulfilled. It is rather obvious that the relationship will become more reciprocal, and confidence will thus be assured. It may be that there will still be a British Governor General stationed in Nigeria to represent the British Crown in an advisory capacity; but there should also be a Nigerian-appointed officer to represent Nigeria in England in an advisory capacity. The Nigerian National Government may be called the Nigerian Republic, or whatever you will. There should be no quarrel over the name. That would be as childish as to quarrel over the details of the government machinery itself.

In closing, I shall stress again the need for psychological reform. Most Nigerians, for the present, are victims of a psychological situation. This stems from some technical omission in our political knowledge of Nigeria in her relationship to the British.

The people of the Gold Coast, who have shown more alertness and sagacity in their political writing and activities, are relatively free from this defect. We, on the other hand, have unconsciously allowed ourselves to be driven to a point where there is no clear distinction between the Nigerian Colony and the Protectorate; the Protectorate seems to be accepting the status of the Colony. I cannot say more on this than Rev. Attoh Ahuma said in 1897.[8] Unless we know what we are and how we came about to be what we are, we shall certainly be unable to know where and how to go further. Nigerian political thinkers have the job on their hands of defining Nigeria first before projecting into the future. The British are such a technically legal people that they never abandon origins and fundamentals. They know their relationship with Nigeria, and they know that a great many Nigerians have not started to approach that relationship from the source. Nigerian states and their kings entered into treaties of friendship with England largely for economic purposes; it must be our responsibility to understand those treaties and to revise them. We must determine whether they are unilateral or bilateral treaties. Then the dilemma of the A.B.C. categories of Nigerian political progress will be eliminated.

I have always maintained that Nigeria as a nation is a distinct unit unto itself. It has no apologies to make about its existence. Nigeria is a distinct organism among cultural families. We need not sacrifice the identity which our forefathers have safeguarded for us.

The future of Nigeria, then, really lies in the hands of the Nigerians. The political imbecility of the nation can be remedied once the Nigerians are able to interpret Nigeria in its true light, and give others reason to respect our political status and those of our rights which are not yet impaired.

The habit of always blaming others for our faults will not save us. Let us do our part and the rest will come to us.

[8] See Appendix IV for the Address to the Gold Coast Aborigines' Rights Protection Society by Rev. Attoh Ahuma in 1897. The topic is "Colony or Protectorate—Which?"

SECTION III—IMPERIALISM IN ÁFRICA

CHAPTER IX

What Price Christianity in Africa?

IN A DISCUSSION of the role of Christianity in Africa, there are always three schools of thought, as Mr. Nnamdi Azikiwe correctly classified them. The first is the rightist, the second the leftist, the third the eclectic. The hypothetical question before them is this: "Is it necessary for the well-being of the African to have European missionaries in Africa?"

The rightist represents a group of Africans who definitely, sincerely, and probably blindly, believe that without Christian missionaries the African continent cannot develop a sense of social or moral stability. To them Africa is still a "dark" continent, and Christianity is the symbol of illumination and civilization. Only in the spirit of Christianity are there any true, moral, and ethical principles capable of guiding man into a well-ordered community of human beings here on earth, preparatory to the day of a greater reward in heaven. "Without Christianity," they would ask, "what could Africa do?" They would declare that for whatever progress we have made today in Africa we are directly indebted to the efforts of missionaries. Forget their shortcomings. Overlook their errors and the crimes committed by some of them. The good deeds of missionaries in Africa overshadow what evil they have done.

The leftist represents a group of Africans who look at the missionaries with apprehension. They see missionaries as a weakening and degenerating influence on the vitality of the African stamina—physical, mental, and social. They say: "Africans are a powerful race, but their physical resistance can be broken down

by an appeal to them to suffer punishment in this world with a view to eternal reward in the hereafter."

While this group recognizes and appreciates some good done by the missionaries, they feel that the present Christian missionary is a tool of imperialism which disintegrates and disinherits Africans everywhere on the continent. They feel with Nehru that "organized religion, whatever its past has been, today is very largely an empty form devoid of real content. It has been filled up by some totally different substance." They see in the organized Christian church something ominous and ugly for the ethical and moral man of tomorrow. They admit that there are still some men of the highest character within the organized church, but they insist that the shadow of our money-conscious world has covered up their spiritual stars and has hidden them from view. These leftists point out, as Nehru does: "that the Church has served the purpose of British imperialism and given both capitalism and imperialism a moral and Christian covering. It has sought to justify, from the highest ethical standards, British predatory policy in Asia and Africa, and given that extraordinary and enviable feeling of being always in the right to the English."

The leftist further feels that Christianity, as practiced by Europeans, has in it a germ of religious intolerance which was unknown and is undesirable in Africa. In his view, Christianity is good as a religious principle, but European missionaries in Africa are more of a social and cultural liability than an asset to the Africans.

The eclectic school represents a lukewarm group, that is, a group which refuses to show any active concern in what happens. It does not matter to them whether Christianity is rooted out of Africa, or whether it succeeds in ruling the minds of men there. In this group are some sincere men who believe in compromise. It is true that European Christian missionaries have distorted our culture, misrepresented us, miseducated us, but we can still compromise with them and abandon our grudges and quarrels. After all, they would argue, "look at Fourah Bay College in Freetown; Presbyterian College at Akropong, Gold Coast; Uzua-

kolí Institute at Uzoakdi, and Awka College in Onitsha Province, Nigeria—all were founded under the auspices of Christian missionaries, and most of the educated Africans have been trained in one or another of these schools.

In view of this, the eclectic school does not believe in complete Europeanization of African culture in the name of Christianity, but it also does not agree that European missionaries are simply undesirable.

In Africa today we can find these three different African views concerning Christian missionaries. One is conservative, one is eclectic, and the last is radical. It must be clearly understood and appreciated, however, that there are more supporters of the leftist view among the "renascent Africans" everywhere in Africa than of the other viewpoints. To convince the new African of the *raison d'être* of Christianity in Africa, "The Christianity of the future must become more and more humble. It must produce more than one Albert Scheitzer, who is in Africa today to make atonement for the white man's injustice and cruelty to the black man, confessing:

" 'A heavy guilt rests upon our civilization. What have not the whites of all nations since the era of discovery done to the colored peoples! What does it signify that so many peoples where Christianity came have died out while others are vanishing or at least disintegrating? Who will describe the injustices and atrocities committed by Europeans? . . . A heavy guilt rests upon us. We must save them. When we do good to them, it is not benevolence, it is expiation.

" 'Brotherliness and coöperation must be in the religion of the future. We shall ultimately ethicize all relationships of life or bring on the final catastrophe.' "[1]

Our world cannot be one of either-or; it must be one of both-and. The whole body of Christian philosophy, to survive, must be liquid, in contradistinction to a solid body, so that it be not broken at the meeting of any opposing force. Only solids break upon meeting an opposing force; liquids do not.

[1] Conrad Henry Moehlman, 1938 *Essay Annual*, p. 155.

The philosophy of the Christian religion must be consistent with African life, in order to be a part of the people. In the words of Eyo Ita of Nigeria, "Man must be rescued as a whole person." Christian religion must embrace the length and breadth of human personality. It must discard all obsolete absurdities and inconsistencies and lay emphasis on intelligent behavior, appreciation of the beautiful, and adoration of true ethical grandeur. The chief responsibility of the Christian religion is to prepare individuals as well as nations to become each a part of the whole, in order that they may be able to fit into the harmonious unity of our twentieth-century civilization. Christianity must take its stand as an impartial judge between human reason and human emotion. We live in a world of reason and emotion, and whenever we allow one to dominate the other, the equilibrium cannot be maintained, and the result is some kind of upset—be it mental or physical. The elephantine and megalomaniac complexes of some nations today are due to unbridled emotional maladjustments characteristic of some unfortunate citizens in those nations. Those phobic reactions of most of the leaders of Europe today are due to the blind selfishness of the statesmen in dealing with those nations on the day of victory in 1918. Retribution is one of the inevitable companions of life. It may come soon or late, but it never fails to come.

Christianity not Imperialism

The success of Christianity in Africa will be a *fait accompli* when the African is convinced in reality that the cohorts of Christianity, and their religion, are not the tools of imperialism. The author does not see any imperialistic flavor in the teachings of Christ, nor is he convinced that it is humanly possible for the Christian missionaries, either from Europe or America, to launch out consciously as the forerunners of the anti-Christian institution known as "Imperialism." By definition, "*Imperialism* is a policy which aims at creating, organizing, and maintaining an empire; . . . Empires may be created by voluntary association or by

forceful annexation. . . ." [2] "Imperialism refers simply to the policy whereby one state extends its political or economic power, or both, over another region, with or without the consent of the inhabitants thereof." [3] Or as Edmund Mower puts it: "Imperialism . . . may be said to mean the projection of national power, out beyond the national boundaries—the acquisition of foreign territory, spheres of influence, or commercial privileges." [4]

By these definitions it is made crystal clear that imperialism is anti-Christian in temper. It embodies "forceful annexation." It overlooks the principle of the "golden rule." It does not consider human personality and its dignity. It nurses economic inequality. It is callous in feeling. Its callousness sanctions the indifferent, legalistic action of the Levite, and stands in opposition to the Christian attitude of the Good Samaritan. That is "imperialism," and that is why I cannot conceive of a body of Christians being the forerunners of such a monstrosity.

What is indisputable, however, is that Christian nations by their words and their deeds ("by which you know them") have failed to live up to Christian teaching in their relationship with Africa. This fact is irrefutable and tragic. Indeed, when we consider the misdeeds of all European nations through their governments and merchants, it is a most sinful misstatement to attach the name "Christian" to any European country practicing imperialism.

What Are Christian Nations?

We agree that there are some Christians in all nations, be they European, Asiatic, African, or American, but they are "some," not "all." If any nation can be called "Christian" because some of its citizens are Christians, then all African nations are Christian nations today. This is true, because apart from the fact that some

[2] *Encyclopædia of the Social Sciences*, Volume Seven, The Macmillan Company, New York. Ed. 1937.
[3] Sharp and Kirk, *Contemporary International Politics*, Farrar & Rinehart Inc., New York, p. 605, 1940.
[4] Edmund C. Mower, *International Government*, D. C. Heath & Co., New York, p. 27, 1931.

African countries like Ethiopia became Christian long before Christianity came to Europe, there is not one part of Africa in the twentieth century into which Christianity has not penetrated, with the consequent conversion of some of the people. In this sense practically all nations would then be Christian nations. But we know that so careless a classification does not answer our question. For the African, the criteria for categorizing nations as Christian and non-Christian are based on different lines of thought.

For a nation to be Christian, it must be baptized in the "Jordan" of the *theory* and *practice* of Christian teachings. I mean the teaching of Jesus Christ. This baptism will be manifested in a nation's *political philosophy and practice*, its *economic structure and its impact upon society*, and its *social ideal and practice*. When any nation has learned to think and act upon these three phases of human life in terms of true Christian ethics, that nation will be a "Christian Nation."

In the political philosophy of a Christian nation, "Our object in the construction of the State is the greatest happiness of the whole, and not that of any one class." [5] In the economic structure of a Christian nation, we must "Give labor a free field and its full earnings; take for the benefit of the whole community that fund which the growth of the community creates, and want and the fear of want would be gone." [6] In the social ideal and practice of a Christian nation, "We can try to spread the spirit of social service in the future generation." [7] This will assure humanity that the world citizens of tomorrow will have a sane perspective of the *raison d'être* of life. They will appreciate each other as social beings, as Aristotle thought they should. This can be accomplished by proper education and not by teaching us that "we are the Americans" and "they are the Germans," or that "we are the

[5] Plato, *The Republic*.

[6] Henry George, *Progress and Poverty*, Robert Schalkenback Foundation, New York, 1931, p. 461.

[7] *The Religion of the World* published by Swami Ghanananda for the Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, Calcutta, Modern Art Press, Calcutta, 1938, Vol. II, p. 742.

brown race" and "they are the yellow race." We are to teach that we are a society of human beings born to serve and appreciate each other in spite of diversities in customs and environments.

These requirements for a Christian nation may seem simple and commonplace, yet the facts are that any African religious thinker who has visited some European nations with the hope of seeing the Christian God expressing Himself in the social and religious life of the people, has always returned disillusioned. Immediately his spiritual self recoils from the wide chasm between man's ethical theories and his actual way of living. If he turns the pages of European history, he finds them filled with accounts of bloody wars, broken treaties, religious intolerance, decapitated kings, murdered Cardinals and Bishops of God, innocent wives divorced to satisfy the whims of reigning kingdoms, states worshiped and man deified, peoples of the world subjugated through the force of arms alone, and race superiority preached, with "less favored sons" of God barred from dancing places, eating places, sleeping places, and even from places of worship, on account of creed, color, or nationality.

Consistent Inconsistency

In Africa, the European missionaries fill our ears with the virtue of "turning the other cheek," "loving thy neighbor as thyself," "civilization," "loving humanity," "scientific thinking free from African superstition," and so on. But the curious African who sets out on a pilgrimage to the Christian nations is disappointed in his search for evidences of the Christian life. He hopes to see lands where man is fully civilized and free from all animalistic tendencies; where there are neither wars nor conflicts; where people do not commit suicide on account of economic and social maladjustments; where husband loves wife and wife husband; where the police need not patrol armed with guns, because men are civilized; where savagery has been forgotten and men do not maul each other; where the dignity of labor is recognized and racketeering absent; where narcotic drugs are taboo;

where everybody goes to church on Sunday and serves the God of Heaven, and not other gods—machines, movies, clubs, "nice rides," airplanes; where people of all colors serve God under the same roof because men are civilized and think scientifically; in short, nations among whom God and Christ are actually man's test.

In these Christian nations the African expects to see everybody serving Christ and living a Christian life; he expects to see people free from the superstitions which are supposed to be the sole monopoly of African "savages"; he expects to see everybody participating in his own government, as opposed to the so-called "autocracy" of African "Chiefs"; he expects to see women so free and happy as to justify the condemnation of polygamy as practiced among some honest and wealthy Africans;[8] he expects to see economic security within the reach of all citizens of "Christian nations." These are what an African observer expects to see!

But what does he actually find? Certain great facts force themselves to his attention. A great cultural lag is the first spectacle that comes to the attention of the observer. There is an amazing contrast between the material and the non-material phases of life among people of Western civilization. Technological development and social institutions are so far apart that the chasm between them seems almost unbridgeable, and at times every effort seems to be being made to widen the abyss. And Barnes rightly says: "We have a thoroughly up-to-date material culture, complete, diverse, and potentially efficient beyond that of any earlier age. On the other hand, our institutions and the social thinking through which we seek to control and exploit this material cul-

[8] Here, I make out no case for either polygamy or monogamy; both of them have their evil and good sides, but as far as we know, if freedom and happiness are the goals of life, there is no proof yet that families in legally monogamous countries are happier and freer than families in legally polygamous countries. It is an open question, and is better left to our sociologists and anthropologists. Differences in opinions affecting it, other than scientific, are a matter of cultural and not essentially religious differences.

ture are an antiquated mosaic, compounded of accretions from the stone ages to the close of the eighteenth century, with very little from a more recent period actually guiding our lives." [9]

So it is that in the Western world, everyone wants to drive this year's automobile, but if you sit beside the driver of the newest car and ask him a question on some pressing social issue you will probably find that his ideas on social problems are as modern as those of Moses, who lived about 1200 B.C. He will probably believe Willkie's one-world idea is fantastic. It is indeed a strange phenomenon. He will advocate consciously or unconsciously that "might is right," that "turning the other cheek" is taboo in Western thinking, and that hence, Gandhi's pacific philosophy is an illusion; that it is rather the Mosaic law of "an eye for an eye" that is the norm of conduct of a civilized man; that money is the measure of all things, and that no matter how superior you are in your cultural refinement, if you lack that power which comes through the amassing of material wealth you have no higher place in the mind of the Western thinker.

The nature of the problem is more incredible when one observes the fundamental elements which form the social institutions—the economic set-up, the press, the radio, the movies, the church. One sees social tension increasing alarmingly, and the neuroses and psychoses which are the inevitable concomitants of such a situation. These maladies characteristic of the social West of today are due to the inadequacy of the whole scheme of life which the machine age has imposed upon "savage man."

The economic West, with few exceptions, is essentially capitalistic. Capitalism has gone through many phases. There have been, as Barnes arranges them: (1) the pre-industrial capitalism which characterized the early commerce, (2) industrial capitalism, (3) monopoly capitalism, and (4) today's finance capitalism —a stage in which the financier takes the place of the industrialist so far as the control of economic life is concerned. Rationalization is emphasized under finance capitalism, and the ideal of economic

[9] Harry Elmer Barnes, *Society in Transition*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1939, p. 946.

life becomes that of accumulation of immediate financial profits through speculation.

Capitalism and rationalization have brought some social changes: family disintegration, homelessness which we call proletarian life, conflict between capitalist and labor classes resulting in constant strikes, boycotts, vigilantism, labor racketeering, industrial espionage, unemployment, child and woman labor, and economic insecurity. These increase the rate of crime. They weaken man's faith. They alienate the mental, and thus the spiritual vitality of the individual, and leave the purse of ethical life empty. That is the burden of the West.

The press presents another illustration of unhealthy lag. While there have unquestionably been great technical advances in the newspaper industry, there has been little improvement in its non-material qualities. This age is witnessing and enjoying the cylindrical printing press, typesetting machinery, cheaper and more economical paper. Moreover, the use of telegraph, radio, and telephone has contributed immeasurably to the efficiency of newspaper technique. World news is gathered by elaborately organized newsgathering agencies and presented by cable, telegraph, and radio. These make the modern newspaper quasi-omnipresent and are laudable. But the fundamental question is: Is the editor sincerely interested in the mass of the people or is he rather slavishly subservient to the whims of the business men? The answer is obvious. "Commercial journalism" is the cause of the ineffectiveness of the press as a social force today. In Nigeria, my country, the first newspaper I became acquainted with was the *West African Pilot*, which may be called the *New York Times* of West Africa so far as circulation is concerned. The impression from this newspaper led me to expect too much of the aims of editors in the West. In the *West African Pilot* the editorial material is vigorous, honest, critical, and impartially outspoken, and that made me think that actually the function of the press was to right the view of the misinformed; to champion the cause of the forgotten and underprivileged in the community; to criticize the

government; to criticize the church, the commercial oligarchy, and the public apathy.

This is not so in the Western world of today. Liberal ideas are often tabooed in the press. The advertisement, whether it is detrimental to the community or not, is the god of the press. Freedom of the press itself has been cut off in some European countries, leaving the ignorant in perpetual bondage to reaction and stagnation. That is why I agree that "they, the press, are rapidly declining as a social force, and such social influence as they exert is massed decisively on the side of stagnation and reaction."[10] If one would make an exception, one could mention *PM*, the *New York Post*, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *Chicago Sun*, and one or two more, as examples of public journals with a soul and a consciousness of moral obligation. These are of course American, and probably there are a few more in other parts of the Western world. But the general pattern is made up of most somber colors.

Turning to the radio, we see another blessing of human ingenuity which gives a limitless impetus to mass education, mass entertainment, and mass information. Boys in tropical Africa enjoying the fragrant odors of their equatorial home, may tune in their radio and hear one Franklin Delano Roosevelt addressing them as "My friends!" A New England gentleman, during his evening hours of happy ease, while reflecting on America and her greatness, may turn on his radio to enjoy music, and hear instead one Nehru in far-off Asia proclaiming the rights of man, as that noble son of Virginia once did when he called for "liberty" or for "death" in St. John's Church in Richmond, Virginia. No one can deny that radio is a blessing, if its function is limited to right and correct information, and to intercourse which may promote man-to-man relationship all over the world. But the true story is different. In some nations of Europe radio is used exclusively as one of the effective agents of a monstrous state, and the people are deliberately deprived of that fruit of international understanding which may be cultivated through a constant interchanging of ideas by words. In Russia, the radio is the instrument

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 623.

of collectivism and "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." In Germany, it is used to accomplish the ends of the Hitlerite gospels of race-superiority and of militarism. And even in the correctly called constitutional-monarchial-democracy of England, radio is much more rigidly controlled than in America (and I must mention here that America is the most liberal country in the world so far as the use of radio is concerned). But the general lag keeps the ears of the common man from listening to the words of the great minds of the age of whom they only read in books. This postpones indefinitely the idea of a cultural synthesis which is so needed in our world of today.

The movies constitute another powerful agency for the dissemination of news and the education of the mind of the grow ing generation. We have seen, however, that certain countries are not shown realistically. The African is always shown as a savage, as if he were still in the age of David Livingstone.

The idea that going to church on Sundays is the only criterion for being a true Christian has been spread and insisted upon by the missionaries in Africa. Such miseducation and misinterpretation of living a Christian life makes an African who comes to America or England feel that because most people do not attend the church services here, the Western peoples, therefore, are not Christians. The contrary is true. There is no proof that those who attend church regularly here or in Africa are more Christian than others. After all, church is really an organized social function with a spiritual veiling. Christian life is a spiritual attitude concretized in one's daily relation with others. These two different things must be distinguished one from the other so that in Africa those who choose to be Christian may appreciate the meaning and the content of a Christian life in contradistinction to living in accord with the outer manifestation which Christ called the outer part of the cup.

What Price Christianity in Africa?

Then what price Christianity in Africa? Christianity in Africa will be measured by its social and spiritual utility. Perpetual exist-

ence is not so worthwhile as a short but effective life. *Africa must not be Tithonus.*

Tithonus, according to Greek mythology, was the son of Laomedon and the brother of Priam. He was the husband of Aurora. He received the gift of immortal life from the gods, but he forgot to ask for youthfulness along with his immortal life. As the years passed by, he grew older and older but never tasted death. His limbs began to yield to the elements of the physical world. They began to degenerate, and still the man Tithonus would not die. They atrophied, and Tithonus began to grow smaller and smaller every day, until he was too small for a man. He became imperceptible. The gods turned him into a grasshopper. He did not die. He still lives, a grasshopper forever. That is Tithonus, who asked for immortal life, forgetting that man is a metabolic organism operating under the two forces of anabolism and catabolism. He failed to realize that unless the waste material is constantly repaired with new materials, youthfulness cannot be enjoyed. Hence his blessing of immortality consumed itself in the pit of continual decline.

So will it be with Africa if she remains complacent in spite of her present "status quo." Today, Africa seems to be playing the role of Tithonus. She asked life of the Europeans who preach the gospel of Christ. The Europeans generously granted her "perpetual existence," but denied her that essential factor: "Youthfulness." It is very easy for a European to say: "In the name of Humanity and Christianity let the native Africans live." But in a lower voice, we hear another utterance: "Make African gold and silver a property of those who know how to use them. It is a just thing to use the resources of nature wherever they are found. Forget the sovereign right of the inhabitants thereof. Control their political institutions and religious convictions. Make them forget their own history, and brand them incompetent in all things."

Today, and my "today" means today, Africa wants both perpetual and youthful life—a youthful life in which she can enjoy the blessings of this earth, and thereby have a right conception

of the heaven to which a true Christian hopes to go. The heaven must begin on earth for the African. That which will constitute a youthful and Christian life in Africa will be found in three basic things: (1) *the form of government which controls the affairs of the people;* (2) *the form of the economic structure;* (3) *the set-up of a social order which will indicate the trend of the spiritual attainments of the people, and of their religious experience.*

In government, the people must be represented. The aim of the whole governmental program must be toward the enrichment of the welfare of the people in public education, in public health, in agriculture, in commerce, in means of transportation, and in other amenities of our twentieth-century civilization.

In economic life, I have mentioned that for Christianity to impress the African, the whole of the world's economic policy towards Africa must be such as to indicate the recognition of a natural fact: that wealth is a creation of the labor of all, from resources that belong to all, making its benefits accrue to all, and its burdens rest on all, with intelligent consideration given to the relative and absolute abilities of all.

No nation prefixing "Christian" before its name, and forgetting to give its populace their "daily bread" through its economic system is worth its name. The founder of Christianity knew the importance of food in Christian life; hence he included: "Give us this day our daily bread" in our daily prayer to God. Africa needs *capital* to create her daily bread for herself on the continent of milk and honey.

In the social order, the African needs regeneration. Today he is faced with confusion. His original social order is broken to pieces by the impact of Western civilization, and at the same time he is denied a full participation in Western culture. He is neither African nor European, and his position cannot be defined. But he can extricate himself from such a dilemma if his society is regenerated. Give his children the proper fundamentals of creative and reflective education, and nourish them with physical and mental vitamins which will produce strong-bodied and independent-

minded individuals. Give the adult citizens equal rights to jobs and to the control of the social and political life of Africa. Show them full and unreserved coöperation, and instill a sense of responsibility in them. Emancipate the African woman so that the home atmosphere is fit for the physical and mental growth of the family. In the motto of the *West African Pilot*, "Show the light, and the people will find the way."

When the proper light operates among the Africans to regenerate their society, to emancipate their mentality, to nationalize their activities, and to secure their existence, Christianity will have accomplished its mission in Africa. But if Christianity fails to solve these basic problems in Africa, it will have no basis for a preferred position over other organized religions in Africa. Then the African will have to make his own choice, not on the basis of the dogmatic claims of any religion, but on the visible utility of its principles in the matter of the physical, mental, and spiritual growth of the whole people.

CHAPTER X

Imperialism as Africa Thinks of It

But we must end the rule of privilege speedily lest, amid the clash of arms, we lose the unity of aim which alone gives purpose to the battle.

HAROLD J. LASKI.[1]

IN THIS CHAPTER the author examines imperialism through the eyes of a Nigerian to whose soil its practice by Europeans has invited indescribable disaster in the structure of things. He is looking at imperialism as a social phenomenon which has to be questioned and scrutinized, and the credentials of which have to be investigated, and either indorsed or rejected on their merits alone. If imperialism has contributed an element that conduces to an orderly world, then we shall acclaim it; but if its effect upon the nations has been negative, then we shall cheerfully consign it into the ash-can of the discredited.

Imperialism may be called a system of international relations whereby one militarily and technologically stronger state extends its political or economic power, or both, over a weaker state with or without the consent of the inhabitants thereof, and with a view to the accomplishment of specific ends, either economic or political, or both, which are of interest to it. It has been motivated in modern times by commercial ambitions, occult nationalism, incidental humanitarianism resulting from the emergence of the Industrial Revolution, and most of all by capitalism which is the chief outcome of the Revolution.

The Components of Imperialism

Every event has beneath its superstructure a cause or causes.

[1] Harold J. Laski, *Where Do We Go from Here?*, The Viking Press, New York, 1940, p. 192.

Imperialism is not an exception. Specific developments in human experience have brought with them the institution of imperialism, as we know it today. The essential root of its frenzied development will be found in the pressure of the economic system to which the Industrial Revolution gave birth. This economic movement was followed and bolstered by the support of national governments. The governments of Europe first entered the imperialist arena as the protectors of their citizens in far lands in which they were seeking gold. Once power was gained in such areas, withdrawal became very difficult. Meanwhile, missionaries diffused the blessings of the gospel to the heathen, the Muhammadans even thinking it their duty to use force in making unbelievers see the light. Many of these missionaries have added their quota in support of both economic and political imperialism. There may be said, therefore, to be three interlocking causes of imperialism: Economic, Political, and Cultural.

Economic Imperialism

Europe was not converted to the doctrine of imperialism through a simple sense of animalism or a conscious design for world domination. The spirit of the West was not even motivated by the doctrine of racial superiority. This doctrine emerged later as one of the rationalizations of the imperialists. The notion of spreading the gospel to the heathen was not dominant in the mind of the Western man during the infancy of these factors which conspired to create imperialism. Rather a change in their economic system was the essential cause of imperialism. It is not only its essential cause, in fact, but it is also the reason for its success.

> New things have been found, new forms of society created, new kinds of industry devised, new fields of commerce opened up, new opportunity for financial operations discovered, new ideas and new departments of knowledge made manifest and new concepts of national and international welfare evolved. . . . From all that expansion has evoked in spirit and attainment —the zest of enterprise, eagerness for adventure, fame, wealth, new scenes and new homes, new places on earth where a

> greater comfort and happiness might be assured, the introduction of the unknown and the increased use of the known.[2]

All these precipitated the doctrine of imperialism.

By the middle of the eighteenth century, Europe was not any further advanced technologically than the so-called backward peoples of Asia and Africa. Life in Europe was chiefly agrarian. Commercial and manufacturing towns were indeed few. Europe of that age was not very far removed from the level known as the Neolithic Age in respect to many of its techniques of manufacturing textiles; and, apart from the development of the science of navigation, the invention of printing, and the utilization of metals, not much had been added to the appliances known to the Stone-Age man. The industrial scope was simple and limited under the system of personal relationship. The organization of industry after the manorial stage was either under the guild or the putting-out system. The only banks known then were very small establishments. Europe during that period had nothing to boast of, if one compared her material culture with that of China or India or Nigeria. Everything was rudimentary. Life in Europe was provincial, quiet, conservative, and circumscribed. "In short, in the year 1750 the Western world was living in what may accurately be described as an archaic 'folk culture.'" The leap into a completely mechanized life was a new phenomenon which came with such incredible rapidity that, by 1900, most people in the West found themselves carried away by the intoxicating complexities of technological appliances.

The Industrial Revolution was responsible for a change of mind and attitude towards ways of living, the idea of profit, and the ethics of expansion. The Industrial Revolution, which is still in progress, opened its epochal chapter in technical methods in manufacture, transportation, and communication. Closely following these developments was the rise of the factory system which changed the organization of industry and the discipline of labor.

[2] H. E. Barnes, *An Economic History of the Western World*, Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1937, p. 210.

Machinery supplanted tools, the steam engine replaced the ox, the internal-combustion engine took over the duties of the ass, while the electric motor proved a satisfactory substitute for the horse. As we proceed, we may find that imperialism, in a way, is an extended factory system, or rather a factory system writ large. By this I mean that with the growth of the factory system in Europe, many individuals were brought together under one central management, and personal business connections gave way to impersonal contractual relations. Man's labor was looked upon as a mere commodity, and the ideal that considered man in terms of humanity vanished. In the beginning of these developments, labor had no effective way to appeal for redress. The employee was at the mercy of the employer.

As technological improvements increased the general volume of trade in Europe, expansion became inevitable, with England leading in this industrial life. If man could be used as a commodity in Europe, why not in Asia, and why not in Africa; and if man could be used as a commodity, why not as raw material? Imperialism is, therefore, first and foremost, the creation of that business development which is now known as capitalism. What would the industrialists of Lancashire do if there were no India? What would the people of Belgium do if there were no Congo? Shall the Frenchman forego the importation of wine from Algeria? To carry commodities to and from distant lands ships have to be built, and the shipowners have to have coaling stations. For necessary communication there must be telegraphs and railways. The bankers, according to Parker Moon, have "financial fingers in every industrial pie" of the colonies. They underwrite loans and extend credit to all venturers in the sea of colonial exploitation. In Germany, the Deutsche Bank played no small rôle in German colonization. Disraeli and the Suez Canal could probably not have made history if the Rothschilds had not loaned him four million pounds, a transaction which brought no small return to the Rothschilds. These and other multifarious factors constitute what may be called Economic Imperialism, the child of Industrial Capitalism.

Today, no one can honestly deny that imperialism, whatever its merits, is the self-destructive instrumentality which is plunging so-called civilized man into oblivion. War—I mean any war since the age of capitalism began in Europe—has had its root, either directly or indirectly, in imperialism. International conflict is inevitable in a world where all nations, or a minority group of citizens in each nation, undertake a program which includes: 1) search for larger market opportunities, by fair means or foul, wherever possible; 2) search for foreign raw materials at the cheapest market possible, where in turn manufactured products will be sold at the maximum price with least competition; 3) an assurance that this system of "buy cheap" and "sell high" is well maintained and buttressed; 4) search for strategically important lines of communication over which marketable products can be easily transported (Great Britain, for example, has been in a constant struggle with Italy over control of the Mediterranean; and, the understanding which England seeks to have with Iraq can be more intelligently understood when one realizes that Iraq is an important air base on Britain's route to India); 5) control of the currency of the territory under the grip of imperialism, and control of its tariff and defense; 6) assurance that in case of national food deficiency, as in Japan, Belgium, England, and Germany, a constant supply of foodstuff from the colony is maintained intact, and prices fixed arbitrarily to suit the nation in power. This latter is particularly true in time of war when some excuse is sought to restrict to the "mother" country the exportation of colonial food stuffs and other commodities. The Nigerian producers today, and since the beginning of the war, are not allowed to export their products anywhere except to Great Britain, and some to British allies. Such is the nature of some aspects of economic imperialism.

Political Imperialism

When a nation is thrown into an economy which forces her to depend on supplies from the outside; when that nation cannot dispose of its surplus goods except by exportation; and when, in

addition, the hands of the legislators and ministers of state are tied by the influential ropes of the capitalists of the nation, that nation turns imperialistic. For example, what would the British government want in Nigeria if there were no Royal Niger Company? Did not the tragedy of King Ja Ja of Nigeria result from the acts of financiers in England? Was the possession of Matabele, now known as Rhodesia, by the British government a result of imperial ambition or a result of Cecil Rhodes' capitalistic schemes? Why do the capitalists always demand that their home government establish political control over the exploited area? Let us see: 1) Political control will be backed by military power for the suppression of possible opposition either from the inhabitants thereof or from powerful outside competitors. 2) Political control prevents possible competition from the inhabitants of the colonial area.[3] 3) Political control assures the security of the investors who have taken heavy risks in these controlled countries. Protection may be against any sudden repudiation of external financial obligation due to the liability of the local government of the territory in question. For instance, when the Pasha of Egypt ran into debt and sought aid from England, could the investors avoid trying to control Egypt through their government in order to assure the return of their investment and the interest due on it? 4) Political control may afford an easy preferential tariff against other powerful capitalists not citizens of the mother country. 5) Apart from direct financial questions, political control has come to have different meanings—one of which is prestige. The organic theorists of the state hold that the norm of international respectability is embodied in territorial expansion. According to Mussolini, "the expansion of the nation is an essential manifestation of vitality, and its opposite is a sign of decadence. Peoples who are rising, or rising again after a period of decadence, are always imperialist; any renunciation is a sign of

[3] Moon writes (p. 59): "India, if free, would long ago have established a tariff to protect Indian spinners and weavers against British competition, but the cotton manufacturers of Lancashire, England, have used imperial England's authority to prevent such a blow to their business."

decay and of death."[4] 6) Political control of an area may create safety for national frontiers. American control of the Virgin Islands and the Japanese interest in Korea may be interpreted in this manner. 7) The controlled area may also supply man-power in case of war. At present the relationship of Nigerian man-power to the British war effort affords a perfect example.

The military and naval officers, the colonial officers and diplomats, the anthropologists and explorers, the adventurers and even the religious leaders, in a subtle combination, make political imperialism a living concern.

Cultural Imperialism

> The way of imperialism was often explored and made smooth by preachers of the Word apparently following the command: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark xvi, 15).[5]

The cyclical odyssey of fate has been most vividly manifest in the missionary enterprise with which the Western countries have attempted to Christianize the East, the home of Christianity itself. The most remarkable of these attempts was that of the Crusades which began in 1096, when Peter the Hermit, through Pope Urban II, inflamed the Western Christians to follow the Holy Banner and redeem the Holy Land, Jerusalem, from the "infidel" Turks. Among the Crusaders were some devout men of character whose religious zeal was unquestionable. But there were also "crazy fanatics and wretches bent on plunder," who made the venture because of the tempting material rewards offered. The Crusades failed in their objective, but their effect upon the general development of Europe was far-reaching. Europe came into contact with Byzantine and Muslim civilizations, which broad-

[4] Benito Mussolini, "The Political and Social Doctrine of Fascism," *International Conciliation*, January, 1935, No. 306, p. 16.

[5] Cited by H. E. Barnes in *An Economic History of the Western World*, from J. H. Robinson and C. A. Beard, *The Development of Modern Europe*, rev. ed., 2 vols., Ginn, 1929–30, Vol. II, p. 147.

ened their mathematical and scientific horizons. The West had discovered the East, and a general stimulation to the social and political life of Europe followed. The loss of money by the lords who participated in the struggle and the consequent growth of the influence of the middle class, the revival of trade and the prosperity that followed, particularly in Italy, cannot be dealt with here. One thing, however, is too important to be allowed to escape our notice. The Crusades marked the actual beginning of the expansion of Europe; they set a force into motion the end of which cannot even yet be forecast. The beginning of the Crusades was stamped with religious fanaticism, and its end was marked by economic and political expansion. Herein lies the irony of life. Missionaries obviously condemn imperialism, but it is they who, consciously or unconsciously, have always been its advance agents.

In more recent times, missionary endeavor in the Orient has been revived, after an interlude, but not on the militant basis of the eleventh century. It has been estimated that in 1800 there were only seven missionary societies of Protestant origin, with one hundred and seventy workers in the field. By 1880, eighty years later, there were one hundred and seventy such organizations with twenty-four hundred pastors and twelve thousand five hundred mission schools in the field with an annual income of one and one-quarter million pounds. Their original aim, it may be supposed, was to spread the gospel, but the aftermath of their activities, in many cases, went much further. Some of these organizations became instruments through which their home governments negotiated when transferring sovereignty from a native king to that of the mother country. "The appeal of the *Gesellschaft der Rheinischen Missionen*, and the resulting establishment of the *German* colony of South West Africa" will illustrate this point.[6] Aside from the influence of missionaries upon their home governments and their betrayal of the natural rulers of other countries, I have elsewhere discussed the disruptive in-

[6] See W. R. Sharp and G. Kirk, *Contemporary International Politics*, Farrar & Rinehart, New York, 1940, pp. 239-284.

fluence of the missionaries upon the lives of the victims of imperialism.[7]

These, then, are the rocks upon which the house of imperialism is founded: the economically interested minority—the politically "effective citizens"; the lawmakers of the land who are the miserable servants of the business interests, and who operate through the national military and diplomatic forces; and, finally, the missionaries. Imperialism is power; and man loves power, which once obtained he does not easily relinquish. Under the sway of this logic of power, the imperialists have presented some illogical arguments in their own defense. These arguments, which are listed below, may be termed Popular Fallacies because of the extraordinary adherence given to them, even among intellectually honest scholars, and even in America.

I. The Fallacy of Tribalism

This fallacy holds that the right to exist independently is the exclusive and inalienable right of only certain races. Tribalism is not a recent phenomenon; no period of history has escaped it. For many centuries the Hebrews or Jews regarded themselves as "God-chosen." The Greeks despised outsiders as barbarians. The Romans called the English and other chaotic communities uncivilized. To the Japanese or the Chinese all others were barbarians. The Emir of Sokoto in Nigeria addressed Sir Frederick Lugard as "unbeliever" and "heathen war-maker." J. H. Fichte of Germany recognized this racial superiority in the general scheme of thought and action of mankind, and made good use of his findings in glorifying Germany. Others, such as Gobineau and Chamberlain, followed, and, in fact, formalized, him. The German brand of tribalism is known as the Nordic Theory. It claims that virtue, intelligence, and vigor are the exclusive heritage of the Nordics. A summary by Lothrop Stoddard gives more precise insight into the Nordic doctrine:

> The white race divides itself into three main species—the

[7] See Chapter IX.

> Nordics, the Alpines, and the Mediterraneans. All three are good stocks, ranking in generic worth well above the various colored races. However, there seems to be no question that the Nordic is far and away the most valuable type, standing, indeed, at the head of the whole human genus.[8]

The American brand of tribalism may be found lurking in the statement of Senator Beveridge before the United States Senate during the acquisition of the Philippines. The learned and honorable Senator said:

> God has not been preparing the English-speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing but vain and idle self-contemplation and self-admiration. No! He has made us the master organizers of the world to establish system where chaos reigns. He has given us the spirit of progress to overwhelm the forces of reaction throughout the earth. He has made us adepts in government that we may administer government among the savage and senile peoples.[9]

The British brand of tribalism was well summarized by Kipling in 1899 when he urged the white race to

> Take up the White Man's burden—
> Send forth the best ye breed,
> Go bind your sons to exile
> To serve your captives' need;
> .....
> Your new-caught, sullen peoples,
> Half-devil and half-child.

Rudyard Kipling, often called "the poet of British imperialism," was born in Bombay, India, but, in estimating his influence, one must remember that he was honored by such important univer-

[8] *The Rising Tide of Color against White World Supremacy* (1920), p. 162, cited by F. W. Coker, *Recent Political Thought*, D. Appleton-Century Company, N. Y., 1934, p. 322.

[9] *Congressional Record*, Vol. XXXIII, Part 1, p. 711. Cited by W. R. Sharp and G. Kirk, *op. cit.*, p. 253, footnote.

sities as Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, and Strasbourg, and that he won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1907. Through this obscure logic of tribalism the "Fallacy of Better Peoples" makes imperialism a right. We cannot minimize this fallacy as anachronistic, because the same spirit still exists in almost all technologically developed countries. Modern scientists, or the majority of them (apart from those under the force of totalitarianism), have repudiated this idea of White Superiority. But that is only the small voice of the objective scientist whose influence is not yet strong enough to affect some psychopathic politicians. Their language is not exactly that of the nineteenth-century imperialists; yet we still hear men in high places talking about the "backward peoples" who should undergo political tutelage. The fact that this racial or tribal egoism does not receive any support in history, natural science, anthropology, and philology should make further refutation unnecessary.

II. Alpha and Omega Fallacy

Another popular fallacy of colonialism is that which makes a mystery cult out of imperialism. This fallacy has found its chief proponents among the British, the Japanese, and the totalitarian Germans and Italians. The British article of this faith holds that Britain has relinquished her former ambition to dominate the world in the form of Empire. Her real aim is to perpetuate the "British Commonwealth of Nations" under the Crown. The "Crown" is the Alpha and Omega—the beginning and the end. It is an axis about which the world state will revolve. The Crown is "the way, the truth, and the life." Nobody can criticize the Crown. It is beyond definition. This Crown is not in Buckingham Palace; it is not in Whitehall; it is not in Parliament; it is not in the Cabinet; it is not in the Privy Council. Nobody owns it, and nobody handles it. Nevertheless, so great is the magnetism of this mystic word that it stands in the minds of the people as the Ark of God—untouchable—except by the Levites. The Crown is a symbol "that Great Britain has fared forth to the ends of the earth, conferring gratuitous benefits on all and sundry, and that

the proudest moment in the life of a brown-skinned Oriental is when he catches sight of a Union Jack unfurling about him." This interpretation of the Crown has exerted tremendous influence on the people of England. In his *Magna Britannia*, John Coatman systematically supports the view of empire, and by implication unfolds the mystical aspect of crown-ism: that the Empire (under the Crown) is molded from within by the voluntary consent of all its members. It embodies all the moral ideals of humanity. In other words, the Crown is not self-interested, it is a priceless asset to humanity, whether within or without its sweeping orbit. Certain Americans, to my sincere amazement, even tend to believe that the breaking up of the British Empire under the Crown implies world anarchy.

Like the British proponents of this faith, the Japanese, whose conception of their Emperor presents a national psychopathic case, have mystically incarnated their imperialism in the East in the body of the Emperor. The Japanese Emperor is the "Son of the Sun." He is born of woman, but his origin is not human.

> The Emperor of Japan was "born"; but assuredly not to a tradition shared by merely mortal man. The Emperor of Japan will "die": but his death, like his birth, will be no more than an episode in a cosmic, eternal process. He is human, but also he is virtually a god.[10]

To the British, the King is not a god in the same sense that he is to the Japanese, but the two nations have some elements in common: both kings are mystical and undefinable political phenomena used very profitably to keep the various factions in focus. The names of both kings are shrewdly employed by the vested interests and die-hard imperialists in continuance of their games.

Internationally, Japan's conception of the Emperor cannot be minimized. The Japanese sense of unity under the Emperor has been projected to embrace the entire human family. They are looking for a world state, a community of nations, the members of which will have to subordinate their identity for the good of

[10] John Gunther, *Inside Asia*, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1939, p. 1.

the whole, just as an individual Japanese has no existence except as a part of the state. In order to assure international peace, the government of this colossal community must be the special function of one state, a state which recognizes that government by man is far better than government by law, and "that politics is synonymous with ethics, that to govern is to do the will of Heaven," and the will of Heaven will be done through the Emperor—the Sage-King. Viewed from this angle, Japan has an excuse for carrying out her mission of tribalism in concretizing her imperialistic ambitions.

In totalitarian Italy and Germany, the doctrine of tribalism is no less potent. Originally Fascism, unlike Nazism, did not accept the cult of the leader, but Mussolini looks on Italy as an "ethic" state, a living faith, powerful in the minds of men.

> It must be thought of as an empire—that is to say, a nation which directly or indirectly rules other nations, without the need for conquering a single square yard of territory.[11]

(Mussolini has yet to tell us how many square yards of territory he left unconquered in Ethiopia in 1935–36.) The tribalism of Hitler is more frank about its imperialist aims, a frankness which has always characterized German colonial policy. I agree with Mr. Rudin when he says that "A remarkable fact about German colonial administration is the conspicuous absence of slogans about the high moral purposes informing colonial policy." Hitler's philosophy of the superiority, mentally, morally, and physically, of the "Aryan" race, and its destiny as ruler of the human family, is too well known to be given space here. The interesting thing to note is that the German nation has a God-sanctioned plan to spread over the entire world. Germany, like Great Britain and Japan, is also mystical and mythical, Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End. The argument against this Alpha-and-Omega complex is that the idea of the divine right of either the king or the state has been repudiated by the world of reason

[11] Mussolini, *op. cit.*

in which we live. And aside from this, the claims and counter-claims for sole divinity made by the different states renders these theories ludicrous, if not infantile.

III. The Fallacy of the Organismic Theory

This theory holds that the state is like any other physical organism. It has to grow regardless of our poor human wishes. If it does not grow it degenerates and dies. The growth of the nation implies the expansion of its domain, increase of its military power, exaltation of its national honor, and the enlargement of its economic influence. In the process of this expansion, the nation has the moral obligation to accept war as an inevitable instrument of national policy. It has the right to carry out all the explicit and implicit principles of imperialism: exploitation and its economic callousness, cut-throat competition, racial discrimination, diplomatic intrigues, international anarchy where possible, and political domination of any state weaker technologically or otherwise.

The chief argument against this organismic fallacy is that while it employs the biological idea of physical growth, it fails to recognize the emphasis which the biologists lay on the amazing unity between the various physical organs and the body in which they operate and have their being. The advocates of this fallacy apparently substitute antipathetic symbolism (considering our world as a biotic community) for the coöperation and partnership of dissimilar organisms, which we call symbolism. Furthermore, this theory lacks the element of universality. No practical thinker can imagine a world in which all states embark upon a plan of expansion at the expense of all other states. Suppose that all states are equally armed and equally rich and populous, who then will expand at the expense of whom? Can we escape self-destruction in a world of that temper?

IV. The Fallacy of Natural Necessity

This theory nurtures the fiction that a country like Great Britain cannot exist without its colonies. It is estimated that two-

thirds of her total food supply is imported, and that one-half or more of this imported food comes from the colonies and dominions; that, such being the condition, self-sufficiency in England is impossible, and that any attempt in that direction will land her "in shallows and miseries."

We do not doubt that Great Britain as an insular country could not survive without importation of some foodstuff from outside. But the argument does not center on this point; for it is an inevitable, natural law that as long as one people by virtue of their geographic position, or otherwise, produce a surplus of any one commodity, they are bound to export it to other countries which have less, whether that country be Great Britain or Japan, without reference to political control. The real argument is: Without political domination of India and Africa, is it impossible for Great Britain to import her needed food supplies from those countries? Is political control synonymous with the economic law of demand and supply?

Since we have taken Great Britain as an illustration, let us seek our answer there. Continuing with our former figures, we find that about one-third of her food supply is imported from the dominions and colonies, one-third from independent countries, and the remainder is produced in England. Now, since a third of her food supplies can be imported from states where Britain has no political control, is it fantastic to ask why it seems impossible for Africa to export her surplus food products to England in the same independent manner? Similar questions have already been asked by certain Englishmen themselves, among them Leonard Barnes, who asks:

> If we [the English people] are really safer by making our suppliers our subjects, why stop at India and Africa? The Dominions, the Argentine and Denmark are much more important as suppliers. Yet even our imperialists do not suggest we should send troops and a viceroy to bring Denmark and the Argentine under the Union Jack. . . . Why then do they sup-

pose that independence for India and Africa would mean the cutting off supplies for Britain from those sources? [12]

Several writers have proved by facts and figures that political imperialism is in itself a bad business.[13] The famous speech of Sir Norman Angell in the Hotel Victoria, on April 6, 1936, supports this view. In this historical argument he said:

> When we built up in Great Britain the greatest foreign trade of Lancashire—we did it on the basis of foreign raw materials. We did not have to conquer Louisiana, Georgia, or Texas to make use of their raw materials, and if today evil times have fallen on that industry, it would not help much if the raw material were within the confines of the Empire, that industry meets the same sort of difficulty. If ever there was a nation that was self-sufficient in raw materials and in resources generally, it is the United States. Yet in recent years on my visit to that country I seem to have gathered some impression that the United States had certain difficulties; eighteen million unemployed was the last figure that I had. If the possession of an Empire would solve the characteristic economic troubles of our time, why are we in Britain the most heavily taxed country in the world; and still possess two million unemployed? Why when we turn to the little states of Europe, like Sweden, Switzerland, and Norway, with no Empire and no colonies, do we find that they have a standard of living as high as any in the world?

Norman Angell, consciously or unconsciously, gives evidence that England cannot continue to rationalize her imperialistic ambitions by means of the fallacy of "Natural Necessity." Political domination is certainly not the inevitable method for securing needed commodities from any country, particularly in a world that is tending toward complete freedom of trade.

[12] Leonard Barnes, *Empire or Democracy*, Victor Gollancz, Ltd., London, 1939, p. 103.

[13] Read: *The Balance Sheet of Imperialism*, and *A Place in the Sun*, both by Grover Clark, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1937.

V. The Messianic Theory of Imperialism

Certain imperialists have a certain kind of messianic complex. They apparently experience a sense of satisfaction and self-justification by indulging in the idea that imperialism is not only right because it is a natural necessity, but also because it bestows inestimable benefits upon its victims. These theorists insist that the people under the grip of imperialism are actually enjoying the fruits of the labors of their imposed masters. They ask questions like this: "Suppose the British were not in Matabele [changed into Rhodesia] how could the copper there be exploited for the greater benefit of mankind? How could railways have been constructed there? Have not the people of Matabele improved their lot by the introduction of new ways of exploiting their natural resources, which under no other circumstances could have been possible?" Without further illustration, let us see how the copper industry of Northern Rhodesia benefits the people of Africa in that region. We may find useful material from which to judge the "messianic" aspect of imperialism.

The 1937 income and expenditures of the Copper Industry in Northern Rhodesia, under European control, read as follows:

Income		*Expenditures*	
Copper exported:	£12,000,000	1. Dividends	£5,000,000
		2. Royalties	500,000
		3. Income tax	700,000
		4. Salaries of 1,690 Europeans	800,000
		5. Wages of 17,000 Africans..	244,000
		6. Balance (other costs of operation, maintenance, stores, freight, insurance, etc.)	4,756,000

An outside observer, influenced by the claims of the imperialists, may be led to believe by the above financial statement that because the total export of copper for 1937 was twelve million pounds (about sixty million dollars), that consequently Northern Rhodesia is progressing proportionately under the kind tutelage of the Europeans. Those protagonists of imperialism may ask: "What more is there to say, when under our guidance the natural

resources of Matabele have yielded such a huge annual income? Is that not sufficient to justify our continued sacrifice to serve the African people?" These questions may sound very logical and convincing to superficial and uninformed minds. Let us analyze the above financial statement to discover who is the gainer from the transaction, the Matabelians or the Europeans. (1) The entire output of copper for the year 1937 in Northern Rhodesia was sold outside the country and it yielded twelve million pounds. (2) Five million pounds of this sum went to shareholders as dividends, and not one of these shareholders was an African—nor was the money spent in or for Matabele. (3) One-half million was paid as royalty, not to the inhabitants of Matabele, but to the British South African Company because of the so-called treaty by which Lewanika, an African King, transferred the ownership of the minerals in this area to the Company. (4) Eight hundred thousand pounds of this money went in payment of the salary of sixteen hundred and ninety Europeans, *approximately five thousand pounds per person;* two hundred and forty-four thousand pounds went to the wages of seventeen thousand Africans, *which approximates fourteen pounds per person.*

In short, it means that of the twelve million pounds accruing from the Copper Industry of Northern Rhodesia, the inhabitants thereof, the legitimate owners of the land, got only one-quarter of a million pounds, while the balance of four and a half million pounds went to the imperialists. Such was the messianic kingdom brought to the people of Matabele by the imperialists! I leave the reader to draw his own conclusions as to whether or not African resources are being exploited for the benefit of the African people—and whether imperialism is interested in the welfare of its victims.

We have looked at imperialism as a result of an economic urge, as a quest for political prestige, and as an outlet for the spreading of "superior" culture. We have also surveyed some of the popular fallacies which captivate even the best minds who give unconscious support to imperialism. Now we shall go further to equate imperialism from the point of view of the elementary

facts of life. The significance of imperialism in our world community will be viewed not as an isolated matter for the consideration of diplomats or business men or preachers. There is a knitting together of all interests, all individuals, economically, psychologically, morally, politically, socially, and religiously. A diplomatic transaction taken up in the Kremlin with such happy ease by two countries may have repercussions which could affect the destinies of unwitting millions in New York, Tokyo, or Melbourne. We are all concerned. Therefore, our question is: What price imperialism?

Psychologically?

The institution of imperialism has a most disastrous psychological effect on the climate of world politics and international relations. There are constant psychological reactions on the part of the "have-nots" against the "have" nations. The "have-nots" feel small and degraded and therefore inferior. They also feel that they are excluded from the benefits of the economic returns which the "have" nations enjoy. They regard themselves as discriminated against and deprived of the advantages derived from the resources of the earth, to which they also are entitled. Whether these reactions are regarded as justified or not, they are psychologically inevitable. And as long as imperialism exists they will continue to becloud the national skies of the "have-nots" who, under their depressing influence, will become perpetual revisionists and aggressors, while the "haves" will of necessity remain defensive.

Nor does the imperialist escape. Imperialism creates a spirit of false values, an expansion of national egoism, which, when excessive, becomes a pathogenic apparatus for self-destruction. So conditioned is the British imperialist to regarding man as a means to an end, as in India and Africa, that automatically he reacts in the same manner to the common Englishman. Aside from these seeds of destruction which the imperialist is unconsciously sowing, there is an ever-present fear which gnaws unceasingly at his soul. He is afraid of his subjects. He realizes, either consciously

or subconsciously, the evils already done and fears that ultimate freedom may give the liberated peoples opportunity for retaliation. This psychological fear, which becomes a sort of phobia, accounts for the fact that the colonials are not armed nor encouraged to control their own defense. It can be eliminated only by the elimination of imperialism. And it is a psychological fact with the imperialists, as with any other power-group, that the longer they retain power the more convinced they are of its essential rightness.

Morally?

We have seen that it is a fallacy to attribute morality to imperialism. Imperialism is based insecurely on the highest pinnacle of deliberate and directed falsehood. In my opinion, international law has neither meaning nor a future so long as it is subject to imperialistic interpretation. Contract has neither force nor appeal when imperialism sits on the throne. We know that law demands two essentials for contracts: they must be binding, and illegal contracts are forbidden. Yet imperialism makes illegal contracts and makes them binding,[14] while it treats legal contracts as bits of paper. Treaties have neither sanctity nor dignity when the irresponsible hand of imperialism contaminates them with its touch.

No people can live a progressive life who have not set up for themselves some scale of values. Human values are essential. The moral sense must be stimulated, and true values sought for. Men must be inspired to join the caravan marching toward the attainment of that which is obviously good. Every nation must have a conscience—a conscience to seek its own good, and a conscience to parallel personal interest with the interests of others. Imperial-

[14] An illustration of this practice is found in a memorable letter written by King Lo Bengula of Matabele to Queen Victoria after the delegates of Cecil Rhodes (Rudd, Maguire, and Thompson) had induced him unknowingly to sign his death warrant on October 30, 1888, by which he gave them "exclusive charge over all metals and minerals" contained in his African kingdom. For the text of the King's letter, see "The Tragedy of Lo Bengula" in *Contemporary Civilization Source Book*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1943, Part II, Section VIII.

ism, from the moral point of view, is empty. It is hopeless and without a future.

Politically?

Imperialism contradicts all the fundamental political principles of democracy. It believes in and advocates the doctrines that not all men have the capacity for self-government; that the inherent ability to rule lies with certain races while other races, subject to the same natural laws, are bound to obey; that our world should be populated with half-free and half-slave people; that in certain areas the people themselves must be an extraneous element in the conduct of their own state; that freedom is good for one people and inadvisable for others. Imperialism pays lip service to democracy and practices dictatorship—government by Orders-in-Council such as the British practice in some parts of Africa (e.g., Nigeria) is an unadulterated brand of dictatorship.

Economically?

Part of the flesh and bone of imperialism is the dangerous fallacy that the "mother" countries cannot exist economically without their dependents. This type of reasoning creates perpetual fear in the minds of the imperialists concerning their own economic future. They are unable to believe that if granted freedom these former dependents will courageously map out their economic plan with sincere recognition of the fact that the nations of the world are interdependent, and that honest and fair dealing with others must animate the erection of national policy. Actually, the mercantilistic attitude of imperialism is shortsighted, leading through a maze of winding passages to oblivion.

Racially?

Modern imperialism is the gospel of racial barbarism. It splits human families into colors in order to exploit certain societies with greater ease. Racial cannibalism is the most monstrous element in this confused civilization of the Western man. Without taking into consideration its pseudo-scientific origin, racial ostra-

cism holds within itself germs that are antipathetic to the future of humanity. Racial ostracism sows the seeds of deep hatred which bores through the flesh and bones of its victim. The fiction of racial superiority is pregnant with danger too, for, as Moon observes, "Asia and Africa have over a billion to Europe's half-billion peoples. The imperialist great powers of today are but pygmies prodding giants into activity." [15]

Religiously?

Imperialism is anti-Christ. It has no spirit, no morality. It has no universal principle. It does not respect other people's rights. It is a gospel of hate which seeks its own. It speaks with the tongue of angels and acts like a devil. It is easily provoked; it is envious; it is proud; it does not intend to bear anything; it rejoices in its iniquity and celebrates a triumph that causes other thousands disaster. The Munich incident is a perfect example of British imperialism celebrating its own triumph while Czechoslovakia burned. Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, describing the Western economic order, which is based on imperialism, wrote:

> Looked at through the eyes of . . . [a] Christian minister . . . I see it rather as an order flagrantly un-Christian . . . and palpably unscientific—an order which, if it possessed any substantial understanding of what Christian ethics really involved, or suspected its practical and immediate application, would dismiss it as a dream, or . . . suppress it as a menace.

Socially?

Imperialism is the champion of social disintegration. In the colonies, it uproots all social customs and traditions of the subject people, and sometimes the best cultural heritages of man. It sets society into a frenzy and creates hatred and confusion among all classes. It separates the natural rulers from their subjects, and encourages each one to denounce all the others. In India, it welcomes and promotes sectionalism based on religion and caste. It

[15] Moon, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

commits all these outrages in order to be able to rule a divided people. Among the imperialistic powers themselves there is also social disintegration on a national scale. Imperialism sets one nation against another in a mad scramble for possessions. It plunges the world into war, and sends the selected youth of the land to shed their blood like cattle. Women lose their husbands, and mothers are powerless to prevent the slaughter of their sons. Foods are rationed and mobility limited. Education is hampered and progress stunted. These evils, and many more, are the offspring of imperialism.

What do we want to know more about the atrocities of imperialism—a blind system that has no future? Need we seek for further evidence in order to understand the evils of a system founded upon and buttressed by fallacious doctrines? J. A. Hobson in his book, *Imperialism*, exclaimed: "To what extent Imperialism lives upon 'masked words' it is difficult to realize unless we turn to the language of diplomacy, the verbal armory of imperialism."

Imperialism, as Africa thinks of it, is a result of economic, political, and cultural immoderation. Its prosperity is pregnant with principles of decay. Its modern epoch presents a melancholy picture in the history of Western civilization—a steady period of distress and anarchy. Imperialism is the art of man, and as Edward Gibbon observes, "The art of man is able to construct monuments far more permanent than the narrow span of his own existence: yet these monuments, like himself are perishable and frail; and in the boundless annals of time his life and his labors must equally be measured as a fleeting moment." [16] Like the institutions of slavery and cannibalism, may we hope that imperialism shall soon perish from the earth! It does not receive logical and scientific support. It is psychologically unhealthy, morally degenerate, economically insecure, politically blind, racially antagonistic, socially disintegrative, and religiously unfit. This indictment should be sufficient.

[16] Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Modern Library, New York, Vol. II, p. 1441.

SECTION IV—AFRICA AND DEMOCRACY

CHAPTER XI

The African View of Democracy

AFRICAN SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY must be understood before the African view of democracy can be appreciated. I do not propose here to present an exhaustive treatment of the African social philosophy, but I shall endeavor to put down some basic social and religious concepts that I believe are essentially African. This may give us an insight into the African social, religious, and political viewpoint.

Several topics will each be treated briefly, but before I proceed, let me warn some of my European and American critics who, whenever they hear Orientals or Africans express themselves in Occidental terms—using such words as "pragmatism," "idealism," and "freedom"—assume without further reflection that these writers have simply borrowed the idea of "pragmatism," "idealism," or "freedom" from the Occident. The contrary is indeed true. The only thing an African or an Asiatic writer is obliged to know when writing in English is the English term which corresponds to the Oriental or African idea to be expressed.

It was a matter of genuine amazement to me, when I started to study the contents of European and American social and religious philosophies—starting with Thales in the Greek period and ending with Schiller, Dewey, and Bergson in our own times—to find that the ideas embodied in those philosophies are generally the same as those current among indigenous Africans. Though the ideas are generally the same, it is left to more talented Africans of the future to put into English words such social and philosophical concepts as Africans hold in common with the rest

of mankind. For example, the word "love" has the exact equivalent *(ifunanya)* in the Ibo language, but the word "pragmatism," though it has a definite corresponding idea in Ibo philosophy, has no exactly analogous term (as far as I know).

We should also note that the word "African" here refers more specifically to that cultural area in Africa from which the author comes,[1] even though he may discuss some philosophic or religious concepts under the broadly descriptive term, "African." This is because—different as one country is from another in Africa—the fact remains that we shall not be making too great a mistake if we permit the generalization that most of what is true of Nigeria is largely true also of Uganda, of the Gold Coast, and so on, and that the understanding of the Nigerian way of life can give us an insight into the thinking of other parts of Africa.

Let us proceed, then, to deal with the basic religious and social philosophies of Africa:

I. Monotheism: The idea ot one God was first developed by Amenhotep IV[2] of Egypt, during his reign around 1375 B.C., who believed that the Sun-god was the only god of the whole world. This only god he believed to be a kindly father, the benevolent creator of all that is. The idea spread all over Africa and, although in some parts today other gods are served, back of the mind of any indigenous African is the idea that there is one Chief God who supervises all lesser gods. There are, then, in the African's immaterial world, one major Deity, and under him innumerable spirits or gods serving Him in their specialized functions. In Christian doctrine we believe in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy-Ghost—three in one; we also believe in the angels of God, and assign specialized functions to each of them. Similarly, we have the doctrine of "many gods under one God" in African religious philosophy.

II. Dualism of Man: It is an African religious view that man is a dual object: physical and spiritual. Man is a metaphysical phenomenon. He has at once a soul and a body. His life here is pre-

[1] The author was born in the Ibo State of Nigeria, West Africa.
[2] He changed his name to Ikhnaton.

determined, and his life to come will be determined by his personality here. The body is the veil of the soul. The soul, like eternity itself, is immortal. When the soul leaves the metabolic body of man, it goes to the spiritual world, and from there intervenes in human affairs, especially within the family orbit. The living family members can offend the soul of an ancestor by ignoble conduct, and the only way to abate the anger of that soul is to confess, sacrifice, and repent. To be a great soul hereafter, one must govern his actions by motives of purity and the highest moral integrity.

Great souls can cause changes in human destiny. They can avenge evil done to their offspring who yet breathe the air of this mortal life.

III. Mysticism: African mysticism is more like the mysticism of Taoism. It is contemplative and practical. It hinges itself on three cornerstones: (1) self-discipline, which will abate all selfishness in human relations; (2) absorption of one's ego into the unity of the family—worshiping ancestors and conforming with the sanctions of the living; and (3) will-power to control the known world and even the gods themselves—the ability, in short, of the spiritualized human mind to rise above the boundaries of time and space.

IV. Personal Existence of God: The African conception of God is an anthropomorphic one. By that it is not meant that God lives in a particular space, immobile and satisfied. Rather it is meant that of all attributes that apply to the living and nonliving organisms of this world, it seems that God's attributes will most closely resemble those of a person. God cannot be imagined to be an automobile, which, though it can move with force, cannot control itself. God cannot be imagined to be a horse, which is directed according to the will of the master. His possession of human attributes does not imply that God is human; rather, that he has fellowship with man. From the evidence of the orderliness of the universe, the African believes that God must be intelligent and purposive, and because of his fellowship with man, he is believed to be responsive to human personality. Comparatively,

then, God cannot be anything but personal. It is a conclusion arrived at by *a priori* reasoning.

V. Immortality: The doctrine of immortality was conceived in Africa. In ancient Egypt there was a definite belief in a personal and conscious immortality. The abiding evidence of this belief presents itself in the vast pyramids of that African kingdom. The belief in a life after death led to the idea of preserving the body for such a life. This brought about embalming. In the life after death, the king would be king, the servant would still be the servant, and the nobility would remain the nobility. The vegetative organism that covered the soul of these classes of men was just a veil, vanishing with death.

VI. Man Is the End; God Is the Means: It is a religious concept of the African that God is essentially altruistic and disinterested, and therefore a means. God did not intend Himself to be an end. God altruistically resigns Himself to be the ladder for human progress. God is not climbing higher; but He is the means whereby man can climb. In Him is the fountain of knowledge of the universe. Obedience to His natural laws will bring about the happiness of man. In a Nnewi proverb given before, it is said: "*Madu sili Edo nwelu Nkwo.*" (Man has chosen to dedicate the market day "Nkwo," to the goddess "Edo." [3]) That means that it is only for man's own convenience that he dedicated that particular day to the goddess "Edo." Man can change it for his own ends. The goddess (Edo) is disinterested and altruistic, and therefore not concerned as to which day man assigns to her, provided that man is served thereby.

VII. Sacrifice: The idea of sacrifice is a part of African religious thinking. The sacrificial concept always embraced an offering of something to the Deity, in order that the Deity might be appeased or that the person offering the sacrifice might attain communion with the Deity. The priestly-minded always controlled the method of making the sacrifice, but a priest receiving

[3] In the Ibo calendar there are four days in the week: Eke, Oye, Afo, Nkwo. In Nnewi, Nkwo, the market day, is dedicated to the goddess Edo—the mother-god of the state.

the offering stands between the individual and the god. This ide is carried over bodily into the Roman Catholic mass, in which th priest stands between God and the congregation.

VIII. Atonement: African religion regarded any individual a an integral part of the animate and inanimate world. Rules wer established by the more religiously-inclined as to how an indi vidual should maintain this religious view. If these rules wer violated in any way, the violator at once deprived himself of hi relationship of at-one-ness, and only a certain sacrificial act coul restore him. This sacrifice is an atonement for the transgressio This African idea was strongly evident in the early Christia church.

IX. Asceticism: It is one of the basic African concepts of lif that our emotional flesh can be subdued to discipline for the en richment of the true and good life. Abstinence in the face o national calamity is a common practice among upper-class Afri cans, especially the leaders. In some parts of Nigeria (Nnewi) there is a custom by which one day out of every seven days i selected for the abstinence of men with religious "Title."[4] It i called "Ubosi Okwu" (the day of spiritual discipline). On thi day, (1) the man with a traditional title is not allowed to sleep with a woman on the same bed; (2) he must not eat food mixed with oil or sugar; (3) he must not swear, even to safeguard him self; (4) he must not pass any judgment against or for anybody; (5) he must not fight or curse; (6) he must not go to war, even if the country is invaded; (7) he must not eat food cooked by any mature woman, except a virgin; (8) he is not allowed to in dulge in any alcoholic drinks, nor can he play, dance, or observe dancers. These rules are all kept in the hope that a disciplined person, deserving a responsible "Title" in his community will be molded—one whose life will be a symbol of purity, truth, and love.

X. Universality: In African religious thinking the principle of universality is ever present. It holds that all our acts must con-

[4] This Title is that of "Ozo." There are different grades of "Ozo," with different elaborate ceremonies, known in most parts of the country.

form with that which can be universalized. For example, suppose a man refuses to marry or to have anything to do with women, on the ground that such an act may bring him down to the level of an ordinary being. The man *is* an ordinary human being, because he was born of a woman and has a father. Has he taken into consideration what would happen if all men should refuse to marry? Such an action in African thinking cannot be universalized, and is, therefore, not approved. It cannot be universalized because, if all men refuse to marry and have children, then the human race will be extinguished. It is as self-destructive as it is self-contradictory.

XI. Contentment: The African, in his philosophy, believes that contentment, not complacency, is a great attribute to a good life. According to the standards of Western civilization, no man is contented or happy unless he finds himself in an overheated apartment burdened with radios and telephones and other mechanical appliances which invite bills upon bills. The African considers such a life false. The spirit of contentment is found in the simplicity of African life: the simplicity of his dress; the simplicity of his house; the simplicity of his mode of living. Everything is simple but not necessarily primitive. As a result of the lack of this quality of contentment in the Western world, too many abnormal tendencies are emerging in human physical and social organisms. In "civilized" social life, we find racketeering, bootlegging, and gangsterism developed to a high degree. Physically, Westerners find themselves in the grip of incredible abnormalities which are not yet social problems in African countries.

But the African believes unflinchingly in getting the best out of life by enjoying what he has, and craving for nothing that he has not.

XII. Compromise: The capacity to compromise in the face of sharp conflict is another essential of African social philosophy which is regarded as a source of happiness. There is an African saying: "*Onye nagba aburu adeketa ekpe*"—"a non-compromiser never inherits another man's property." This saying is derived

from a story that there was once a man whose sons, at his death, gathered to share his property. But one of them was so greedy that he refused to share the property as the family elders designed. He refused to participate in the sharing if he did not get as much as he himself wanted, even at the expense of his other brothers. He took his hat and walked out. The family elders then shared the whole property among the other brothers and left none for the avaricious son. And it is from that tale that the saying gained currency: "a non-compromiser never inherits the blessings of the earth."

XIII. Fasting: Abstinence from food is one of the African religious convictions. It is a common practice among certain classes of society. The purpose of fasting in Africa is not necessarily ascetic. It is partly a matter of self-discipline and adherence to custom. But it is essential in order to avoid the conveyance of evils and impurities into the body while the preparation for the reception of holy food from the intangible but living spirits of ancestors and deities is being made. It is through fasting that the weak mortal body can yield its impotence to the upperhand of the spirit, and so generate the required pathological atmosphere for ecstatic exaltation.

XIV. Conservatism: The African is by nature a proud man—excusably so, particularly when one turns the pages of African history up to the last two centuries. Man becomes a conservative animal as soon as he realizes that he has attained to something that works, something that is permanent. Although politically Africa has been humiliated since the last century, culturally the continent can boast of a vast contribution to human civilization. There are but few things (if any), contributing to basic human civilization, that were not first found in Africa when Europe was a mere child of nature. Africa had the first organized government, the first scientific approach to universal phenomena, Africans were the first to sail the seas, the first to speculate on heavenly bodies, Africa witnessed the first empire, the first international trade, the first use of minerals, the first idea of one God. We must admit that the African did not continue to improve on

these achievements. He was conservative, and is so even now. He hates to act apologetically in the face of any improvement made by man on the cultural relics that were almost all founded or discovered by his ancestors. That accounts for the conservative aspect of African life.

XV. Hospitality: One of the essential features of African social philosophy is the doctrine of hospitality. This is expressed in one Ibo saying: "*Obialu be onye abiagbuna ya ma onaje mkpukpu apuna ya*"—"let not a visitor bring along anything of evil to his host, and let him not depart with any physical deformity." In other words, guests who mean well ought to be treated with all hospitality so that on their departure they may feel happy and gay. But this principle of hospitality, basic to African philosophy, has worked a great deal of havoc in African life in modern times. Travelers from Europe have been accommodated, but instead of appreciating the hospitality of the African, the African has been branded "fool" and "ignoramus." The reward that Africa received for her hospitality was active imperialism, thanks in part to some Christian missionaries from Europe and America who unhappily paved the way for this.

XVI. All Men Are Not Born Equal: The African holds that nature bears witness to the inherent inequality among men. No two mountains are equal in height, no two rivers are equally deep, no two animals are equally strong, none of the fingers are equal. The sun and moon and stars are not equal in brightness. Indeed, no two things having a natural origin are equal. One must be either less or more. So it is with men. Some men are better or worse than others. Some are equipped with more brain power to reason and govern; some are stronger, some are more foolish, some are more ethical; so all men are unequal. This is the law of nature, and the law of reason. This inequality is evident in origin itself: "*Agu adamu nwa onu ochi*"—"a leopard never gives birth to a small-voiced animal." It extends even to the life hereafter. It is believed in some quarters that each man descends from a particular god, and it is believed that the descendants of lesser gods will always be ruled by the descendants of higher deities:

"*Oka onye ka Chi Ya*"—"anyone superior to an individual is also superior to that individual's god." This idea perpetuates aristocracy in African minds, although it does not negate the principle of equal opportunities for full growth for everyone. Every person must have his chance.

XVII. Right to Revolution: In the question of revolution, Africa is more like China. It is the philosophic concept of the Chinese that the people have an inherent right to revolt against the power-that-be, if that power fails to function as the mediator between man and heaven. The Emperor, it was admitted, had the mandate of heaven, but should he fail to meet the requirements whereby ruinous visitations were prevented from pervading the earth, then he must be put out, and whosoever leads the revolution against him automatically becomes the god-chosen. Such is Confucian philosophy, and the African has the same view about political rulers. Government is a necessary evil, but that government is the best which governs the least; and if any government fails to perform the function of maintaining peace and order, or if it transcends the boundary of family control to interfere in each minute detail of a people's life, then it is doomed.

The people have that revolutionary right as a remote but inalienable attribute. The revolution may be carried out by any members of the governed society, whether men or women. "The Women's Riot," which took place in Nigeria in 1929, is the most recent example of this attitude of the African; it also indicates the freedom of action which Nigerian women have in social life.

XVIII. Freedom of the Individual: In African social philosophy, freedom of the individual is the essence of life. There are three basic freedoms recognized by the African: economic freedom, social freedom, and religious freedom. African society is modeled to meet the requirements of these three basic cornerstones to man's freedom.

For economic freedom, the society is stratified into families, and the economic needs of any individual are taken care of by long-accumulated facilities for living. As soon as a man comes to a certain age, usually twenty years, the family provides him with

some acres of land for farming and a home, productive plants like palm and cola trees, a wife, clothing, and the basic things that will assure a growing youth that he is welcome in the society in which nature has placed him. By this means, his economic life is well started, and he can expand with hope and confidence in that society.

Of social freedom an individual is always assured. The family is bound to provide it. It is the function of the family both to protect its members from being bullied and to prevent them from bullying others. Any bad conduct of an individual reflects on the whole family.

As for religion, any person has the right to worship one God or several gods. It is not who you worship that concerns the African, but what you do. That is one of the reasons that Africans cannot understand why Christians are so intolerant even of themselves. They profess to be serving one God through Christ, yet they distort and discredit each other, and try to convert Africans to religious intolerance. African religious freedom implies that there is a God, but that any individual has a right to worship Him through anything or anyone: either through stars or Christ or Gandhi or even the Atlantic Ocean. What counts is to find every conscience so disciplined that the members of society can live together in peace and confidence and love. These three freedoms, perpetuated by the pattern of African social solidarity, are being increasingly and lamentably broken up by the European intrusion into Africa.

XIX. *Humor:* Humor is a disposition of mind; it may be an attitude or a point of view towards life. The African is a realist, in spite of his mystical outlook. But his sense of humor makes this realism a puzzling factor to foreign observers. The African beholds the vanity of vanities which envelops the task of mankind, and humorously smiles at it. He perceives the smallness, the follies, and the hypocrisies which govern the cunning thought of man—and the African smiles.

Like the Chinese, the African sense of humor is broad and irrepressible, and this often makes it difficult for Africans to take

things seriously. But there is another aspect to African good humor. The African seems to mourn when he has cause to rejoice, and to laugh when he has cause to mourn. Therein lies the reason why foreigners in Africa do not understand, and probably never will know, how and when the African calculates his emotional responses.

XX. *Happiness—the End of Life:* Sociologists maintain that the chief bases for human happiness are found in man's desire to satisfy the following needs: (1) security, (2) love, (3) recognition, (4) new experience. To the African these things, though they sound so good and conclusive, are really the obstacles to happiness. They are negative in effect. When one takes it too seriously upon himself to worry about *security*, about *love*, about not being *recognized*, or about the lack of means to travel and thus come in contact with *new experiences* and excitements, then one finds himself in perpetual agony and remorse. True happiness, to the African, is attained by easing one's mind of nervousness and anxiety over the material things of life. Man should endeavor to live an enjoyable life, but it seems to the African that man is never satisfied in the amount of security or love or recognition or new experience which he has. This lack of satisfaction is a negative companion of happiness. Happiness lies in intelligent disregard of security, love, recognition, and new experiences.

If we consider all the above-mentioned social and philosophic viewpoints operative in Africa, we shall see at once what an average African will expect of any system of life which claims to embrace all social and spiritual phenomena, and which promises to satisfy all human desires in all aspects.

The *summum bonum* of life in the African idea is centered upon happiness. Of course, Africa is different from the Western world in that the Western man has developed more material things which he has so tragically failed to apply to the sole enhancement of human happiness, whereas the African has a greater tendency and capacity to enjoy the few things which nature has bestowed upon him.

Our modern world is becoming more and more machine-

minded. Man's resignation to a civilization based upon over-developed machinery is constantly ravaging his freedom. The belief in happiness as the most valuable goal to be sought for occupies an insignificant place in the present scheme of things. To the African, the situation is quite to the contrary. Happiness comes first. Other additions to life are to be regarded as secondary. It is good to have automobiles and refrigerators, but in seeking for those things, we can justify nothing which overlooks the supreme position which happiness has to take above these wants. Automobiles and refrigerators, in other words, are not prerequisites to happiness; they are only incidental.

But the African is not hedonistic. His idea of happiness here must not be mistaken for hedonistic pleasure. The hedonism which sanctioned the view that the highest good that man can attain is physical pleasure is condemned by the African with the same argument which Socrates presented in dismissing it. "Physical desires," said Socrates, are "due to the disruption of the equilibrium of an organism; and the satisfaction of such desires is the restoration of its normal balance. They put an end to the pain of desire, but only for a short time. The pain soon reappears: for everything physical is subject to constant change." [5] Physical pleasure is evanescent and negative, and this the African knows.

The African is not altogether plastic. There is some element of stubbornness in his character and philosophy. Although he seems to be easy-going, below the surface of his inmost delight in commonplace life lies the tough resolution to hold a rendezvous with life, and to hold down, even by force, any desires which tend to negate happiness. Like the Chinese, the Africans "are in love with life, which is so sad and yet so beautiful, and in which moments of happiness are so precious because they are so transient. They are in love with life, with its kings and beggars, robbers and monks, funerals and weddings and childbirths and sicknesses and glowing sunsets and rainy nights and feasting days and wine-shop fracases." [6]

[5] A. J. Nicholson, *An Introductory Course in Philosophy*, p. 56.
[6] Lin Yutang, *My Country and My People*, p. 103.

The type of happiness the African wants in life will determine his view of democracy. Of course, we cannot define with precision just what are the attributes of happiness in the African mind. But essentially, happiness must include certain elements of permanence—it must not be evanescent. Happiness must be such as to end in immortality. It must be surrounded by rational thinking. Life must be pragmatic, and the individual must be free to act within the bounds of reason. There must be certain elements of altruism in life which make man look to the future, and be loyal to the idea of one God—that original concept of Ikhnaton. Man must be regarded as the end; other things are the means. Lasting happiness lies in actions which can be universalized; it lies in the ability of the people to conserve what they have labored for; in that freedom to revolt against any power that fails to operate for the welfare of the people as a whole; in the spirit that is disciplined to be moderate in all things; in the society that develops its individuals to hold the basic principles of the golden mean; in the conscience that is true to itself and which can subject the animalistic sentiments of man to rationality, even by fasting; in reverence and responsibility to the family; in the adoration of the ancestors who, though dead, are seen with the eyes of the soul as they move and intervene in the affairs of men; in the ability to "give in" for the sake of peace, to compromise; in humorous contentment which can exterminate covetousness from the minds of the people; in the spirit of hospitality which will treat man for man's own sake, and overcome the disintegration of human society by pointing to a higher and more inclusive union of all fragments.

To the African, there lies the happy life.

What then, must be the African view of democracy? Naturally, the African must expect democracy to fulfill these principles that underlie his life, and in which he believes that happiness can be found. The African views democracy as a form of government which is a challenge to the degrading and disorganizing economic exploitation which does not use man as an end in himself. He sees it as a way of life which not only emphasizes

the "other worldly" idea with its mystical elements, but also draws from an eternal order the inspiration for achievements here.

To the African democracy is a way for those who want to live dangerously, as Christ did, in order not to condone what they should condemn, and condemn what they should cherish; a spiritual movement which believes in brotherliness and practices it; believes in the security of all and fights for it; believes in enduring peace and strives to win it; a message of good will which warns man to "take heed and beware of covetousness," hoping to free him from the chains of the acquisitive instinct, and saying to him: "We lose what we do not share."

Democracy, in addition, should be able to preserve family integrity and make all nations feel like members of one family who will substitute coöperation for competition, compromise for aggression, peace for war, love for hate, and altruism for selfishness. It should be able to integrate technical civilization with religion, and adopt a broad outlook, because the African people, being in the full flush of a new zest for life, have little interest in anything which turns their eyes inwards to their own emotions. They are interested in anything which is connected with the idea of a "New Africa" that will conquer nature and create a new man and a new humanity.

To justify itself before the African, democracy must establish once and for all a way of life which has no room for special cultured classes, but rather seeks to create a wholly cultured people by giving to all the people equal leisure, security, and opportunity. It must be a philosophy of life that can be either lived or refused. Man needs a philosophy that can be lived: something practical, something possible, something real, something to make life better and happier. Titus summarized the African view when he said that "Man will not be permanently satisfied with a philosophy that puts happiness far off in the future," [7] and "Aggrey of Africa" has already emphasized that "only the best is good for the African." Africa needs to place her sons and daughters

[7] H. H. Titus, *Ethics for Today*, p. 432.

in the presence of the beautiful, the great ideas and ideals of humanity's conscience.

In short, to Africa democracy must be something African to have permanence; it must be something lively to have attraction; it must be something creative to have appeal; it must be something spreading outward to have a following; it must be something now-here to have promise; it must be something practical to have realism; it must be something true to draw faith; it must be something altruistic to have a future, and it must be something godly to merit reverence.

CHAPTER XII

The Democracy We Want

WE HAVE DISCUSSED BRIEFLY those basic ideals inherent in African social philosophy which determine the concept of life in Africa. In the present chapter we will summarize roughly what kind of democracy the people of Africa will appreciate as consistent with their social ideals and their commonsense desire for a creative social order and permanent international peace.

In a democracy which would receive support of the Africans, people must not live just as ~~mere~~ individuals interested in "I" and in nothing else. Too much competition and rugged individualism cannot solve the problem of production and distribution. The first duty of democracy, then, is to train men to know that they are men first—but that men, in their individual capacities, must embrace the total human family in their affection. There must be a deep-seated belief in the *Unity* and *Interdependence* of that family—reflecting the Unity of God. And as Joseph Mazzini puts it:

> In that fraternity among the peoples which is destined to reduce that Unity to action; if wherever a fellow-creature suffers, or the dignity of human nature is violated by falsehood or tyranny—you are not ready, if able, to aid the unhappy, and do not feel called upon to combat, if able, for the redemption of the betrayed or oppressed—you violate your law of life, you comprehend not the religion which will be the guide and blessing of the future.[1]

In short, African democracy demands a community of interde-

[1] Joseph Mazzini, *Duties Toward Your Country*, Pensiero ed Azione, 1858.

pendent men and women, in which each person regards himself as a guarantor responsible for others within the community, and conducts his daily life so as to cause his country to be loved and respected through him. "The true country," said Mazzini, "is a community of free men and equals, bound together in paternal concord to labor toward a common aim." And, he continues, "There is therefore no true country without a uniform Right. There is no true country where the uniformity of the Right is violated by the existence of castes, privileges, and inequality."

This ideal applied to Africa means that democracy must not develop national ethnocentrism. Democracy is a principle of living; it is not a particular culture. Democracy adapts itself to particular cultures; it does not destroy them. For example, in political democracy there are essential basic principles which make any country politically democratic, though other differences may be seen in its practice which may depend on cultural differences. For illustration, political democracy may be said to include, among other things, the franchise of all adult citizens; freedom of thought, press, and speech; the election by the voters of those principal officers of the state who formulate policies; the understanding that any citizen or party defeated at the polls will retreat unobtrusively from office, while those duly elected will take charge of their offices and conduct the government according to the popular will of the people, while also defending the rights of the minority. Any country with this political arrangement may be called a democratic country.

In that sense, both America and England are democracies in principle, but their political culture and practices in some measure are not the same. American government is operated under the presidential system and England under the cabinet system. Under the presidential system, the chief magistrate of the nation is elected for a fixed period and his removal before the end of his term, other than by death, is not practicable (though possible). His ministers have no independent political status and may or may not have had legislative training; there is no access to such training during their term of office. The president's powers are de-

fined by the constitution, and he depends on no one in exercising them. He devises policies, but he cannot insist on the legislation necessary to implement them. He negotiates treaties, but unless two-thirds of the Senate are prepared to agree with him, the treaty cannot be ratified. He is the commander-in-chief of the army and navy, but it rests with the Congress to supply him with the required revenue to carry out his orders.

What of the British Cabinet system? The head of the administration is called the Prime Minister (without statutory position). He is not elected by the people as such; his position is given him by the Crown because he is that party leader supposedly able at the time to secure the majority support of the House of Commons. His term of office is not fixed but depends on the support which comes from the House. As soon as that support is removed, he resigns. He must belong originally to one of the Houses of Parliament (an American president does not have to be a member of either of the Houses of Congress). Cabinet ministers are all adepts in parliamentary processes (unlike the presidential ministers), and must have gained some recognition in parliament.

Although both America and England possess political democracy in common as a principle, the British have a hereditary monarchy and a peerage. America has neither of these. England has a permanent aristocracy, while America strives against permanent predominance by a single family or individual. Many other differences between American and British democracy can be cited, but we cannot spare space for further demonstration. The important thing is to recognize that democracy as a concept does not lie in multifarious ramifications of any one people's culture. Democracy, as Africa conceives it, is a principle, and a principle so flexible as to fit, when intelligently adapted, into practically all forms of human culture. As John Dewey observes:

> Democracy is much broader than a special political form, a method of conducting government, of making laws and carrying on governmental administration by means of popular suf-

> frage and elected officers. It is that, of course. But it is something broader and deeper than that. The political and governmental phase of democracy is a means, the best means so far found, for realizing ends that lie in the wide domain of human relationships and the development of human personality. It is . . . a way of life.

This amplifies my point that democracy as a way of life must not be mistaken for the means devised to attain it. And John Dewey added that "it is a form of idolatry to erect means into the end which they serve." Democracy in Africa must do away with any system of government which overlooks the importance of the system of other governments. The principle of "identity" [2] is a perfect pattern for political slavery within the framework of imperialism. Similarly, the theory of "Native Administration" [3] which the British introduced into some parts of Africa is consistent with that African democracy which I am describing. But that principle may be grasped realistically by the Africans and the most made of it—provided the British are sincerely willing to make that principle work in practice, without making a fetish of its vestigial attributes.

African democracy fights against any unethical religion which is lacking in appeal, antiquated in dogma, swollen with bigotry, intolerance, and superstition; or is opposed to progress, promotes economic fundamentalism productive of schisms and disunity, or is committed to inconsistent theory and practice. Political inventions and religious idealism, in conjunction with economic progress, cannot be safely locked up in separate compartments without finding the prisoners irresistibly restive.

[2] By the principle of identity one form of government is transferred to another country without regard to the traditions of the people of the country.

[3] "Native Administration" refers to the principle which advocates that in Africa the government should be run by the Natural Rulers with the advice of the "superior" power from Europe. Comparatively, the latter principle is more consistent with democratic method than the former. That does not imply that the writer condones the actual practices of the Native Administration principle. He condones the principle, but condemns some corrupt and reactionary aspects of it.

There must be a fusion of life into one stream of idealism. All life is expenditure, no matter under what guise presented. Indeed, when one looks at life with the eyes of King Solomon in his Ecclesiastes one beholds everything in human endeavor as a "vanity of vanities." But granting that that philosophy does not appeal to the materialism of the present age, there is no doubt that the essence of striving here is to live and to live abundantly while there is life, knowing full well that, as a link in a long chain, each generation is a product of the immediate past and lives today only to yield the scepter of existence to the coming generation. Man is selfish. He wants to assure himself before he dies that his offspring will have a decent world to enjoy for himself. On this basis all religion, all government, all economy has two responsibilities: to make life here enjoyable and to provide for a better future for posterity. There is no reason why African democracy should compartmentalize religion, politics, and economics. They all tend toward one goal—to satisfy the human material, and its psychological and spiritual yearnings. They are made to build up one house, that house is human personality, and a house divided against itself will surely fall.

"Among free men," says H. M. Kallen, "the entire purpose of education is mastery of the means of communication." He sees democratic society to be one in which,

> "Individuals and associations of individuals, each different from the others, live together with the others in such a way that all men enjoy the freest possible movement, the greatest possible initiative. They form an *open* society, in which hindrances to free communications are at a minimum, and the process of free communication on all levels . . . constitutes the bond of union between the different communicants." [4]

Following this argument, I believe that democracy in Africa should provide a simple but sufficient system of communication, and thereby acquaint the various parts of Africa with each other

[4] H. M. Kallen, "E Pluribus Unum and the Cultures of Democracy," *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, February, 1943, p. 331.

for purposes of exchange of commodities and cultural heritage. This concept implies a great deal. I agree with John Dewey that "The foundation of democracy is faith in the capacities of human nature." There is human nature in Africa. Plenty of it. The social organization of European imperialism involves fixed subordination of that human nature. There is an ugly coercion enforced upon the life of the whole people and nature—and they suffer inarticulately. On the part of the people, coercion need not be only physical. It is more often an economic, moral, and psychological retardation. The masses, so far, become psychologically unaware that they have any claim to the development of their own powers. Their experience in the art of modern scientific method is so restricted that they are not conscious of the restriction. They suffer in ignorance. But the democratic principle which Africa wants is one which would recognize that the burden of such individuals reflects on the whole social body of the human race. Their potential energy, which European imperialism has restricted from operation, deprives the whole human race of some essential resources that should be at its service. Capacities of human nature cannot find expression in empty space. Men are not Joves. It is only through the manipulations of the limbs and brain upon the available materials that man can express his capacity—in industrial society.

We live in the age of active industrialism. Africa can no longer go back to the past ages. They are dead and gone. To march with her sister nations, the African countries need to take up the burden of industrialism. They must also take early measures not to fall into the mistakes which the Western world made when it entered into an industrial age. Democracy and the human touch must not be allowed to disappear as industrial progress proceeds. The aim must be to make industrial conquests the avenue for the expression of the capacities of human nature itself. Beyond this, industrialism will be a menace.

Requirements for a functioning industrial society are definite. Every individual in an industrial society must have a specialized function. His status must be recognized. There must be a system

of steady integration of all parts so that the goals of social purpose shall be attained for all. Political freedom is indispensable in a free society. The participation of the citizens in political matters must be actual, or else the ideal of unfolding the capacities of human nature will become a mockery. Democracy should not be mere form and legal ballyhoo. It should be meaningful and true.

Democratic government must understand its status, its functions, and its scope. It must appreciate that political government is a mere tool to sharpen democratic society. *Democratic society* is the end, and everything else is a means. We are seeking a social goal in which human personality and industrial development shall be plausibly knitted together without one destroying the other.

Is the industrialism which we seek possible in Africa? The question answers itself. Africa is rich in natural resources. Most of the resources are as yet unexplored. Africa has great rivers to be harnessed in order that electricity may be utilized in domestic life and the burdens of the African housewife lightened. There is a need for electric lights to take the place of candles and oil lamps in poor African homes. Women and house boys in the kitchen in poor homes should be able to heat their kettles, oven, and grill by the turn of a switch. Tropical cotton wear will iron more quickly with electricity. Hand-brooms must give place to vacuum cleaners so that the knees of the housewife can be saved. Without electricity the industrial society I am describing would not come into being. Without electricity radio cannot be a success, and all other avenues to free movement and communication would be closed.

Political democracy in Africa must, therefore, plan for the electrification of life if true progress is to be possible. The system of electrification should touch all African nations through its arteries and the nerves of its economic and social life. Agriculture should receive a new impetus. The health of the populace should be improved by better sanitation and diet. There should be a conscious social plan to create a new society of men and women —able bodied and attractive. They will turn the life of society

into an enjoyable whole. Agriculture and industry are meaningless without proper means of transportation. Progressive society cannot exist in a vacuum looking inwardly into itself.

Nothing in Africa must any longer be used to fatten alien peoples while the Africans themselves suffer. There is plenty of gold to be utilized. Africa has no equal in the production of gold. Although some countries have repudiated the monetary use of gold, it still has its worth. "Gold," said Hewlett Johnson, "has a sinister history. Sinister in the getting. Sinister in subsequent manipulation." [5] Johnson did not forget Cecil Rhodes and South Africa when he said that gold has a sinister history in the getting. The democracy which Africa seeks will be the means whereby the production and the use of natural resources have to be channeled to a social purpose in Africa for the Africans in order to invigorate the principles of our faith in the capacity of human nature.

During the preliminary stage of the introduction of machine life in Africa, it would be natural to buy the machinery from the more highly mechanized countries like the United States, and to employ their technicians during a period of instruction and transition. Africa is bound, if she would survive, not only to buy machinery, but to establish a machine-building industry. This should be preceded by the training of thousands of expert African technicians, which is a prodigious task by itself. It calls for the provision of schools, colleges, and technical institutions staffed by skilled teachers. It means also sending out brilliant minds to universities anywhere in the world for advanced studies. As in Russia, it demands a broad but natural jump by a people unacquainted even with the most elementary forms of machine construction. It invites the development of discipline and emulation, and many other qualities of character both in the leaders and in the led. It means vigilance for leaders, and calls for the loyalty of free men.

Democracy which Africa wants has a task. The task is inevita-

[5] Hewlett Johnson, *The Soviet Power*, International Publishers, New York, 1940, p. 157.

ble if democracy itself would survive and supersede all other forms and principles of living in Africa. The government cannot assume the social planning and functions *in toto* in the democratic society we have in mind. That kind of society is alien to an African way of life. But to accomplish the task of industrialization the state must provide its enterprising citizens with sufficient government subsidy and commercial protection. By doing that, faith in the capacity of human nature can be expressed and fostered.

African democracy must look outward. African thought, African culture, and the African people—the most obscure of our obscurities, the most curious of our curiosities, our splendor and our ugliness—all must be exposed to the world. Africa must acquaint herself with the rest of the world. Democracy must fight against the psychology which makes Africans inarticulate and afraid. Africans must talk to their neighbors in the community of nations. The world is quite ready to get along with Africa as with an equal, if only our new democratic Africa will release that potential giant.

In introducing itself to the world, Africa has a responsibility. There are three *musts:* (1) The African must be prepared to speak his mind as truly as his African culture will allow him to think—in order that others may distinguish the African mind as such. (2) The African must act in his own way in order to be not only impressive, but also representative of a particular people with a particular culture. (3) The African must accept himself in order to give others reason to acknowledge him. These fundamental principles cannot be achieved in Africa unless we repudiate the fake allegation that African countries do not have the capacity to govern themselves. We have to reclaim our political system upon which we shall build a new democracy to fit the machine age. That must be accepted as a "destiny" which Lord Halifax says "is stronger than men or any government."

Vigilance is one of the attributes of effective democracy. There must, therefore, be a prompt checking of the enemies of democracy: African democracy must fight against those who deny

human rights, who condone inequality before the law, bureaucratic tyranny, repression of the labor class, unequal pay for equal ability and equal work, secret connivance over discriminations based on color, religion, or nationality, imperialism, secret diplomacy, unequal treaties, and calculation of power in terms of destructive elements. Psychological and social warfare must be waged against the idea of *noblesse oblige*, which some races and governments still ridiculously acclaim. All anti-democratic philosophies, so far as the new Africa is concerned, should be resisted with resolute mind; and there should be a relentless attack on those who oppose democratic aspirations. Human welfare and domestic tranquillity, the building of human personality and the creation of a nation of untrammeled intelligence must be the permanent pursuit of African democracy.

CHAPTER XIII

Independence for West Africa

WEST AFRICA IS composed of all countries occupying the area from Dakar to Loango, covering several countries including: Senegal, Gambia, Port-Guinea, French Guinea, Sierra Leone, Ivory Coast, Gold Coast, Togoland, Dahomey, Nigeria, Cameroons, Rio Muni, and French West and Equatorial Africa. If in this area we include all the British, French, Spanish, and Portuguese colonies and protectorates, we have about four million square miles of land inhabited by more than fifty million indigenous Africans.

I do not intend to confuse my readers or myself on the question of West African independence by treating West African territory as if it is one country. It is not only that originally these countries were not one, but that since the European scramble for Africa, these countries have been under different European nations with different languages and cultures. This superimposed Europeanization complicates the already complicated case, so that in West Africa one finds not only different African languages, but also different European languages spoken by the indigenous Africans. The same thing is true of the culture. People are forced to live in a dualistic culture. Some are Africo-French, some are Africo-Portuguese, and some thrive under Anglo-African traditions. It is a maze of confusion and disintegration. In such a situation, a realistic planner must take care not to forget these unfortunate artificial partitions. Some writers have already started to talk about West African federation, but no reference is made to the disruption in the territorial and cultural contiguity of the area concerned.

I am not forgetting that my American readers (being Ameri-

can) have a "champagne taste." Americans like to think only in big terms. That is excusable. The American nation was founded with high-spirited ambition, which was perpetuated by a constant pioneering spirit leading to territorial expansion which made the United States almost a single continent by itself. The possibilities accruing from the richness in wealth and technological culture of the nation has scarcely any parallel in our modern world. This keeps Americans in a psychological atmosphere in which small things are often left out of consideration. The European propagandists have exploited this American psychology to the limit, knowing that Americans do not want to give consideration to things that seem small to them—petty things—such as communities without organization or split tribal governments. The Europeans who give Americans information inevitably indicate that Africans exist only in small communities which they, the Europeans, have helped to unite. The first impression of an American then is expressed thus: "What are we going to do with these petty and unorganized communities in Africa? After all, we hear from 'authoritative' sources that the Africans themselves do not possess the capacity to unite or to control their own affairs in modern government. We would do better to deal with the Europeans directly and leave these Africans alone to solve their problems with their European mentors."

The crux of the matter is that African countries are not just split tribal fragments. They are large countries—some of them are many times larger than any two European countries put together. Furthermore, the African problem is not a problem which should be left to Europeans alone. What happened in the Italo-Ethiopian episode should be enough to convince even the most uninterested observer that no single nation today can escape the ills that any other nation suffers. In addition, the Americans might as well know that whenever the African problem becomes critical, the Europeans, particularly the British, are going to run to America for aid. This should all indicate that the African problem is already a world problem, and one that will become more acute as time goes on.

The fact is that Americans should understand that Africa is a continent and not a country, and that any realistic approach to its problem must recognize that the African countries are not on the same level of development and resourcefulness. Some of the internationally recognized countries in Africa, if not less progressive, still have fewer possibilities for a rapid growth than do some African countries which are at the present ignored because they are considered to be protectorates or colonies. Compare Uganda and Liberia; French Equatorial Africa and Ethiopia; Nigeria and Egypt.

The point here is that, in considering the political future of Africa, it will be very necessary to think of Africa as a group of separate countries and not as a massive block of European property calculated in terms of illiterate population easily available as cheap labor in a land yielding unlimited raw materials for use in the manufacturing countries. Moreover, it is necessary to bear in mind that the most imminent danger in Africa will come from the inevitable upheaval that is taking shape in the huge, neglected countries there which are now under European rule.

With this fact in mind, we shall then approach the problem of West Africa. The independence of West Africa is a pressing question; it is a heated issue now, and no one should predict the point at which the bow will be pulled to the breaking point. It is necessary, therefore, to examine the matter briefly in this chapter, and to state what the author considers the best method for attaining West African independence with the minimum of internal and external conflict.

Before presenting the author's view, let us survey the views of some others who have already expressed opinions on the question.

Condominium—Kweku Ata Gardiner

Kweku Ata Gardiner of the Gold Coast, a student of Oxford and Cambridge Universities in England, was a student leader of the Study Group of the West African Student Union in London, and is a diligent scholar. He has a great sense of responsibility and insight, and is now on the staff of Fourah Bay College, Sierra

Leone. He has a broad outlook and definite convictions about the development of the African countries. His address to the W.A.S.U. in London indicates a reflective mind. He once said:

> We believe that attempts to convert individuals to the African point of view, to seek redress for particular wrongs and grievances, and to plead for favors are futile. We can never build a strong and self-respecting community on the basis of other people's generosity and charity. We are, from this moment . . . determined to play an active part in the dynamic processes which are shaping our destiny. To do this, we must, from now on, strive to think in terms of principles and interests. In the historic days ahead of us, he who fails to put national interest above all others is a traitor. We are out to conquer time. . . . We have no faith in any nebulous conception of civilization—Western or otherwise. We need to cultivate within us the spirit that can live through destruction of plans, disappointments, and failures. This spirit alone can lead us forward in spite of all.

On his visit to the United States in 1943, Kweku Ata Gardiner was asked to speak in the Riverside Church, New York City. The object was to tell the Americans what Africa—West Africa—wanted after this war or the war aims of African peoples. Speaking precise Oxford English, he made a brilliant survey of Africa and its various problems, and in his conclusion, stated that "I recommend Condominium for West Africa." Whether Mr. Gardiner knew what he meant or not, I did not know, but when his speech was over, I went to his room at the International House and asked him whether he actually meant "condominium" for West Africa, as he told the American public, and if so to clarify for me what countries should join in governing West Africa. Mr. Gardiner was unable or indisposed to give a specific answer to this question, but insisted, nevertheless, that he recommended "condominium" for West Africa. It remains for me, therefore, to interpret his meaning.

Mr. Gardiner may mean that he recommends that two or more outside powers should unite West Africa and govern them con-

jointly in a manner similar to the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan or the Anglo-French New Hebrides. It implies an acceptance of the fact that Africans cannot become self-governing countries capable of a voluntary federation among themselves. The condominium theory is an antithesis to the resolution of the West African Students Union of England, which Gardiner represented, because it demanded internal self-government for West Africa *now*. One must concede that if we agree that the West African countries are capable of internal self-government now, and of complete independent government after the war, the recommendation that West Africa be under condominium government would be in diametrical opposition. Condominium, apart from its undesirability and inapplicability to nations that feel themselves capable of self-government, is an impractical proposition. Who and who are going to join hands to be overlords in West Africa? America, England, and Russia? First of all, to our limited knowledge, Russia is not interested in ruling any other people, nor is America. And, of course, the British Government has made it clear through high officials that they do not welcome colonial federation under several powers—whether Allies or enemies.

To substantiate this point, one may refer to *The Overseas Daily Mail* of March 27, 1943, published in London. That paper said: "We congratulate the Prime Minister on his robust defence of Colonel Stanley's colonial policy. The main plank of that policy is that the colonies must remain the sole responsibility of Great Britain. That such a policy should be challenged is incomprehensible. . . ." Besides, our advocate of condominium should have been familiar with Churchill's non-equivocal statement that England intends to hold "her own." So, apart from the fact that the West African peoples do not want *any* alien rule after the war, the British, if they do continue to rule, are not willing to share their "melon" with others—even with her Allies. On these grounds, we may dismiss condominiumism either as an Uncle Tom [1] proposition, as an expression based on misunderstanding of the word, or as a statement of an impractical theory.

[1] An expression indicating a deliberate and hypocritical ambiguity. Ed.

The Committee on Africa, the War, and Peace Aims—Phelps-Stokes Fund

The Committee on Africa, the War, and Peace Aims was originated and sponsored by the "officers of the Phelps-Stokes Fund." The Committee arrogates to itself the responsibility of interpreting the eight points of the Atlantic Charter as it applies to Africa. There is not space in this book to describe the details of the Report. We shall summarize it in four basic principles as written in the Report: "The elemental rights of the African people have thus been grouped and summarized under four comprehensive headings: Economic Rights, Personal Rights, Native Participation in Government, and Self-development and Coöperation." [2] To bring these basic principles to more concise and comprehensible terms, let me quote Dr. Thomas Jesse Jones, the Educational Director of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, and one of the chief architects of the Report. He, in his speech at the International House to the members of the House from all parts of the world on the question of "African Colonial Problems After the War," summarized the African colonial problem in the very simple terms of *Participation*, *Capacity*, and *Coöperation*. By listening to Thomas Jesse Jones explain what he meant, one can understand without difficulty what the Report he helped to engineer means to the African people and to the democratic principles for which we are fighting. Let us follow him step by step:

1. Participation. By this Dr. Jones means that all African countries, either Protectorates or colonies, are in such an infant stage politically that it is "dangerous . . . if complete self-government is provided before the people are qualified." [3] The only feasible and most generous thing the Christian imperial nations can do for their "fellow" Africans is to allow them to *participate* in their "native governments" until they have grown in stature in the hands of their kind mother; and to give them some kind

[2] See *The Atlantic Charter and Africa from an American Standpoint.* A study by The Committee on Africa, the War, and Peace Aims, 1942, p. 87.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

of opportunity to eke out their economic imperfections through gathering a few crumbs from their master's table. After all, we Christians agree that Africans are human beings, and they at least must exist.

What are the mortal defects of this participation theory? The word "participation," as interpreted by an African scholar from the Gold Coast, is a peculiar American term in which Americans indulge when talking about the relationships between black and white in American politico-economic life. In America the black man is in such a minority that all that he can fairly and rightly demand from his white co-citizen is to give him equal opportunity to participate in the abundance of economic possibilities of the nation, and take active part in the political life of the country to a point sufficient to give him his fundamental liberties as an American citizen. If Dr. Jones in his Report is using the word "participation" in that sense in application to the African countries, the error and the ignorance of the true situation are unforgivable—particularly by one claiming that he is an "authority" on Africa. Let us take Nigeria for example. J. Hobson, in his *Imperialism*, estimated the population as between twenty and forty millions. There are only five thousand non-Nigerians in the country. This includes Europeans, Americans, and Asiatics. The sovereignty over African countries cannot be divided between Africa and Europe. Africans possess Africa and mean to hold it, just as Europeans possess Europe, and Americans possess America. The African problem, therefore, does not involve participation, it involves complete self-government; and that is the understanding between African countries and their present European "friends." An authority like Thomas Jesse Jones should know that.

II. Capacity. According to Dr. Jones and the Report, capacity involves the evaluation of the ability of the African to participate. It means that the African will be allowed slowly to take part in government to the degree in which he proves himself capable of participation. It means that we are looking for a day

in the future when that capacity will be proved. As to the present, Dr. Jones would say that it has not been quite proved that Africa is capable of self-government. We need not belabor ourselves in discussing the capacity of the African to govern himself. But if anyone needs evidence on this point, let him refer to: The Charter of the Nigerian Youth Movement, the activities of the Nigerian Democratic Party, the progress of the Nigerian Labor Union, the efforts of the Trade Unions Congress of Nigeria, the Petition of the West African Congress, the aims of the Gold Coast Aboriginal Society, the Gold Coast Bond of 1844; the Resolution of the West African Press Delegation to London in 1943; let him read the *West African Pilot*, the *Nigerian Eastern Mail*, and *The Daily Service*, not reckoning the other local papers in the Gold Coast and in other parts of West Africa. For political activities in the past one may refer to the Ashanti and Benin Kingdoms still existing and to the activities of the West African members of the Legislative Councils of British dependencies. The Report belittled or ignored many incontrovertible facts about Africa. It forgot the great civilization of West Africa in the days of Songhay, Ghana, and Melle. It forgot the Aros, the Jungun Kingdom, the mighty Ibibios, the Kingdom of Abuakwa, and the House of Decemo. It forgot Herbert Macaulay, the Alake of Abeokuba, and Wallace Johnson. With those facts in mind, let us confront Dr. Jones with the question: "Does the African have political capacity?" Dr. Edwin W. Smith, the former President of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain, answered the question concisely. In his speech entitled "Can Africans Govern Themselves?" spoken on January 21, 1944, at Cooper Union in New York City, Dr. Smith said: "*The answer* to this important question might be given in a few words: 'Yes, they can, and they do govern themselves.'" Approaching this matter with scientific objectivity based on anthropological and historical research of the African political culture, Dr. Smith examined the political capacity of the African and came to the following conclusions:

(1) That African political institutions have had in them

"the essentially democratic privilege of entire freedom of speech. . . ."

(2) That the Africans "have achieved a real measure of democratic self-government."

(3) That "We have historical evidence that in the Sudan, . . . a number of powerful states existed from the Middle Ages into modern times. They stretched from the Atlantic to the Nile—a greater distance than from New York to San Francisco. We can name them in geographical sequence: Ghana, Susu, Bambara, Melle, Surghai, Mossi, Hausa, Bornu, Kanen, Bagirmi, Wadai, Darfur, Fung. . . . Some of them in course of time swallowed others and became empires."

Now, it is left to the doubting Dr. Jones to abate his fears about the African political capacity or incapacity. I am not blaming him for his ignorance of African history both present and past, but I am only saying that the American people must no longer be deceived about Africa by those who fail to approach the problem with open mind and relative outlook.

III. Coöperation. By coöperation the Report states that it means "coöperation with individuals, cooperation with economic process, coöperation between social groups however differentiated." [4] The principle of coöperation is well understood by Africans, but the question is: What kind of coöperation? Is it the coöperation that exists between England and America—in which one helps the other through the bonds of mutual love of political equality, or is it a forced coöperation in which one side must coöperate *or else?* The Report recommended that the kind of coöperation that Africa needs is that "provided by sympathetic groups in Europe interested in native welfare." But the Africans feel that the days of European sympathy in Africa are gone. Anybody who is in sympathy with Africa will fight against European imperialism in Africa—which is the cause of our poverty, distress, and humiliation. But with this understood, Africans are very coöperative people by nature, and their past and present history has not proved otherwise.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 85.

Our coöperation has been manifest to the Allies in this war. It is owing to our coöperation that the Allies found it comparatively easy to start the first conquest in Africa. It is owing to our co-operation that what happened in Singapore did not happen in West or North Africa. It could have happened, but the Africans are coöperative in fighting for freedom.

This Report does not represent a true American point of view. Wendell Willkie, who took time to travel to the East, presents a different view of a free world. It does not represent the African point of view: in Africa today, the cry is for self-government everywhere—and particularly in West Africa. The W.A.S.U. has already declared in a "Resolution" that internal self-government be granted West Africa now and complete self-government immediately after the war. They did not ask for *participation*. Nigeria, through the Political Blue Print of Mr. Nnamdi Azikiwe published in several series in the *West African Pilot*, the *Nigerian Spokesman*, and in the *Eastern Nigerian Guardian* did not ask for the weighing of the capacity of the African to participate, but rather laid out a plan which will leave Nigeria an independent sovereign nation equal in status with the United Kingdom or any other nation in the world. In addition, I am not sure whether the members of the Committee who spend the Phelps-Stokes Fund in interpreting the Atlantic Charter as it applies to Africa ever noticed the famous correspondence between the people of Nigeria and Churchill immediately after the signing of the Atlantic Charter. Briefly, the correspondence involves a direct question from the people of Nigeria through the *West African Pilot* to the Prime Minister of Great Britain to clarify Nigeria's position relative to the edicts of the Atlantic Charter. Churchill's reply was blunt. He said it applied only to European states under Hitler, and thereby contradicted himself and his subordinate officers, such as Major Atlee. He also contradicted President Roosevelt, who consistently maintained that the Atlantic Charter applies to all the peoples of the world.

Our Committee under discussion used the Phelps-Stokes Fund to put out a Report to satisfy their imagination, but not to en-

lighten the American people on the real developments and possibilities in Africa. I doubt if any member of that Committee has seen Africa since the beginning of the war; some of them have never been to Africa; and some, like Dr. Thomas Jesse Jones saw Africa more than two decades ago, when Africa was half asleep. Their Report, therefore, based on African participation and the weighing of Africa's capacity to participate, is a sort of anachronism. I believe, however, that the authors of this Report, which postpones any definite statement regarding immediate independence—internal or external—do not intend to be inimical to African progress nor intentionally to mislead America. I am only saying that they lack first-hand knowledge of the real conditions of specific areas in Africa. They treated the whole continent as a single country, and with one standard of political development. This led them to follow the orthodox method in the nineteenth century of treating Africa. I remember that referring to *Education in Africa*, a book put out by the same Phelps-Stokes Commission in 1922, Margery Perham observed that while that Commission helped to emphasize the need for education in Africa, in referring to Nigeria it did not carry the idea "far enough . . . because they did not fully realize the nature of political opportunity open to Africans in a country like Nigeria." [5] What Margery Perham said of the Phelps-Stokes Commission of 1922 is what I am saying of the Phelps-Stokes Committee on Africa of 1942. I am saying that their present Report shows very clearly that they must have failed to realize the political possibilities and movements now existing in different protectorates and colonies in Africa—particularly in West Africa—or else their recommendation would not have stopped at those which Dr. Jones so simply summarized as *participation*, *capacity*, and *cooperation*—very vague terminologies, which might have been descriptive of imperialist Africa of fifty years ago. The American public deserves to know the real conditions *now* existing in all parts of Africa—what the people of Africa think, and not what someone imagines for them.

[5] Margery Perham, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

West African Press Delegation to Great Britain and the Atlantic Charter

The resolution of the West African Press Delegation, although not completely approved by the writer, does substantiate my point that the Phelps-Stokes Committee did not reckon with the actual sentiments and political movements in Africa. Let us examine the cardinal points in this memorandum of August, 1943. The memorandum opened: "The members of the West African Press Delegation to Great Britain (August, 1943) have been guided in drawing up this Memorandum by the assurance that the reforms embodied herein express the will and aspirations of the majority of the people of the Colonies and Protectorates of British West Africa.

"Convinced that factors of capitalism and imperialism have stultified the normal growth of these territories, the framers of this memorandum believe that it is now necessary for them to evolve into full fledged democratic States."

And, consistent with the Atlantic Charter, they could add: "Basing our claims upon the declaration of Clause 3 of the Atlantic Charter that the signatories thereto 'respect the right of *all people* to choose the form of government under which they may live,' we put forward the following proposals:

"1. Immediate abrogation of the 'Crown Colony' system of government and administration in the Colonies of British West Africa.

"2. The substitution therefore of representative government (i.e., internal responsible self-government) for a period of ten years.

"3. The introduction of full responsible government for a period of five years."

In a nutshell, this Press Delegation wants full responsible government internationally for all West African countries having connection with Great Britain. The process of gradual withdrawal of the British administration will take fifteen years. Their interpretation of the Atlantic Charter differs from that of the

Committee on Africa in some vital aspects: West African Press Delegates want self-government now; the Committee on Africa says that the right of the people to choose the form of government they want "is an ideal seemingly as foreign to Africa as the statement in the Declaration of Independence that 'All men are created equal.'" [6] One makes the date for independence definite; the other attempts to fix the date in an indefinite future when an "ultimate" goal has been reached.

The Press Delegation, under the leadership of Mr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, made a constructive survey of post-war Social, Economic, and Political reconstruction in West Africa. In social reconstruction, they demanded compulsory and free education for all inhabitants of West Africa. Education, according to them, "shall be designed to fit the citizen to his environment," and make him intellectually powerful enough to apply his individuality to the enrichment of his society and the growth of his personality. In addition, the delegation stressed the need for health and social legislation designed to provide schemes for better housing, a better penal system—which would attack juvenile delinquency—and educational instruction of the people in the need of better sanitation. In the field of economic progress, they stressed the need for reform in agriculture and land preservation, and vital mining reforms. Trade, commerce, investment, and labor are very inadequately managed in West Africa, and the delegation pointed out some pertinent factors to be reckoned with when Africa takes over actual control.

But all of these improvements hinge on political reconstruction which will come only by Africanizing the African political institutions in a way which is democratic and indigenous to the peoples. The delegation listed twenty-four constitutional rights which Africans recognize, and stated that they would like the British government to remain during the first stage of the independence program, while stipulating that all functions should be handed over to the West Africans at the end of a ten-year period.

[6] See p. 37 of the Report.

The Opinion of the British Government

Concerning West Africa's future, the general opinion of the British public differs from the government. Most of them, particularly the Labor Party, would like to see democracy extended to Africa in our post-war world in compensation for what Africans have voluntarily contributed to the British war effort everywhere. Some Englishmen suggest that a modicum of self-government should be extended to us now, and that by making certain positive steps today we shall be able to walk better on our feet politically after the war. In prescribing the British Labor Peace Aims, the Rt. Hon. C. R. Atlee, parliamentary leader of the British Labor Party in the House of Commons, said that there are certain principles essential to a lasting peace, one of which "is the recognition of the right of all nations, great or small, of whatever color or creed, to have the right to live and to develop their own characteristic civilization, provided that they do not thereby infringe the rights of others."

Dr. Haden Guest, M.P. (Labor), in his recent speech, was not as general as was Mr. Atlee. In referring to Africa he said: ". . . democracy is not for England alone. It is also for Africa. We of the Labor Party are out for the best possible conditions for the largest possible number, whether white, black, or otherwise. In short, freedom and liberty are all rights and privileges to be derived from and enjoyed under democracy and also for all African people," but Dr. Haden Guest emphatically added: "*But it is the duty of the Africans themselves to get together now and hammer out unceasingly what they want for Africa.*"

Some conservative and orthodox British non-official circles would not suggest any political freedom for Africa; they would suggest something different. One such example is the National Peace Council of England. In reference to colonies it said that there would be "a new colonial system which, while protecting native interests, would ensure to all nations a share in administrative responsibility and equality of access to raw materials and opportunities for trade."

The National Peace Council's proposition in relation to colonies, of course, is anathema to the people of West Africa. All West Africans agree upon the necessity for a complete abolition of the "colonial system" whether "old" or "new" in kind. The Council's proposition for internationalization of Colonial Administration is repugnant to the sense of political integrity of those West African nations which are under British rule. That suggestion is also antithetical to the pronouncements of the British government. Churchill means to hold "his own," and in his thinking there is certainly no plan for internationalization of colonial administration. However much I may disagree with some of Mr. Churchill's aims, I agree with him in that aspect.

Colonel the Rt. Honorable Sir Oliver Stanley, Secretary of State for the Colonies, speaking to the Lagos Press representatives during his visit to Nigeria in September, 1943, said specifically that both he and the Prime Minister had made definite statements in the Commons about Protectorates and Colonies to the effect that England shall maintain her present dependencies without any political working-together with other nations. He believes that coöperation with other nations in colonial questions will be limited to those economic and social common interests.

I Agree with Colonel Stanley

Although there may be many differences between Col. Stanley's views and mine, I agree with him that the Native Administration principle cannot be considered a contradiction to self-government—either for Nigeria or any part of West Africa. After all, what any country wants is to have its people control its own administration. I stress this because some Nigerians have asked Col. Stanley what will become of the Native Administration governments if Nigeria gets her independence. Such a question reveals the confusion of some Nigerian citizens as to what Native Administration means to the independence of Nigeria.

My Suggestion for West African Independence

In this section I do not intend to introduce any ideas that are

new or foreign to West Africa, nor shall I suggest anything that is not a part of the feeling of the people.

I do suggest, however, that we adopt the principle of *Native Administration* in the whole of West Africa. I do not mean "Indirect Rule." In the *Youth Charter and Constitution and Rules* of "The Nigerian Youth Movement," page 3, the people of Nigeria stated: "We are opposed to the term 'Indirect Rule' literally as well as in principle. . . . We shall therefore strive for the complete abolition of the indirect rule system." But referring to the "Native Administration," the Charter said, "We will encourage it and support it."

The problem of independence must be settled by each country for itself; but after that stage, West Africa as a whole can have a voluntary federation. This is the procedure which I have termed the *inside-out plan*. This plans calls first for a strong Gold Coast, a strong Gambia, and so on, before there is a final approach to the federation of the subcontinent of West Africa. I prefer the inside-out plan for several reasons: (1) There cannot be a strong Federated State of West Africa unless there are first strong, free West African states, each an independent country within and without. Only then can there be effected a voluntary union of co-equals. (2) For any Federation to be natural and permanent the uniting powers must be free and equal, at least in law, so that their union is not directed by any super power from the outside for the ultimate benefit of the latter. Any Union of West Africa setup under European domination will be a matter of masters uniting slaves in such a way that unity will render the slaves incapable of a concentrated resistance. Such a procedure will only lead to continued turbulence and internal conflict. (3) By uniting West Africa now under the leadership of Great Britain, another potential Indian problem will have been created. There will be a multiplicity and complexity in the problems of the various kings—in their counter-claims on the one hand, in turn leading to an unsuitable ideological and purely political debacle among the elite of West Africa on the other. The elite will consume their useful energies on who will represent whom, or how many Sierra

Leonians will be in the Senate and how many Nigerians; or whether the Ashantis will lead the Ibos or whether the capital should be in Liberia—*ad infinitum.*

The British in their usual way will appeal to the pride of each of the factions, emphasize their importance, and show the world that West Africa cannot be granted self-government unless all have agreed among themselves. Nor are the British going to minimize the importance of little differences. If the constitution of West Africa is presented by the British, any small or large section of the whole area can give the British enough reason to withdraw the question of independence. And we know that there must be differences and strong objections from each of these states—but such differences as could be handled if the countries were free and understood the necessity for unity and federation themselves. (4) If one remembers that the people of India, who were practically under one central government, find it impossible to accept a constitution from the British—even at the price of delaying their natural independence—one can easily understand how the West African countries—which have been ruled by separate alien governments—would find it difficult to unite overnight under one flag and one constitution. Federation sounds plausible and patriotic. It is also a future possibility. But it is an illusion for our immediate political strategy.

The method and detailed plans for these countries are matters of internal concern. I have already treated Nigeria in some detail.

West Africa will be the first testing ground for the British idea of freedom in Africa. As we see it, there would be no need for open conflict. The people of West Africa are willing to forget and forgive the past, if the British are ready to repent the imperialism of that past. French West Africa must also be let alone to develop on an independent basis—while maintaining friendly relations with the French and with other nations.

West African independence is essential to peace—an enduring peace. This is particularly true for America when one considers the proximity of this area to the new world. West African independence is essential to peace, because it will be a true demonstra-

tion that this war was not fought in vain, or for the white race alone to gain freedom. West African independence is essential to peace because its continued subordinate status may result in a new type of international debacle. Soon after the war it could form a nucleus for all kinds of counter diplomatic battles between powers with different social ideologies. If England begins well in West Africa—without imprisoning the national aspirants, without physical threats, without intimidation—the British goal in Africa will be attained without bitterness or loss of life, and all shall be benefited.

SECTION V—CONCERNING ENGLAND AND AMERICA

CHAPTER XIV

What England Means to Me

People may wonder why I am so concerned about England. Most of the references to foreign rule in Africa that have been made in this volume concerned England. France, Spain, Italy, Belgium, Germany, and Portugal—all of whom are imperialistic nations in Africa—have been almost ignored. It is possible that this may lead some readers into popular misconceptions about Africans or an African writer. Some may think that I mention England so much because I am a British subject; others may think that I have a particular hatred for England. Both of these assumptions are wrong.

First, I am not a British subject. In law and in fact, I am a subject of Nnewi State and a citizen of Nigeria. The Nigeria to which I belong is not a British colony, and therefore is not "owned" by the British. Rather the Nigeria to which I belong is a British protectorate—made up of kingdoms that were independent prior to the coming of the British, and which later by treaty surrendered temporarily to the latter control over their foreign relations—while retaining intact a large degree of control over their domestic governments. The Nigeria Protectorate may be distinguished from a British colony because its status represents "a voluntary act of subordination to the protecting state," depending solely on a mutual guarantee of reciprocal assistance with the ultimate judgment as to a presumption of freedom resting with the protectorate. The British made it clear to all the existing Nigerian rulers that they (the British) had no claim to the ownership of the land or to the property of the country. And to some extent the British have observed this commitment. The in-

ternal structure of the Nigerian kingdoms are not disturbed radically by the British. The natural rulers still maintain their sovereignty (though limited by the British interest) over their own juridical areas, and under the present Native Administration which I have discussed, there is still at least the "image" of power in the hands of the rulers.

At this juncture, it may be interesting to note that Nnewi State, to which I belong, came under the British influence only in 1905. Although the British claimed "protection" over Nigeria in 1885, the first British official to come into my father's state did not arrive until after 1900. My father was the first Obi of Nnewi to rule under a foreign government—the British. Prior to 1905, Nnewi State has never been under any foreign power—either from within or without Nigeria—so far as our known history can trace. My grandfather, Ezeifekaibeya I, died just before the British established themselves at Nnewi. That was in 1903.

This will indicate that I barely escaped belonging to the first generation of Nnewi to be born under Western influence. Right now in Nnewi State exist many individuals who consider themselves to have lived in two worlds—the world in which they were completely free from the white man and the world in which they are now living under white domination. Some old war generals of Nnewi, who flourished in the pre-British era, are still alive, such as the famous Ezeodumegwu—"Onuaora." Other generals, such as Dim-Orachi and Eze-Enefeanya, died only four years and one year ago, respectively. Men belonging to this group are more emotionally perturbed under the present system than are we of this generation, who were born only to jump into British schools and European Churchianity.

Secondly, my constant reference to the British practices in Africa is not based on any particular hatred for England. It only means that I prefer to deal with that which is most familiar to me without pretending to a detailed knowledge of everything about the African continent just because I am an African. The British are the only European nation whose influence affected me while I remained in Nigeria. My language is Ibo, but my second lan-

guage is English. I was brought up in English controlled schools, and I was trained under the English church. Outside of Nigeria, therefore, my other self is inevitably almost British—or at least that is what was intended by those who are responsible for my early training. I cannot be fair to myself if I do not confess that I sympathize with the British people and culture. There is a sentimental affiliation which human nature cannot easily deny once it is there. The choice is not mine; it is a historical accident. And that fact must explain my frequent references to the British and British procedure.

Most of my intimate white friends are English. Even here in America, the majority of my personal friends among the white are English in descent. To the best of my knowledge, I have never met a better type of people, more loyal in personal friendship, or more practical, helpful, and noble than the English.

But as a Nigerian what does England mean to me? By England I here mean the British government which has assumed the protection of Nigeria. I am not referring to the sober and free populace of England. My question refers to the British not as a people but as a government—and as a government in relation to Nigeria.

Unfortunately, it so happens that human beings in general are prone to fallacious reasoning. That is why it is difficult for some people to distinguish between an enemy of a people and an enemy of a principle. Whenever one says that he is against imperialism, he is branded anti-"this" or pro-"that." But we forget that imperialism is not a form of government nor is it personified as a nation; it is a principle, a philosophy of force and oppression like slavery or barbarity; it is like religious intolerance or racism, and one can rise to fight against racism in a nation without necessarily hating the people of the nation. When William Wilberforce fought against slavery, he did not hate England. When Abraham Lincoln preached human equality to offset racial prejudice in America, he did not hate his countrymen. Our contemporary, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who by words and acts in her daily life challenges race discrimination in America and stands for humanity as a whole, certainly only expresses her great love for this

country. Harold J. Laski, in his trenchant philippics against English conservatism, does not indicate hatred of England. Hewlett Johnson, the Dean of Canterbury, in his attack against the present English capitalistic system, does not necessarily hate England—nor is he pro-Russian as opposed to pro-British. There are other great men and women such as Ghandi, or, here in America, Pearl Buck, who fight for and against principles and not against peoples and objects; not against countries and governments; not against sects and denominations.

What England means to me and my view of it must be looked upon from the very perspective of what I have said above. Culturally, I admire the English people for their traditions, their great institutions, their love for stability; their attachment to realities; their contribution to constitutional government; their courage; their love for liberty for England and their spirit of enterprise.

But having belonged to a country which is not English; with a culture which is not English, speaking a language that is not English; having a tradition that developed along different lines than the English, I cannot but be seriously concerned with what England means to me and to the future of my country in which the British influence is so strong. There are only two things that England could mean to me: either a stepping-stone or a stumbling block, and both depends on England. The choice is her own. She is more developed technically than is my country. Her experience in international trade is greater; she has made more contacts in the world than my country; she has inspired trust in many commercially important countries; practically all her children have the chance to attend public schools, an opportunity denied to the children of my country; she has all the avenues of communication and transport for quick contact all over the world—both of which my country has very little as yet; her literature has spread over all the globe so that others may appreciate the cultural heritage of the British people; the literature of my country and all the rich past of its culture is yet unknown to the world; the British have the army and navy, the bombers and submarines

—comparatively and for the present, Nigeria has none. But it is not that Nigeria is jealous of England; there is no need for that, because Nigeria has a great future. But if might is right, if men are great because they can take advantage of the unfavorable conditions and temporary weaknesses of their fellow men, if ethical standards and moral judgment have no room in Western civilization, then I have the right to say that the choice of what England could mean to me lies with England—the British Colonial Government—because at present it is the more powerful.

But suppose we take it the other way: that the Western civilization of this age, in spite of its materialism and power politics, has a moral conscience; that the end of all life is not calculated in terms of force and physical coercion; that the principles of the Atlantic Charter were meant to work in the faith and conviction of President Roosevelt; that the broad, humanitarian doctrines of Henry Wallace can be truly applied; that the voice of English free thinkers and liberals can be turned into realities; that if those French citizens who legitimately called themselves Free French (free from Nazi imperialism) can understand what is meant by Free Senegalese (free from French imperialism), then, as a Nigerian, I may say that England would mean a stepping-stone to me.

In that case I shall look upon England to encourage those Nigerians, who take pride in being the citizens of that country, to effect their designs in putting Nigeria in her rightful place.

Whether Nigeria shall become a member of the British commonwealth of nations or an entirely independent country of her own will be determined by the way in which England helps Nigerians develop the country now.

Nothing is more surprising than the way some people talk about the Nigerian Protectorate aiming at Dominion Status. Historical facts do not warrant such statements, if they are carefully weighed and scrutinized. First, as a protectorate, Nigeria is not a vassal state nor a nation of English settlers, such as are Canada or South Africa or Australia. Nigeria is a distinct country, composed of many political states and kingdoms tied to England by treaties. Both countries have mutual guarantees without which

the present relation can be severed. There was no stipulation that either Nigeria or Great Britain should give up her political status to be identified with the other—either to ask the British to become a member of the commonwealth of Nigeria or for Nigeria to become a member of the British commonwealth. I do not know how much the people who talk about this know or think about Nigeria's history and its origin. The people of the Gold Coast refer to their Bond of 1844. But some Nigerians refer to Dominion Status as the beginning and end of Nigerian culture and personality!

Now, I am not against Nigeria being a part of any large political organization in the world; it may be the British commonwealth of nations—but how? It depends entirely upon how friendly is the British attitude to our aspiration to become a real nation. If they let Nigeria plan rapidly and progressively without putting every legal and physical obstacle in our way, and if they definitely convince us of their sincerity and abide by their words, I do not see why the two peoples could not get along in unity. I personally am in love with some British political practices because in many aspects they resemble those of Nigeria.

I do not consider it completely impossible to have a British commonwealth either in Asia or Africa, nor impossible that Nigeria could attain independence through such a framework; but I am concerned with the fact that membership in a commonwealth must not be imposed upon Nigeria, as though Nigeria had pledged itself to pass through a Dominion era. I believe that a condition which evolved in other places because of historical circumstances—the origin of the people concerned, their cultural affiliation, and the concrete advantages obtained—cannot be introduced into Nigeria as a natural and inevitable stage in political development; for that it is not.

Participation in a commonwealth is based on mutual confidence; it cannot derive from a country's passing political examinations, in order to be promoted from Class C to Class B to Class A, such as occurs under the A.B.C. mandatory system. If you give any country Dominion Status when there is lack of mutual

trust, that country is not going to be serviceable to the nuclear country. Ireland supplies an example of what I mean; India another. But if there is already mutual confidence, then the status can be useful to all concerned. The British know this better than I, and I have given expression to no new doctrine. Anthony Eden, in his speech at Annapolis, Maryland, March 26, 1943, said: "The Commonwealth is a voluntary union. Its bonds are the will of peoples and races with a common past and a common purpose to travel the same way."

Under this definition, do Nigeria and Britain have a common past? With the present setup in Nigerian Legislative and Executive Councils can we say sincerely that our union with the British is all voluntary? Have Nigerians and their rulers analyzed British purposes, and vice versa, and have they agreed to travel the same way?

These are pertinent questions which should be answered by those who are looking forward to Dominion Status for Nigeria. Englishmen, Australians, New Zealanders, Canadians, all have the same racial origin, the same age-long historical and cultural backgrounds, and naturally they look forward to the same national destiny in their social, economic, and political institutions. To think that these can coincide with those of Africans or Asiatics, of entirely different cultural outlook, is a misunderstanding or misinterpretation of real similarities—as distinct from apparent similarities or like circumstances. It is fallacious as logic and highly dangerous as procedure, unless all the necessary precautions are taken to avoid an outburst of outrageous and cataclysmic upheaval.

I have maintained that the British have every opportunity now to do good in Nigeria. There is no cause for bitterness at this point—and in this the situation differs from that of India. Anglo-Nigerian relations can be made very smooth and exemplary, if the British Government will follow a wise policy in Nigeria by allowing the citizens of Nigeria and their rulers to plan their own lives without fear of physical and legal obstacles. So far, I see no reason why the two countries cannot be perpetually

friends—close friends—a condition which can only come about through sincere coöperation and a mutual respect for individual rights and national dignity. If the British will not brand Nigerians who love Nigeria as "anti-British," and list them in their "Blue Book" of revenge, and if the Nigerians will appreciate the forces of history, and forgive and forget all the atrocities which British imperialism applied to our King Ja Ja of Opobo and others, there is no doubt that the future will be salutary. But if the offender does not repent and the offended refuse to forgive, the future is dark for all.

I want to look at England in her relationship with Nigeria in terms of principles, and not in terms of persons and objects. There are certain principles which, as a Nigerian, I mean to uphold for my country—the principle of freedom, the principle of individual liberty, and the principle of untrammeled intelligence. I want to see Nigeria develop an attitude of good neighborliness with other nations, to uphold democracy, and to repudiate, once and for all, the Nazi doctrines of the German race.

Can England mean all this to me? That is, can I depend on England to coöperate with, and to develop these universal principles in Nigeria? Can England distinguish between an enemy of a people and an enemy of a principle? Can England look far enough ahead now to see what mutual confidence will mean to her and my country—to the English people and to my people—and to the world as a whole? Must the bitterness in India repeat itself in West Africa? I have no ready answer to these questions.

The issue is crystal clear. The question before us is momentous. It is a question of man—of human values—not of controversy. It is not a question as to whether Nigeria should be a member of the British commonwealth or a colony or an independent state. It is rather a question of the direction of a new moral sense in future relationship between Nigeria and England—and how that will affect the whole of the new world order. It is a question of defending our civilization—those fundamental principles which prompted the fight against Nazidom. It is a question of intellectual honesty in discussing the African peoples and their political

culture and capacities. It is a question of avoiding those constant and fallacious arguments which we use to defend the existence of the colonial system—those arguments which have helped such men as Hitler to draw their ultimate conclusions leading to the sick world of today.

Take for example, Lord Hailey, in his recent book: *The Future of Colonial Peoples*. He tried ineffectively and unconvincingly to prove that West Africa is still too "backward" to govern itself if left alone. His standard of measurement is "on terms consistent with modern ideas of civilized rule." I imagine that Lord Hailey is referring to European standards as "consistent with modern ideas of civilized rule." What argument is there? I would like Lord Hailey to indicate any continent which has fought more wars in this century, has witnessed more internal and external riots and disorder, plotted more sabotage, suspected its members more, killed greater numbers of its citizens, or has been more susceptible to anarchy than has Europe. Are the Northern Nigerian Emirates not operating under the Muhammedan code of ethics, and are those the only Muhammedan states in the world, or does Lord Hailey mean that we shall stamp out all Muhammedan states and force them to accept other ethical standards before granting them self-government? Where in Southern Nigeria were there no law and order before the British came to Nigeria? Is the English dynasty older than the Benin dynasty in Southern Nigeria? Has it ever been proved that the House of Windsor in England is older than the House of the present Onitsha Dynasty or the Ezeoguine House in Nnewi? Although these areas may be comparatively small in size, the essence of their being as cultural entities cannot be denied. We can no more deny that fact than we can affirm that because Switzerland is small, it is therefore not a nation comparable as a political state to the United States, or that England is not a nation because China is many, many times larger and more populous.

Lord Hailey's argument about West Africa is very weak indeed. He forgot to mention the Bond of 1844 between the Gold Coast and England, and what the people of the Gold Coast and

their rulers are saying about it now—even *now*. I do not know whether Lord Hailey has any argument which would prove that the Liberians have particular qualities which today make them more fit to be independent than those areas in West Africa which are controlled by the British and French. Why did not the United States present the same argument, and then take over the political control of Liberia?

This takes us back again to the point that our problem is one of whether we are willing to be intellectually honest in the education of our youth and in our writings. We must not encourage men like Hitler and Mussolini to conclude that, after all, what we write and what education we give our citizens concerning international matters and concerning other peoples are but a planned euphemism for the prolongation of our own rule over others. We must not let such men believe that we are going to continue to exploit those who have all the qualities of nationhood except the possession of those materials necessary to enforce their opinions upon others or to resist encroachment from without. For, so far as I see it, the crime of the peaceful and well-ordered governments of the indigenous Africans today is that they have no destructive instruments with which to attack others or to defend themselves.

England and Nigeria have a moral issue to decide upon. Even as Lord Hailey observed, Nigeria seems to fall into the category of those countries which "for geographical or other reasons are unlikely to be assimilated within the structure of their controlling power"—England. He believes that to Nigeria applies "the demand for general 'liberation,' " but Lord Hailey thinks the time for that demand has not yet come. This sort of conclusion makes the Nigerian problem all the more of a moral issue—an issue of the sense of direction and the safety of man; an issue of basic principles rather than that of mere statistics and unilateral standardization. These principles should be defined in the light of the urgency of the times.

The issue must be made clear that the main interest of the British in West Africa was originally and still is economic, and that

political control is a means of attaining that economic goal. There is nothing wrong with an economic quest—if it is directed to the mutual, social benefit of all. But let not this necessity force us—with all our moral judgment and scientific objectivity—to harp on an ineffective and hopelessly anachronistic and contradictory premise that some people are incapable of governing themselves. It is a crime against humanity and a challenge to God for any people to deny that Nigerians—who for centuries have been living peacefully with durable social traditions, under kingdoms and constitutional monarchies, under strong family traditions and personal immunities rare in the world—are capable of governing themselves. Let me ask: Who governed Lagos before 1851? Who was governing Ife before the latter part of the nineteenth century? Who was keeping order and making rules in Sokoto before 1900? Any informed Briton could answer these questions. Lord Lugard could state what kind of Kano he met in 1900, and why he accepted the principle of Native Administration in Nigeria. The doctrine of "backward" peoples is simply ammunition for Hitlerites with their geopolitical theories and their absurd racial doctrines. It is not that England advocates what Hitler believes; it is simply that the imperialistic nations, including England, have ignored what Hitler openly avowed. By relying upon a theory of "backward" peoples and "primitive" civilization, Hitlers find their excuse for postulating the principles of "better peoples" and better "Germanys." One lends help to the other—even though unconsciously.

It is for these reasons that I feel that England has significance for Nigeria in terms of the present world trend and the final destiny of our struggle. Basically it is a struggle of moral principle versus Nazi doctrine, intellectual honesty versus defenseless fallacies, mutual respect versus planned degradation of other peoples, collective security versus partial security. But today it is necessary to distinguish between an *essence* and a *degree*, between our own standards and the standards of others. The individuality of Nigeria must be acknowledged and protected. If England has undertaken the responsibility of protecting Nigeria,

then the protection of Nigeria involves perpetuating its culture, its peculiarities and identity—its inner, personal way of feeling and thinking. It is not denying the individual qualities of a people by measuring the inherent capabilities of their own rulers by the yard-stick of alien standards.

Nigeria lives for God as an embodiment of a particular culture. It is not a European culture. It was not intended to be so, and there is no need of measuring it solely by the European standards of whatever you call ethics or morality—let alone "civilization." Nigeria is a work that bears its features. It possesses the imprints of the handiwork of men of vision among our proud ancestors, of the farmers who left the legacy of their labor for the new generation; there still remain the work of the artists, whose insight led them to achieve a creation complete in itself, of the craftsmen and thinkers whose eternal vision interprets the Nigerian world.

That is the way I see Nigeria in her relationship with England. They have the natural issues of individual destinies in common. If one can help or complement the other for good, that is desirable. But arrogance and a feeling of cultural superiority will encourage bitterness; it will encourage a feeling that might is right. It will provide new and more dangerous doctrines than those now found in Nazi Germany. But an approach that makes a frank admission of motives and designs, that gives others credit for their own contribution to world culture, and that repudiates the theory of a native "incapability" for independent government will put England on a new plane after the war.

This attitude will give both Nigeria and England a right to moral indignation against German dictatorship and Japanese "superiority" doctrines.

As a Nigerian, what England means to me will be determined by her decision on these fundamental principles of might and right, domination and coöperation, fallacy and intellectual honesty, dictatorship and freedom. My final stand will not rest on whether political Nigeria is independent or not, or on whether dominion status or protectorate status is better. The people of

Nigeria themselves have that decision to make. I am interested in those questions of human principles and values on which future relations of peoples are to be based—whether that of freedom or that of a chain.

The answer today is not clear to me: it is to the future alone to reveal to me *what England means to me*—to my country and to my people.

CHAPTER XV

America—The Daughter of Untrammeled Intelligence

THE VERY OLD STORY about three blind men and an elephant may be appropriately retold here. Before the men had become blind none of them had seen an elephant; but later they came in contact with one and were curious about him. One of them touched his trunk and was conscious of a trunk; one of them touched the elephant's side, and thought he touched a wall; and the third felt the elephant's tail, and was sure it was a snake. Each man had a different impression of his experience with the elephant. Indeed, each was right in so far as he had experienced the elephant. Each believed earnestly in what his sense perception told him, a bitter argument ensued, they began to fight, and finally killed one another.

This little story can be used symbolically to illustrate the prevalent misunderstanding of the average American about Africa. In considering America's rôle in post-war Africa, which is a part of the perplexing problem now occupying the minds of the greatest leaders of the world, I believe that if the nations of today are to avoid the calamity which befell the three blind men, the most important step to be taken in determining America's rôle in post-war Africa is for Americans to get some real knowledge of the whole of Africa—I mean of those human beings in Africa who, in the past, have been treated as chattels in the European slave-market of political and economic diplomacy.

There is little doubt now of a complete military defeat of the enemy and that America will play an important part in solving post-war problems as they arise on all fronts. What is America

going to do with victory? Is she going to win the war with the invaluable blood of her citizens, and then forfeit peace at the altar of European imperialism and power-politics—as she did in 1918? To win the peace, to determine her policy toward other nations, it seems reasonable that America must have a real knowledge of the nations with whom she must deal.

In this country, there is perhaps less real knowledge and understanding of Africa than of any other continent on the globe. Americans generally misunderstand Africa because they have not seen and do not know Africa as a whole, nor do they know Africans as human beings with an inborn sense of freedom. Few people visit Africa, and those who do seldom see more than a very small part of the continent—perhaps a village, a city, or a jungle. When these visitors, travelers, anthropologists, or missionaries come back, they often—perhaps, unconsciously—give the impression to the people at home that they have seen or known all about Africa. It is as though an African were to visit New York or one of the slums of a southern city, and on returning home were to tell Africans that a southern slum is all that constitutes the United States.

Africa is not, as many believe, typified by jungles, semi-barbarians, and elephants. I never saw an elephant in Nigeria, and there is no lion existent in the country. The first elephant I ever saw was in a zoo in Columbus, Ohio. I wrote home and informed my family about it. I described an elephant to them, because I knew that they had never seen one and possibly never will.

African life is simple but not necessarily primitive. When visitors come to our tropical Africa, where the climate is such that excessive dress is not necessary or even desirable for daily living, where there is no need for overcoats, gloves, ear-mufflers, scarves, woolen socks, and heavy shoes, they—owing to their national conception of dress—think that we are primitive. The extremes of weather in the temperate zones here force the Western man to be more cautious about clothing, and indeed more serious about gaining a livelihood than is his African brother. In Amer-

ica, for example, no one would dare to walk barefooted in the winter, and all have to dress according to the weather. The African has no idea of the frigidity of this climate, nor does he have to build homes to protect himself against extremes of temperature. It is comparatively easy for him to extract food from the soil, and life is, therefore, simpler for him. Aside from tropical diseases, some of which are endemic, the African does not have too much to worry about. The heat is tempered by constant breezes, and a profusion of tropical flowers and palms enhances the pleasure of living. Under these conditions the African can live more casually and, in the opinion of some, more happily than Americans. He has developed a philosophy of simplicity and a love of a carefree life, but this simplicity should never be mistaken for primitivism.

A little story told me by a cousin illustrates my point. My cousin has a wife and three children. The eldest child, a girl, has twelve pairs of shoes and plenty of clothes. Her brother has ten pairs of shoes. On the girl's twelfth birthday they decided to take a picture of the family group with the boy and girl seated on each side of the parents. The boy wore socks and shoes and the girl was barefoot. My cousin showed this picture to an American friend who drew from it two conclusions: (1) that the parents were too poor to buy shoes and socks for both boy and girl; (2) that they bought them for the boy because of a preference given to boys in Africa. Both conclusions were wrong. The girl had enough shoes, and actually had two pairs more than her brother. She was barefoot because she was hot, and believing, as her parents did, in comfort and simplicity, she was more comfortable without shoes.

Africa is many countries; there is no country called Africa; and in some of the countries there may be found jungles. In others, however, life closely resembles life in the West. Of course, there are no skyscrapers and subways as there are in New York or Philadelphia. Nor does practically every family own radios and automobiles and telephones. These are all to be found in Africa, but to a lesser degree from the point of view of distribution.

We do have paved roads and beautiful homes built of cement blocks, the roofs of which are sometimes made of iron sheeting. We also have more recreation facilities than one has in America. There are numerous African games such as: *Itu-ogu*, *akpakolo*, *igbu-uga*, and *ebili-ebili*.

It has been generally thought, since the middle of the nineteenth century when most African states came under the political and economic domination of some European countries, that the idea of citizenship or of a political sovereignty of African kings is non-existent. This is not true. We are first of all Africans, loyal to our own traditional governments and rulers. Secondly, we believe in world inter-dependence.

Sometimes when Europeans or Americans meet an African they ask: "Are you English, French, or are you Dutch?" For example, when I was asked to speak at a National Conference of a Christian denomination in Dayton, Ohio, in 1940, an American friend introduced me as Prince Orizu of the royal household of Nnewi, Nigeria, who had come to America to study political science. He added that he thought I would be able to give a particularly worthwhile and enjoyable talk since, along with being a recognized student of my subject, I was also an Englishman. He did not realize how much more pleased I would have been if he had introduced me simply as a Nigerian.

For the most part, African states are today dominated by European nations. In some protected areas, such as Nigeria, the people have their own kings, princes, and local governments. Many of the kings and royal families are enormously wealthy and live and are thought of in much the same way as are the fabulous maharajahs of India. It might be interesting to note here that the Maharajah of Alwar, India, has eight hundred thousand subjects, whereas the Emir of Kano, one of the numerous kingdoms of Nigeria, has over two million subjects. The difference probably is that many Indian princes are still ruling a feudal state, while most of the African countries have almost passed beyond feudalism and are entering the modern age. But they are yet unfamiliar with the intricacies of modern capitalistic life, and are, therefore, partic-

ularly concerned with and perturbed by economic problems.

The force of European imperialism, which has served as a disintegrating factor affecting the actual sovereignty of the rulers, cannot be minimized. Life is undergoing a change; but in spite of all the changing conditions and despite European domination, African society is still organized in traditional African ways, and allegiance is still paid to the real African rulers.

In many ways of life and government, Africa is as highly organized as are countries generally supposed to be much more advanced. I shall not try to evaluate Africa's stage of advancement in comparison with that of other countries. Some say, in regard to one nation's code of ethics toward another, that they are still in a savage state. Savages encroach upon one another without cause, pursue policies of aggression with no regard to ethical considerations, barbarians behave according to the old code of "an eye for an eye," and only Christians behave with kindness and consideration as a matter of principle. One can prophesy that so-called civilized nations would go through barbarism rather quickly and would finally, as nations, reach a true civilized state. Civilized persons exist as individuals. If the generally considered advanced nations have not reached a true state of advancement, how can we properly evaluate Africa? I use the word "advancement" purposely because "civilization" is a misleading term.

In regard to loyalty to his government and country, the African rates very high. An example of his loyalty is the length of time the Ethiopians fought for the freedom and sovereignty of their country in the Italo-Ethiopian War. The war actually continued for years against a highly mechanized enemy. When we remember how quickly some of the European countries were forced to surrender in the present conflict to a more highly mechanized, better equipped enemy, the length of time the Ethiopians were able to hold out seems unbelievable. The Africans love their countries, are willing to fight for them, and believe in their long-established customs and institutions.

Perhaps the reason why Africans are often misjudged and mis-

understood by the American people is because Americans receive their knowledge about Africans through moving pictures and bizarre night-club entertainment. Those who write movie scripts with African settings, or who arrange night-club shows, do it with an eye to sensationalism rather than to accuracy. That is unfortunate. While speaking of misconceptions, another point I wish to make is that we as a nation are not naturally impoverished. The resources of Africa are enormous and undeveloped. We are perhaps nearly as rich in resources as is Russia. Well-meaning missionaries who come to Africa put emphasis on the fact that Africans are poor, and thereby try to collect money at home to help Africa. I do not quarrel with this help, but it would be much better for all concerned if they would rightly emphasize the fact that Africans are poor because they are deprived, by exploitation and domination, of the natural wealth and resources of the country. The missionaries do not emphasize the fact that Africans are not naturally poor, but are impoverished by the economic and political subjugation of those who dominate them with superior technological and industrial devices. America can help Africa tremendously by equitable exchange of mechanical equipment for needed raw materials. Equitable exchange of goods is the essence of harmonious relations between all nations. One nation must not "help" another by attempting to control her or by conniving at other nations controlling her politically or otherwise.

From the above it is plain that the emphasis should not be on the fact that African nations are naturally poor, but rather on the fact that they are made poor by the ruthless methods and callousness of European domination in Africa. Collecting money for African missionary work has its worth, but it certainly has nothing to do with changing the conditions of poverty in Africa. Until Africa frees herself of political and economic serfdom, there will be a continued need for charity.

Life in Africa is communal. Ordinarily food is abundant and inexpensive. In Northern Nigeria one can obtain a thousand eggs for two dollars or less. A chicken may cost a dime. In Nigeria a

large hog can be bought for about three dollars and a cow for about four. Of course, the wages are so low that a common laborer may receive twenty-five cents a day while privileged groups can amass wealth. Every unit of the family has a house, which is the property of the family as a whole. Families in Africa consist of all who can claim a common ancestor, and consequently often consists of thousands of people—yet there is real coöperation and happiness in family life in Africa.

The late Dr. Alfred Adler, who has contributed so much to modern thought through his discoveries in psychology, would, I am sure, consider Africa's contribution of coöperation in family life of enormous value to humanity. It was Dr. Adler's belief that lack of family coöperation—the "I" spirit—is the cause of many of the woes of humanity. To this lack he attributed crime, failure, neurosis, illness, and even insanity. These social maladjustments are rare in Africa. Sometimes it seems as if there are fewer diseases in Africa, per capita, than in America. People live normal, healthy lives and are not forced to strain beyond their abilities and strength to compete, as they do here in a highly competitive capitalistic society. The idea of poverty in Africa, even though she is, as I have shown, imperialistically dominated, must not be too exaggerated, nor must it be considered to reduce the country to abject misery. There is poverty and want in Africa. There are low wages indeed. European imperialism has retarded social progress and economic advancement, particularly in South and East Africa. But to identify "Africa" with "poverty," because of the simplicity in her way of life, is a gross mistake and an entirely unscientific analysis of her in our world of relative values. One must try to distinguish between the simple life of the African as a cultural type, and the poverty imported into Africa by European imperialism as a new development.

The customs and beliefs of the Africans in regard to marriage are strange, perplexing, and misunderstood here. People in America believe that love is not the basis of marriage in Africa. This is not true. The love and marriage questions are dealt with differently, however, than they are here. A young man there is at-

tracted to a young woman as he is here, but instead of simply marrying—if both parties are willing—the African goes through a long period of deliberation, consideration, and preparation. The custom is for him to take his parents into his confidence and to consult them as to the desirability of the young woman for a mate. The parents look up the girl's family, seriously investigate everything about the members of the family, and, if they are found to be in every way desirable, make a serious effort to become friends of the girl's people and to bring the two families together. If the girl or her family are found to be undesirable, the boy is strongly advised against marriage, and, in fact, is practically forbidden to marry. All of this long period of consideration, together with the advice and counsel of the parents, makes for stability in marriage. Divorce as it is known in America is practically unknown in Africa.

The status of women in Africa is indicated by the quotation that follows from an article by Sir Donald Cameron, "Tanganyika Service and Some Nigeria":

> It is alleged by some, for instance, for the most part persons who have never touched the life of the people, that women are slaves because a dowry is paid for them in marriage. The dowry is in the good conduct of the woman; it is not a vicarious practice, is well suited to the conditions in which the people live. It has been said, moreover, that the women [in Africa] do all the work, while the men loll in the shade. This is not true, and specific instances to the contrary can be cited. There is in all tribal law and custom a division between the work of the men and the women and it is well-known that the strongest supporters of this customary division of labor are the women, who jealously guard their share of the family farming operations, establishing their claims even in the native courts against their husbands.

People here consider that we in Africa buy our wives as chattels because of this dowry system. This is a mistake. "Dowry" to the African has a very different connotation. It is not a price but

a tribute paid to the bride-to-be's parents for the rearing of a daughter who is considered to be a contribution to society. It is also considered a tribute to the sacred ideal of womanhood. The prospective husband gives a certain sum of money to the future bride's family, part of which is to be used to provide entertainment for the marriage festival. The bride's family, in exchange for the dowry, gives gifts to the groom. Part of the dowry given to the bride's family is used to establish a home and is sometimes added to by the bride. In short, the dowry is used in three ways: first, to entertain the family of the bride; second, to entertain the family of the groom when they are at the bride's home; and third, to buy household goods for the bride and to establish the new home. In all this, there is distinctly no idea of buying and selling. The amount given by the groom as a dowry depends on his wealth and prestige. It is all a token of esteem and appreciation. Family life in Africa not being individualistic, all the members of the families involved feel that they are deeply concerned in the marriage. The family is a unit and any act of one member is of great importance to the family as a whole.

The fact mentioned above—that African young people are guided by the judgment of their elders in the selection of mates—leads us to another interesting realization. African youth respects age. An African is displeased if he is thought to be younger than he really is. Age is supposed to represent wisdom, respect, and venerability. In this regard, the Africans have the true oriental viewpoint.

The African concept of beauty is interesting, and in accord with that of all peoples that have real race-consciousness. All race-conscious peoples consider their own type of features and color of their skins to be the ideal. So do the Africans. Europeans are to them "colored," and their long hair is a defect. Their idea of a beautiful physique, however, conforms to that of Americans and to that of most races. A straight, strong body, broad shoulders, slender waist, and straight limbs are considered beautiful by most peoples. If one has observed the natural symmetry and grace of the black American diver during the summer here, one can

easily come to appreciate the African point of view in regard to the beauty of his race. A real African cannot understand why the black women in America try to make their hair artificially straight and make every effort to resemble something other than themselves.

By this we see that the whole matter of beauty is one of local concept. Who shall say wherein true beauty lies? Even in this great country the ideal of feminine pulchritude changes from decade to decade. Now I am told by a masseuse catering to the Hollywood set that a special course of exercise has been developed to give the face the Marlene Dietrich contour. Decades ago American women wore "plumpers" to make their faces round. Where and what is true beauty except in the eyes of the beholder?

Until Africa is better known and appreciated, America's rôle in post-war Africa cannot be determined. I have dwelt at some length on the misconceptions and lack of information about Africa. Now I want to point out what the two countries have in common. First and foremost, Africa and America both have adequate land resources. This should make for a certain bond between the two nations. In comparison with the land-poor countries of Europe, both America and Africa have enormous national wealth and boundless opportunities. Africa, like America, is extremely rich in mineral resources. Both peoples, in national outlook, have a certain personality likeness expressed in optimism and buoyancy. People threatened with famine and real food shortages are not likely to view their situation with serenity and confidence, nor are they apt to reflect optimism and buoyancy. The national optimism of the descendants of pioneer stock in America is sometimes lost sight of because it is overshadowed by the strain caused by extreme competition. But the very fact that these descendants and all Americans carry on the competition so conscientiously and with such great achievement shows that underneath they have the same optimism, sense of cheerfulness, and belief in the final outcome that we Africans have.

There are also certain similarities in African and American

backgrounds and ways of life. Both countries developed out of colonial domination. America has finished this process of development, while Africa is still going through it.

In comparing our ways of life, I see many similarities in types of food; the common American dish, mashed potato, resembles our *fu-fu* or *utala*. American gravy is comparable to what we call *ofe*; cornbread to *ikpakili*. We fry, boil, and broil chicken as you do here. Soup is very like our *ofe-nsala*. We have no pies, but ice-cream has been introduced by Americans. Palm wine, which is white as milk and rather sweet and quite intoxicating if not mixed with water, is the national beverage. It is very nourishing and is used as leaven in making bread. We also drink *pito* and *burukutu* made from grains. In place of oatmeal we have *akamu* and *tapioca*. Our food generally is lacking in milk, which is not considered real food in many parts of Africa.

I have already mentioned that Africans entertain themselves in much the same way as Americans. They are both devotees of dancing. In South American music (La Conga) and in American jazz, I feel something very similar to African music which thrills the rhythmic sense of the African. The rhythms of these types of music seem to be entirely African in origin. The manner in which Negro spirituals are sung here, as well as the music itself, is definitely of African origin. African music is full of force, vigor, and lively rhythms. There are many other similarities between American and African life, which space prohibits me from elaborating upon. But where does this revelation lead us to?

It means that with reference to Africa, America must be awakened because she is now confronted with two approaches to the settlement of the post-war problem in Africa. She must choose between coöperation and domination. Whichever she chooses will determine our sincerity of purpose in this war, and the prospects of maintaining an enduring peace. Many people believe that the recent depression was caused by a lack of markets for goods. The trouble was that there were not enough people in any of the countries who could buy the amount of articles—shoes for example—produced in that country. New markets had to be found.

Of course, at the moment the problem is reversed; but after the war the industrial nations are apt to lapse into another condition of over-production. If this is true, the African continent with its tremendous population might prove a wonderful market for goods. What has happened in the industrial expansion and development of Russia can just as well happen in Africa.

I am not of the opinion that Africa will continue in her present state long after the war or that the African people have definite constitutional limits of attainment. I do not believe that the I.Q. of nations considered collectively or individually are static. Any race or group, or members of a race or group, segregated from the interests of the world would, I believe on very good authority, show a low I.Q., if such a test could be applied to them. With identical environments and with the abolition of superstitions regarding heredity, the result would be different. There is no question of doubt as to what extent inferiority feelings of any kind hamper an individual or a nation, if isolated involuntarily.

Africa admires America's pattern for democracy, and thoroughly realizes to what extent America has contributed to it. Compared to the other nations of the world, America has made an excellent contribution to democracy. The fact that America has given Liberia political independence shows the former's potentialities for even greater democracy. Liberia, as compared with other countries of West Africa, such as Nigeria and the Gold Coast, is small, poor, and lacking in resistance—yet America has demonstrated that it does not want to dominate politically any country in Africa by giving the excuse that that country cannot govern itself.

American imperialism, when it does exist, is an entirely different type of imperialism from European imperialism. American imperialism, for lack of a better term, may be called "limited" imperialism. European imperialism is total. It tends to penetrate the political, cultural, religious, and economic life of the people. American imperialism is the imperialism of the business man, and does not try to dominate the religious, political, and cultural aspects of life as Britain, for instance, dominates India. This is due,

I believe, to America's ideal of democracy; namely, that all people are capable of governing themselves.

When America has dominated politically there has been no tendency to aim at perpetual political domination. There is a sincere determination to educate people to know their rights. A comparison of educational progress in some European and American colonies will illustrate my point. In Algeria, controlled by the French, forty-six out of a thousand children go to school; in the French Cameroon, three out of a thousand; in the Belgian Congo, twenty-six out of a thousand; in the Gold Coast, seventeen per thousand; in Nigeria, British protected, seven per thousand. This last figure is based on findings of American investigators, but according to the *Statesman's Year Book*, the number is thirty per thousand. This latter figure includes a large number of Muhammedan schools not supported by Britain. In Portuguese Angola, according to one report, one out of every thousand children goes to school, and still another report shows eleven per thousand. In British India 37.07 per one thousand attend. In the Dutch East Indies thirty-eight in a thousand. Compare these figures with those for American controlled Hawaii, where there is universal elementary education! In the Philippines the number is one hundred and twenty per thousand. In the British Colony of Nigeria, with which I am familiar, there is nothing, as pointed out above, like universal free education in any school group from kindergarten to college age. Those who obtain an education pay for it. As democracy is inevitably tied up with universal education, it certainly cannot thrive where free universal education does not exist. In Puerto Rico, American controlled, a hundred and seventy-five out of one thousand children attend school. Again compare this with the seven per thousand of Nigeria (British).

From all this, one concludes that America offers much greater opportunities for the average person without independent means to obtain an education than do most other countries. Herein lies one of her great contributions to democracy. To obtain free education here was not easy. Anyone familiar with the early history

of this country will remember the long and bitter struggle that was carried on for its establishment. Education here in colonial times was principally by means of private and church schools. I shall not elaborate on the struggle. Now free elementary and secondary education is established and we all know of thousands of cases where students, by various means, are enabled to earn money for higher education after they have completed their free high school education. One brilliant chap whom I know earned his way through Cornell by running a laundry. He not only put himself through college but practically supported his parents while there. This is one of many instances. Then, too, one may if he wishes attend college for a while, stop and earn money, and take up his college course again when he is able. These opportunities do not usually exist in other countries, with the exception of Russia.

The facilities which America has to offer for education, and the steps taken to enable people to get it, show that she fully realizes that a true working democracy is unthinkable without universal education. This the fathers of the country knew. Of course, in the more backward states there is still much illiteracy. I believe, however, that the education is available for the population when it reaches the stage of social consciousness where it demands the privilege. The American people have been called "the sleeping American public." This applies to it when speaking of the individual feeling of responsibility in government, but generally speaking, and in comparison with the rest of the world, America is certainly more awake to its educational obligations than most countries.

America has given a new meaning to the practice of democracy which is not noticed by many observers. That new meaning will be found in her outlook toward a philosophy of life. I agree with Alexis de Tocqueville in his article, "Democracy in America," in which he says: "In no country in the civilized world is less attention paid to philosophy than in the United States. The Americans have no philosophical school of their own, and care but little for all the schools into which Europe is divided, the very names of

which are scarcely known to them." While I agree with de Tocqueville that America has paid little attention to formal philosophy, I shall say that in my opinion America has developed what I call a "democratic philosophy." By this I mean a kind of individual philosophy. Every man more or less, and as far as conceivable, thinks out his problem for himself. By far the majority of Americans are extroverts, and have no interest in the realms of speculation and meditation. What cannot be demonstrated to the senses generally has no appeal. I exclude, however, America's acceptance of religious beliefs. These are, of course, generally accepted, and, I must admit, not reflected upon too much. Religious beliefs for which the very nation was founded, however, are part of the national inheritance of almost every man.

Americans accept no philosophical formalities and rigid dogmatisms, and they have a tendency to revolt against the shackles of wanton tradition, to evade the bondage and habits of familyisms that lead to class consciousness and, in some measure, national megalomania. Their philosophy is to make individuals. Hence there is no philosophy of the people, but rather a philosophy of individuals. Each individual seeks the reason for things in himself and in himself alone. That seeking I call the philosophy of democracy. It is synonymous with self-knowledge, self-conviction, and untrammeled experimentation for oneself. The theory of true democracy is not a conclusion—a closed book of how things must be—it is rather a hypothesis, something to allow people to work now and give others a better opportunity to continue to work. In this sense America has given the world a practical pattern which should make it easy for all nations to make rapid strides toward the goal of democracy.

I have spoken at length of America's enormous educational and philosophical contribution to democracy because it shows what America can, if allowed and willing, extend to Africa and to all the world. There is no doubt, however, that I, as an impartial observer coming from Africa, cannot help but say that America rates highest of all nations in her effort to democratize her country. But there is one spot in American democracy—a very dan-

gerous spot—which I cannot pass over without mention. That spot is race prejudice or racial cannibalism. I wish I could write this chapter without mentioning it. But it is here and shows itself in different degrees of intensity and in different localities all over this country. I often feel ashamed of mankind when this evidence of inhumanity presents itself. I am emphasizing, therefore, and without any bitterness, that if race prejudice is removed from American life no country, no people, no demagogue, no age, would be more glorious than the present age of American democracy!

From what has been said up to this point, it should be clear that America's first step in her rôle in post-war Africa is to find out about Africa, to clear up the general misconceptions about Africa, to understand and appreciate their similarities, to understand and realize the enormity of the American contribution to democracy and to democratic philosophy, and to realize and understand from all this how Africa and America need each other.

We have not yet said anything about the attitude of the United States government towards Africa. Our next discussion, therefore, will center on this point.

The whole discussion is based on the recent address made by Mr. Henry S. Villard, Assistant Chief of the Division of Near-Eastern Affairs of the Department of State, at the Chautauqua Institute, on August 19, 1943. The choice is made advisedly, because Mr. Villard himself said definitely that he was stating "the main problems with respect to Africa from the standpoint of the American government."

His speech was divided into three main points. First, he surveyed the historical phase of Americo-African relations from the earliest time of this Republic to date. Second, he focussed attention on the economic and strategic importance of Africa. Third, he enunciated the policy of the United States government on the political issues of African countries now under European imperialism.

Our interest now is centered on the immediate problem of the government policy relative to present and post-war Africa. This

involves economic, social, and political considerations. On the economic front, Mr. Villard recognized that the impact of the present war has brought with it many unprecedented social and economic changes in Africa—changes from which Africa cannot retreat. In his own words: "air bases have dotted the landscapes and the airplane has become a familiar sight; ports have been enlarged and improved and all this has stimulated new wants and trade expansion which are for the present limited only by the desperately over-burdened shipping facilities."

This argument led Mr. Villard to ask in a somber tone: "To what extent will our ships continue to ply the waters of Africa, laden with building supplies and machinery on one hand, and return with valuable tropical cargoes on the other hand?"

Here lies the point. Mr. Villard's answer to his own question is interesting. I shall sum up his conclusions on the Americo-African economic future: (1) The American is definitely interested in participating in an economic relationship with Africa now and after the war—as never before in the history of both people. Villard said, "We would not be American if we were not interested in that." (2) The American nation has just developed a use for African products, and retreat from that new usefulness during the post-war era is most unlikely; e.g., metals, like Nigerian tin, manganese, and copper may be increasingly needed here. (3) The American is ready to apply point four of the Atlantic Charter in which it is stated that ". . . all states, great or small, victor or vanquished," will have access, "on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world. . . ." By holding to this principle, America is only reaffirming her old international policy of the "open door" or equal-opportunity policy. This will be fully applied to Africa—whether in independent, colonial, or protectorate areas. (4) The Americans recognize that Africa needs her skill and efficient services for industrialization and increased productivity in Africa; hence, American "interest in Africa is not that of the pirates of old who plundered and robbed and took without giving in return."

Any conscious citizen of both America and Africa would look,

with deep apprehensions, at these economic policies of the United States Government relative to Africa. They have far reaching implications, and yet from many points of view are salutary. Let us see what the Africans think about it. Concerning the first and second points, Africa agrees with the United States that America ought not to retreat from Africa after the war, Africa having made its contribution to the suppression of tyranny. Africa is also proud that America recognizes now that even Africa has tremendous contributions to make to keep America industrially and commercially stable. Africans are also resolved not to retreat from their association with America after the war, and they recognize equally that American skill and machinery and capital is needed to industrialize Africa and to increase her productivity.

The Africans agree with point four of the Atlantic Charter, provided that after the war the Americans would not allow another Wilson to be crucified on the altar of European imperialism, thereby making Africa just a field from which raw materials can be gathered by cheap labor and abject human suffering. This leads us to point four, in which Mr. Villard made it clear that America is not interested in going to Africa to plunder, rather than yielding a return to the Africans. This point is very encouraging; but it is now necessary for the American to develop vigilance for he must be willing and ready to deal with African business men directly, rather than through other peoples as intermediaries. Americans must be ready to resist the "advice" that the Africans cannot do business themselves. Mutual confidence must be developed, and to accomplish that let no American imagine that the African is going to be recommended by European imperialists as good and trustworthy. And the same advice applies to Africans. The Africans have been directly or indirectly made to be afraid of the American business man, because we are told he is terrible and merciless. By these excuses, some countries find a pretext to keep the two peoples apart in their economic relations.

On political matters, Mr. Villard, if I am interpreting him correctly, made the following points: (1) The United States gov-

ernment in keeping with its "traditional policy" has "no desire to carve out for its exclusive benefit any portion of Africa." (2) The United States government is interested in the future treatment of Africa and its peoples, although it does not mean to ally itself with any one particular point of view concerning the political status of the African countries, but recognizes that economic progress would give its peoples avenues for political freedom. (3) That in Africa, only a minority of the peoples have expressed a desire for independence. These are basic points worthy of our consideration here. We shall consider them one by one from the African point of view.

Judging from the past Americo-African relations, the first point is self-evident. The Africans implicitly believe that the United States is the only great Western nation which does not want political control over any African territory. It is even because of American influence that we have an independent state in West Africa: Liberia.

In referring to point two, it does not seem necessary that the people of Africa should expect the United States, as a government, to give them their political independence. That would be asking too much of the American government. Nevertheless, the American government has the freedom to advise its Allies on the lines of action which would ensure a real and equitable peace, consonant with the pronouncements of the Allied leaders—of which the American President is an important influence. There is no need for anyone to put his hands into a fire, and, when they begin to burn, to beg help from friendly and powerful neighbors to help get them out, then only to put them in again. Any really good friend, from both ethical and material points of view, would warn his neighbor against putting his hands back into the fire. He would even try to prevent the repetition, if persuasion did not work. On this ground, it may not be out of place for the American government, even if it does not intend to embarrass her European Allies with the question of the African territories, to discourage the tendency to keep African people poor, illiterate, unhealthy, and unemployed. This simply implies that America,

as a people and as a culture, must make itself distinct from Europe in the eyes of the African peoples in the post-war era. Africans admire America. The two countries have never had any serious conflict; there is no American imperialism in Africa. American missionaries are viewed differently today in Africa. The Africans, who have had the opportunity to study in American universities, are endeavoring to let African people see the true aspect of the dynamic, untrammeled spirit of the American people—their amiableness, their natural sympathy with the oppressed, their capability to create, their love for the unfolding of human intelligence, and their love for freedom. This bright beginning must not be allowed to be dimmed by those chronic European ideas of total imperialism which maintain that there are still living in our world human beings incapable of governing themselves, even if they were sincerely left alone.

Mr. Villard's third point maintains that it is a minority only of the peoples in Africa that have expressed a desire for self-government. This is a misinterpretation of the African people based on traditional European misrepresentation. Taking Nigeria and the Gold Coast for example, we find that every resolution in those countries since the war began indicate at least a popular demand for immediate complete local self-government preparatory to immediate external autonomy after the war. I know of no evidence about the people of Nigeria which would indicate the contrary. All the reports of the local newspapers from Nigeria and the Gold Coast show the same trend. The West African Press Delegation to London, led by a Nigerian editor, demanded *immediate abrogation of the crown colony system in West Africa, immediate local self-government, and complete autonomy immediately after the war*. When the delegation returned, all West Africans acclaimed the resolution, and no Nigerian expressed the opposite view on the ground that British Courts dispense better justice than Nigerian Courts. Since, despite the censorship imposed by the war, the papers in those countries are able to voice these things at present, we can imagine what they really would have said if all the avenues of expression were free. I think that Mr.

Villard misinterpreted the Africans on that particular point; that is understandable, since most of the African news that reaches Americans comes second hand from the imperial powers. Whether the Americans appreciate that point or not, the Africans do not know. But the American and African peoples will do well to open entirely new avenues of direct and purely cultural contact, leaving political entanglements alone for the present.

The social aspect of the matter is equally important, and for the moment may be said to be the most important to Africa and to America.

Mr. Villard rightly recognized that America can, as an immediate objective, help in the internal development of African life. He pointed out that such things as "the opportunities for improvement in living standards, in education, health, and agriculture are practically without end," and then he continued: "If we wish to obtain benefits from the development of Africa, in the interest of all peoples—including the natives themselves—capital must be supplied for various purposes and from various sources: philanthropic, commercial, and perhaps international. The proof of our sincerity in fulfilling hopes awakened during these years of war will lie in our willingness to contribute to and invest in the future of Africa."

Nothing is more encouraging than these words from a representative of the United States government who knows that "The Continent of Africa is bound to play a prominent part in any system of international security which may be devised for the future."

At this juncture it may be necessary to say that it is a personal view of the author, without any dependence on the opinion of other Africans, that there should be a definite cultural and economic exchange between America and the African countries, but that the political issues affecting independence of each of those African countries be taken up by the peoples of Africa themselves. It is not my conviction that the African Protectorates or colonies—whatever you call them—should ask the United States government to guarantee for them their political independence—

as if political independence were an American hot dog to be served at will. Moral support through goodwill, economic collaboration, educational improvement, and industrialization are what Africans want from America. No nation gets independence as a prize from another country. The people concerned must demonstrate readiness, determination, and resoluteness as signs of a sense of responsibility and of national integrity. Such requisites do not come from the outside; they emanate from within, and then spread their pressure for recognition to the outside. At that stage the outside observers will be bound to accept the inevitable.

This point of view leads to some definite conclusions in regard to the policy of the United States government toward Africa. It provides a common ground between Africa and America on which the peoples of both areas must collaborate economically and culturally by breaking through the artificial walls built by European imperialism to keep them apart. It all means that new avenues of understanding, a new attitude toward their different cultural patterns, a new awakening relative to their common destiny must be stimulated. It is not an easy task because, in the first place, it means a relearning of a people—a repudiation of former "authorities" on Africa, and an entirely new quest based on the American traditions of open mindedness, unfettered expression, and scientific reality. It calls for the evaluation of African culture in the light of its own measurements, and not based entirely on the scale of other values and cultures. It also means that Africa must relearn America; understand her through her own peculiar institutions and traditional beliefs which, at the bottom, are beautiful and serene. There is no reason why this task cannot be accomplished, even against human inertia and provincialism.

It is a responsibility—a worthwhile task. The American government is aware of it and accepts the challenge. The Americans, as citizens of a free country, are equally awake. A few months ago it was reported that the Carnegie Foundation gave some thousands of dollars for the improvement of school libraries in Nigeria. Africa is ready for mutual friendship and independence. She preserves a peculiar love for America and her peoples with

their occasional childlike bounce mingled with high technical efficiency, her mass production and her democratic spirit. The blessings of nature in Africa await humanity just as the African peoples expect humanity to come to their aid in their effort to stamp out illiteracy, disease, technical inefficiency, and an undeveloped economic life.

As Africa looks at America, it becomes more and more difficult to forget or to overlook what made America: Why she is so great today culturally and commercially. Here is a nation made up of the legacies of all nations, races, and cultural patterns. The legal, political, and linguistic heritage of the Anglo-Saxon civilization; the intellectual legacy of the Dutch; the esthetic and utilitarian industriousness that was German; the liberal contribution of the Swedes; among other things, the cosmopolitan and philosophical spirit of the French; the imponderable attributes of the Spanish culture and its missionary spirit; the forest lore, the contributions to medicine and agriculture bequeathed by the Indians; the music-pattern and folk lore which the Africans brought with them—all made up a new nation—America. History has never recorded such a nation in the past. Here is a country—a subcontinent—where all the problems of human relations converge; a nation of wide contrasts and extreme contradictions.

The reason for this dynamism is in the fact that the *nation's intelligence is not trammeled.* America fanatically believes in a free access to knowledge, and she provides the avenues for individual development and for independent search for truth. A citizen once born knows that if the initiative lies within him, he may climb to any heights—from the obscure to the sublime. This is a new faith born out of dissatisfaction with the restraints of the old worlds—both European and African. It is a laudable reaction against the chains and restrictions that enveloped the human personality in the old social order. It is a democratic upheaval!

A new Africa must learn from American experience. The American nation was not born out of complacency and lazy dreams; it was born out of arduous work, patience, persistent effort, and indefatigable spirit—a spirit of unending dreams and

a will to power aiming at controlling nature and its resources; a soul to impose upon all known phenomena and to make all sources of energy subservient to human desires and designs; a resolution to live under a free government which alone can give individual personality a guarantee of its fullest development and fullest civil liberties. Now, the American nation has not yet succeeded in fulfilling all her social goals; her shortcomings are legion, but the sincerity of her struggle against inhumanities through her far-sighted citizens is beyond question. The evidences of her free will are indicated in a great many ways. A persistent attitude to cherish freedom has inflamed the passion of the nation's soul.

Such is America—a mixture of mixed peoples and mixed cultures, formerly living in a new world of isolation, expanding its boundaries and resources, has now come to a new stage of recrossing the ocean to join hands with older nations to build "One World"—one world with Europe, one world with Asia, one world with Africa. This new development has a peculiar significance for Africa, for although Africa is old, she is also young—very young today. Her development lies in one single factor—the development of human intelligence. America has demonstrated that crooked places can be made straight; that mountains can be penetrated either from above or from below; that forests can be turned into mansions; that any product, no matter how valuable or huge, can be subject to mass production; that man can fly through space, and spoken words travel across the seas. All these are the inevitable offspring of the peculiar character of a nation—America—the daughter of untrammeled intelligence.

CHAPTER XVI

The Rôle of the Negro in Post-War Africa

A GREAT many Negroes in America whom I have met have asked me, "Will they accept us as brothers if we ever come to Africa to visit your country?" In the same way, some Africans have always wondered how far the American Negroes would respond to the Africans and their problems. The plain fact is that Africans know nothing about the Negroes in America, and vice versa. The knowledge which both peoples have of each other is distorted and degrading, so that instead of attraction there developed repulsion.

But the barrier of ignorance is being broken down with the increase of the means of transportation and communication. Africa is no longer isolated from America as before. The result of this is that a number of responsible Africans are now studying in American universities, and at the same time are learning more and more about the American Negroes. Their presence is also a practical lesson to the Negroes here, who begin to realize that Africa and her people are not as the story tellers would have them depicted through the Hollywood picture producers, who manufacture an Africa of savages and cannibals while ignoring the higher qualities of African life which are well known to sincere observers. If the motion picture is an art in America, it has failed to present Africa realistically; but if it is a mere propaganda medium, then it has succeeded, so far as Africa is concerned, in making gangsters out of saints, barbarians out of citizens, monsters out of the beautiful, jungle-dwellers out of the home-bred, and naked men out of the well-clad.

A young Negro born in America is first forced into an inferior position by his background, because all the avenues of public education have unconsciously conspired against Africa. He knows

that the origin of the Negroes is in Africa, but where is Africa, and who are there? The moving picture, as I said, would answer that "Africa is in the jungle and the people who live in Africa are savages living among snakes and tigers and monkeys." The radio would rather say nothing at all about Africa, but where it is said, it conforms with the traditional idea. In the public schools, no African history is given. No American Negro high school student—in fact *no* American high school student—has ever heard of Prempeh, Shaka, Imhotep, or other great personalities that in African history are comparable to such Western leaders as Napoleon, George Washington, and Alfred the Great.

The fact is that "Africa" is not taught in American schools. It is amazing, because one-tenth of the American population is of African origin. Such a situation explains, in part, why Negroes seem to act indifferently when Africa is mentioned. A human being behaves according to the training that was given him. No one can blame anyone for not appreciating what he does not know. Therefore, I find no reason why African and American Negroes should continue to blame each other for this long isolation. The solution will lie in starting now to make amends.

First, a sense of pride must be stimulated in the Negro youth through educating him to understand that his forefathers in Africa were men and women of dignity and honor equal to any other peoples on earth; that the name "Africa" is great in history, and that those who happen to come from the countries there should be as proud as those who came to this country from England or Germany or China; that they all should live in equality and mutual self-respect.

Second, the Negro leaders must make it clear that the sooner this psychological inferiority is removed, the better for the whole group. Events have proven that the most successful Negroes in America have this pride of origin in their veins. Booker T. Washington, Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, Paul Robeson are among the greatest of all who think and breathe with the pride of their African origin, while at the same time retaining their fullest share of pride in being Americans. They have commanded the genuine

respect of white Americans. No white man will respect a Negro who tends to reveal shame of his African origin. Anybody who accepts being a Negro must accept that Negroes are originally from Africa, and that Africa has its own respectable culture. Any other reasoning is a sign of mental confusion.

Third, the Negro educators should see to it that African cultural, economic, and political history is popularized in schools. This should be true in all American colleges and universities. At present, Fisk University is leading in this experiment. The University of Pennsylvania is making a good beginning. Northwestern University, through the effort of Dr. M. J. Herskovits, is also making a great contribution.

If these three suggestions are followed, then the Negro as an American will be ready better to understand himself and to appreciate all the beauties and glories to which, as a man of African descent, he is an heir. He will become psychologically emancipated, historically elevated, and culturally removed from the idea that he is of barbaric origin. Then the Negro will understand the rôle his race has played since the dawn of history, and will appreciate that the "black man" is something romantic and beautiful; something that many men have sought to become in the past; something that has grown in splendor and then declined—just as other civilizations have done—but something that is resurging again in the name of the New Africa and the New Negro.

The African, too, has to change his misconceptions about the Negro in America. One great lesson for the African to learn from the Negro in America is that the African, no matter under what climate, culture, or diet—no matter by what name he is baptized—can grow and conquer his environment. George W. Williams, in his *History of the Negro Race in America*, so well described the ability of the Negro to stand up against odds. He wrote in reference to the Negro: "With the fountains of knowledge sealed by law against the thirstings of human souls for knowledge, the Negroes of America, nevertheless, have shown the most wonderful signs of recuperation, and the ability to rise against every cruel act of man and the very forces of nature, to a manhood and

intelligent citizenship that converts the cautious, impartial, and conservative spirit of history into eulogy!" Then he continued pertinently: "They have overcome the obstacles in the path of physical civilization of North America; they have earned billions of dollars for a profligate people; they have made good laborers, efficient sailors, and peerless soldiers. In three wars they have won the crown of heroes by steady, intrepid valor; and in peace have shown themselves the friends of stable government."

The progressive and evolutionary history of the American Negro commands the attention of every honest man everywhere in the world. If the Africans are misinformed and think that the American Negroes are lazy and degenerate and lack a sense of direction, let them be told that from 1866 to 1875 alone, Negroes produced seven Lieutenant-Governors of Southern States; that within the same time two Negroes served in the United States Senate, while thirteen served in the House of Representatives. From that time, up until the present, there have been many in such posts. Some have served as Foreign Ministers; others have become bankers, farmers, scientists, real estate men, writers, owners of the press, inventors, lawyers and judges; they have produced doctors of all types, educators and founders of schools, artists, pugilists, and world-famed sportsmen.

With this knowledge, the African must be proud of the American Negro as his offspring, just as the Negro must be proud of Africa as his origin.

Among the contemporary great Negroes may be mentioned Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, George Washington Carver, who died recently, Paul Robeson, Adam Clayton Powell, Marian Anderson, Richard Wright, C. C. Spaulding, A. Philip Randolph, and Mordecai Johnson.

Among the Negro leaders are some whose great contributions have not been fully recognized, either because of fate or circumstance, or because of a false standard of values as to what constitutes a great man. To me a great man is not measured by mere academic achievement or economic acquisition alone. I do not even reckon a generally accepted popularity among the populace

as a criterion of greatness. Greatness should be sought in all this, but it must be looked for also in obscure places and origins, in neglected paths and trades; it must be searched for in a man as a combination of qualities. It can be found in one who believes in his own destiny as a human being, who first accepts himself as he is, and then projects his personality into an integrated social unity. The quality of blending self-confidence and a spirit of universal service is rare among leaders who suffer from psychological confusion in relation to their beginning and end. I have noticed this difficulty among a great many American Negro leaders. While they have developed a high sense of social consciousness and have demonstrated a great ability to adapt methods to their own use, that rare sense of social destiny is occasionally lacking. And the only real cure for this lack is to apprehend the expanse of human destiny as a whole. Through proper education in historical perspective, a man can find the rôle of his race and clan and ancestors, and thereby evaluate his racial and personal contribution in the past, in the present, and in the future.

The Negro in America cannot succeed in doing this without first widening his social horizon and interesting himself in what happens in other parts of the world where black men live. Some knowledge of what takes place in South Africa may depress him, but in the same measure, the place of black men in places like Nigeria, the Gold Coast, Haiti, Liberia, and Sierra Leone may serve as an incentive to great vision in commercial, intellectual, and political progress.

I have personally talked to some Negroes who have considerable capital available for investment in international trade. Only very few have a proper notion as to what it actually implies in the long run. The war is on, the world is getting itself ready for peace—a peace with new business enterprises and connections. Most Negro leaders seem to be concerned only with Negro representation in the peace conference, forgetting that now is the time to get capital together for commercial enterprise soon after the war. That cannot be done automatically. Connections must be made now and friendships developed.

This statement is not a wholesale charge against Negro leaders. There are a good number of them who are conscious of these facts, and are determined to effect changes. Of those who have developed a broad view of the problem may be mentioned Alain Lock, L. D. Reddick, Ralph Baunch, Paul Robeson, A. J. Rodgers, George Schuyler, Langford Logan, and Augustine A. Austin. We realize that Mr. Austin, for example, has lived an exemplary and independent life economically—particularly when we become aware of the fact that he came to this country from Antigua as a lonely youth in 1903, and that by now he commands business enterprises with an income of over four hundred thousand dollars annually, and with capital and assessed properties totaling more than three million dollars.

He is a member of the Uptown Chamber of Commerce in New York City. He has founded and is president of such important economic institutions as the Antilean Holding Co., Inc., Augustine A. Austin, Inc., and Angrapa Tool Corporation.

I am not so much impressed with Mr. Austin's accumulation of wealth as I am concerned with his initiative and industriousness, his integrity and pride in his origin, his understanding of the fundamental problem of true freedom which comes only when one is able to provide for oneself without depending on others to provide for one. He is a true example of the combination of those attributes of manhood which illustrate my point of view. He is a West Indian by birth, an American by adoption, and an African by origin. He knows all these, he acknowledges all of them, and he is equally proud of them. He has a social vision which made him interested in the great social movements of Negro America and he has contributed, though always silently, to great causes and projects that promote individual welfare in his community. Such men of exemplary character—the chips off the old blocks of our ancestors—must be emulated by the growing youth.

Our point should be clear, then, that there is a great indication that the Negro in America is awakening from his psychological and social thralldom, and becoming a New Negro—one whose aim it is to belong to the world in which all peoples form the parts.

To belong to that world is to be in it. The principle of common sense dictates that conquerors originate from the areas of least resistance. The Negro, in jumping into the world, must start from the area of the least resistance—I mean in areas that will receive him with more friendliness and appreciation. That area is mainly in Africa. Now, I do not believe in any scheme to transport the Negroes, like hogs or criminals, into Africa merely because they originated in Africa. But I do suggest that the Negro ought to be equally as interested in African commerce and social reconstruction as are other Americans. Educated and trained Negroes could help in converting the African resources into useful purposes in our modern industrialism.

Dr. L. D. Reddick, in his article, "What the 'Brothers' Need to Know," published in *The African Interpreter*, special number of Summer 1943, Vol. 1, No. 4, p. 11, asked the following question: "What kind of quiz could Walter White or A. Philip Randolph or Channing Tobias or A. Clayton Powell or Congressman Dawson or Willard Townsend or Sam Solomon . . . pass on the present-day mass movements and leaders of Africa? Who among us is familiar with the goals and techniques of the West African National Congress, the All-African Convention, the Youth Movement of the Gold Coast, Sierra Leone, and Nigeria?"

After asking these questions, Dr. Reddick gave some practical suggestions for coöperation. He said that "the Negroes of this country, as elsewhere, must know, first, what the fight is about; and secondly, with what groups and programs coöperation is possible." The three "proposals" of Dr. Reddick are worthy of note:

1. The exchange of newspapers. Negro newspapers here should exchange with the *West African Pilot*, the *Bantu World*, the *South African Sun*, *Ohmeteli*, and others. In this way they could reprint from our newspapers and we from theirs. (The Schomburg Collection of the New York Public Library and other institutions already receive some of these African periodicals.)
2. Exchange of publications between such social action and cultural organizations as the National Association for the

Advancement of Colored People, The National Negro Congress, The March on Washington Movement, the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, and equivalent groups in Africa. Several brochures and booklets might be prepared for this very purpose.

3. Exchange of visitors. The splendid students who come over to attend American universities are exceedingly helpful, but we need to see some of the elder statesmen, scholars, and leaders. Also, we need to send over some of our scholars and artists and organization heads.

Dr. Charles Wesley, the President of Wilberforce University, is very much in favor of the Reddick proposals, and I have little doubt that every one would see their validity. When I was interviewed by the representative of the *People's Voice*, I was asked to list the practical ways in which I think understanding could be promoted. I gave suggestions similar to those of Dr. Reddick, but I added that there should be intermarriage. While the visitors are being exchanged, decent families ought to marry each other, for this will cement permanent interest and complete understanding. American families of European origin still often marry Europeans (even in royal families), and the same thing could be done among the New Africans and the New Negro.

We are at the rise of a new day. Roi Ottley would rather prophesy that "New World A-Coming," but his prophecy is already a reality. The space is shortened between Africa and America. The barriers of language are broken down by the introduction of the English language in Africa. Of course, I would suggest that American Negroes should learn some of the prominent African languages such as Yoruba, Ibo, Hausa, and Fanti—in fact I would suggest that these languages be taught in American schools generally.

Once a writer asked: "Can the Negro endure the sharp competition of American civilization? Can he keep his position against the tendencies to amalgamation?" The answer is obvious. The Negro has already endured the sharp competitive spirit of America of which he is a part. He can keep his position in the world

and in America without amalgamation, since it is a fact that the people who are not white constitute the majority of the world's population. There is no need for Negro America to demand amalgamation as a basis for equality.

George W. Williams, in his book, said that all that the Negro in America had to learn and hold fast to is that "Race prejudice is bound to give way before the potent influence of character, education, and wealth. And these are necessary to the growth of the race. Without wealth there can be no leisure, without leisure there can be no thought, and without thought there can be no progress. The future work of the Negro is twofold: subjective and objective. Years will be devoted to his own education and improvement here in America. He will sound the depths of education, accumulate wealth, and then turn his attention to the civilization of Africa . . . And Africa, in return, will send America indigo, palm oil, ivory, gold, diamonds, costly woods, and her richest treasures . . ." Then in Africa, he continued, "geography and science will enrich and enlarge their discoveries; and a telegraph cable binding the heart of Africa to the ear of the . . . world, every throb of joy or sorrow will pulsate again in millions of souls. In the interpretation of History the plans of God must be discerned. . . ." [1]

[1] George W. Williams, *History of the Negro Race in America*, G. P. Putnam & Sons, New York, 1885, p. 552.

SECTION VI—ZIKISM

CHAPTER XVII

Zikism—A Universal Philosophy

In the previous chapters, we have read something about Africa—its peoples and ideals. We have gone through what the African thinks about imperialism and racialism; we know by now what kind of democracy Africa wants, and what rôle America and the European nations will play in post-war Africa if they sincerely desire a permanent peace. After these short—but we hope comprehensive—surveys, we turn to the next section, dealing with the contemporary philosophy of the "New Africa."

This section we believe to be particularly important because it should lead to a definite understanding of the mind of the African today, and of his aspirations and of his determined beliefs. It attempts to portray the ideology which animates the mind of the new man in the Africa of this new age. No harm will be done by understanding and appreciating this new evolutionary philosophy, but a great mistake could be made if other peoples—particularly Western people—continue to look at African thinking as comparable to that of medieval Europe. That would be disastrous, because a refusal to acknowledge what really is never eliminates its existence. And any nation or nations entering into relationships with post-war Africa must reckon with this new African outlook towards the economic, social, religious, and political phases of life. This new, contemporary, African philosophy I have termed *zikism*.

Aggreyism

Before entering into an extended discussion of zikism some

background observation is necessary. We shall first examine aggreyism, the influence of which on the thought of some Africans was no less profound than that which zikism wields today. Although both influences are directly against one thing, we shall soon find out where their methods of approach differ. Let us understand from the beginning that there is an essential difference between zikism and aggreyism as patterns of thought, but the difference lies more in the time each of the ideas was born than in the essence of the ideas themselves.

The date-and-fact type of history alone cannot explain why Aggrey looked at things the way he did. Nor can we understand "Zik" by assuming that a great man is the basis for understanding the events of his time. Nor yet can these two types of social philosophy be explained solely by the mere social life of the African people either then or now. We do not believe either that evolution from aggreyism to zikism is altogether a result of natural causes influenced by climate, race, the country, or laws of supply and demand. The reasons are interlocked in these causes. But there is a main fact: aggreyism and zikism are the results of African thought. The personalities with which they are connected have little to do with the ideals which they represent. Kwegyir came before Nnamdi and served as a stepping-stone toward the attainment of the goal which zikism seeks today.

Zikism did not drop down from the sky upon the naked earth as did the "deus ex machina" onto the Greek stage. Rather it is an offspring of previous ideas and ideals. C. Delisle Burns, in his *Political Ideals*, once said: "If you want to understand the present in order to direct the future, you will have to grasp not only what great men did and how common men lived, but also what all men hoped for." He said this because he believed that, "We cannot understand the meaning of what actually happened unless one appreciates what men wanted to happen." The conclusion is true when we consider, as Burns did, that "there were many things which men in the past hoped to do and never did. That hope is an explanation of difference in what we now do, often because what our forefathers dreamed of has come true after

they have passed away. . . . The present was in the past as a hope, a longing, an ideal."

The above statement is very true of aggreyism and zikism. During the Aggrey memorial celebrations held at Salisbury, North Carolina, on Thursday, November 26, 1942, Mr. Kweku Atta Gardiner summarized "Aggrey's Africa" in the following words:

"The Africa which Aggrey saw, knew, and loved was divided into subject territories governed by colonial powers. . . . Yet Aggrey was proud of her. Aggrey's Africa was and still is suffering from economic exploitation. Africans were considered and treated as part of the coveted raw materials of the tropics. Aggrey knew all this. In Portuguese Angola he wrote, '. . . the first time in my life I smiled at my brother, and he smiled not back. He only stared—a solemn, appealing, questioning stare. I turned my face, tried hard to keep back the welling tear. I couldn't. And the voice rang in my ears, "Carest thou not that we perish?"' In the midst of all these experiences, he [Aggrey] preached human brotherhood and the love of God." What does this mean to us? It means that Aggrey saw a terrible Africa. He knew that the disparity between the mechanical development of the West and of the Africa of his time was too great. He understood that the masses in Africa were not yet awake to the movements of the world around them. Under such circumstances, in which he and a few other enlightened Africans formed a lone star, he developed a pacific philosophy. That was only natural, but did not indicate that Aggrey was a pacifist. He himself said many things which definitely disprove this. Both his African and foreign admirers and interpreters have in most cases misunderstood him. If anybody wants to understand Aggrey, he must seek him in his yearnings, his longings, his wishes—his ideals. One must understand that Aggrey was looking far beyond what he was supposed to have said. He was searching for something which was difficult for him to grasp: something that was always moving away from him as he approached the place where it seemed to be—the "New Africa." He was not oblivious to the fact that his own day was

that of the "Old Africa"—when his people were ignorant of modern scientific method and technology. There was no need for him to talk about a New Africa (except as an ideal) when the people were yet unbaptized in the Jordan of mental emancipation. The only philosophy which could work in Aggrey's day was a passive philosophy—a philosophy which laughs and smiles in the face of humiliation and indignity. He would have been a crazy man if he had adopted the positive philosophy which zikism adopts today—nearly two decades after aggreyism flourished. For instance, Aggrey said: "You can never beat prejudice by a frontal attack, because there is mere emotion at the root of it. Always flank it. You can catch more flies with molasses than with vinegar." Some contemporaries have carried this philosophy of molasses too far. By that they have developed a strange, lethargic, mental satisfaction expressed in complacency with which they regard the indignities that men suffer in Africa. They have taken this Aggrey idea to mean that political independence, economic security, and social progress will come to Africa by the magic of smiling, and of being "good" and reasonable men to their imperialistic masters. To these people who think themselves cautious, practical, and scientific, the difficulties involved in setting the potentiality of human nature in motion in African *Irredentism* seem prodigious. They have "scientifically" analyzed the obstacles in detail and the attempt seems illusory to them. They brand zikism the illusion of youth. But that was not what Aggrey meant. He was only living his own day, and had his eyes open to the times ahead of him when the dreams of his day would become real in Africa. With his eyes of vision Aggrey beheld and said: "There is a Youth Movement coming in Africa that some day may startle the world. This restlessness all over Africa stands for self-discovery and self-realization. It tells of power just breaking through. The great continent has been asleep for a long time. It is now waking up. . . . The Africa of twenty years ago is now gone and gone forever. There is a new Africa coming today and it is a challenge to civilization."

Zikism and all that it stands for was Aggrey's ideal. Zikism is

the philosophy of the youthful in mind. Aggrey predicted it because he wanted it to come. He worked for it. He knew that no nation could build itself anew while still compromising with every inhumanity that man placed on his fellow man. Aggrey said: "I sincerely hope that the time will not be far distant when, in matters that affect Africa, her sons and daughters will be represented in person." When he expressed this (something he knew could not happen in his time), Aggrey could not have meant (with his knowledge of history) that African political independence for which he hoped could be attained by smiling at imperialism. He certainly knew that no great movement for political freedom had realized its aims with smiles and courtesies. There must be sacrifices. For the Bastilles to fall in Africa, Aggrey knew that the iron gates would have to be broken with force to liberate the innocent men from prison. He agrees with Oswald Spengler who said that "*World history is the world court*, and it has ever decided in favor of the stronger, fuller, and more self-assured life." Hence, Aggrey said: "To those who have fire I give more fire, and to those who have might I want to give might mightier than man's." These are the very words of Kwegyir of the Gold Coast. He loved harmony, but he emphasized that harmony is possible only between two equals.

Aggrey developed the philosophy that the relationship between the lives of an African and a Western white man is comparable to the relationship between the white and black keys of a piano. He meant that each key must complement the other before musical harmony can be attained. But Aggrey did not imply that either the black or the white keys should be subordinate to the other. They have to complement each other. Some of Aggrey's interpreters would have Africa believe that Aggrey wanted Africans to remain servants to the European imperialists, so that the latter will not get angry, thus causing disharmony in race-relations. That is another erroneous interpretation of Aggrey. If disharmony should come because Africans do not any longer want to be mere servants and economic and political slaves of other human beings, I am sure that Aggrey, if alive today, would have

advocated such disharmony because that was what he hoped for —a day when the sons of Africa would be awake and carry out what he termed the "Youth Movement."

Zikism answers Aggrey's call. It is a youth movement which comes at an opportune moment when compromise on matters of imperialism in Africa is being discredited and discarded. Aggreyism hoped for the time to come. Zikism knows that the time has come. That is where aggreyism and zikism parted ways. One was hoping, the other is working on the reality of the hope itself.

Our danger is that some Africans do not understand nor appreciate the trend. They are still living in "Aggrey's Africa," thinking that they are living with Aggrey himself—looking for the living among the dead. These Africans fail hopelessly to distinguish between Aggrey as a man of timeless destiny, and "Aggrey's Africa" as a past, decadent phase of African evolutionary history. They will have to be reëducated to know that there is no difference between aggreyism and zikism, except that one was passive and idealistic and yet predicted the inevitable change to come, while the other looks outward, is positive; if you strike, it strikes back. It does not suffer indignity and inhumanity silently. Its ideology is to destroy man's inhumanity to man. It does not seek harmony where there is no social regeneration. It first asks for equality before asking for harmony. For where there is no recognition of human equality in social life, indulgence in the word "harmony" is a complete mental delusion. Night and day never did exist simultaneously at the same place within our human experience. So it is with harmony and inequality. Round things do not fit into square holes. Imperialism cannot exist side by side with human harmony—anywhere in the world. Before America and England could be harmonized, America had to revolt and gain her equality; then between equals there came harmony. Zikism seeks harmony but with its prerequisites: the stamping out of imperialism, racialism, illiteracy, and economic inequality in Africa. To overlook these fundamental things and talk about harmony is to reflect cowardice and political puerility.

Aggrey was a metaphysician in his own way, and we know

how difficult it is for one of that disposition to communicate his thoughts to others. Observers and interpreters of such a mind very often fail completely to grasp its construction of means and its conception of ends. Partiality and inadequacy, to say nothing about misdirection, mark the appraisal of such observers and interpreters. It was even so with Aggrey, who walked sometimes alone and talked like a pacifist because he found himself surrounded by ignorance and superstition and despondency and insecurity, by the blind, the willful, the desperate, and the scheming among men.

Aggrey has done his duty. He set the fire burning in the hearts of a few; he helped introduce education into Africa in a greater measure than any before him; he raised the eyes of the younger generation skyward, and left them gazing at the galaxy of human achievements of which Africa was also capable; he called upon them deliberately to dream dreams and to accept the challenge of facing fearful odds for the sake of mother Africa in the modern world.

Why Zikism?

We now turn from this introduction to the real subject of this chapter. The word "Zik" comes from the African name Azikiwe: Azi-eweka-iwe, or Azi-akalilika-n'iwe, or Azi-erika-n'iwe, any of which can be translated: "The Youth is overwhelmingly indignant," or "The New Age is full of revenge."

Nnamdi Azikiwe was born in the Ibo State of Nigeria, in 1904. His parents belong to the aristocratic class of Onitsha, and his father, who was a civil servant of the British Government in Nigeria, lived in different states of Nigeria. The boy Nnamdi thus had an early opportunity to study in various elementary and high schools of the country. He studied in Onitsha, Calabar, and Lagos, and as he moved from one city to the other, he precociously acquired a zeal for nationalism, so that before he was twenty years old he had become a "victim" of patriotic masochism. He chose to suffer exceptionally in order to gain the proper knowledge to help him formulate a new philosophy for the African.

He left the shores of Nigeria for his Western pilgrimage in 1924, twenty years after his birth, and studied in the United States of America for ten years. Before the completion of those ten years, he became an instructor of political science at Lincoln University in Pennsylvania. His major fields of study were anthropology, political science, and journalism.

While at Lincoln University, he wrote his first book, entitled *Liberia in World Politics*. Soon afterwards he returned to Accra, the Gold Coast, West Africa, in 1934, and there became editor-in-chief of the *African Morning Post*, a position he was still holding when he was charged with sedition by the British Government in the Gold Coast. He was first convicted and sentenced to six months' imprisonment, plus a fine, but was later completely acquitted by the supreme West African Court of Appeal.

In a large measure that charge of sedition against Azikiwe was a great asset to his personality and mission. The whole of the African world became acquainted with him, and they clearly saw in him those qualities which could make him "independent in all things and neutral in nothing affecting the destiny of Africa." [1]

In the meanwhile, he had published another book: *Renascent Africa*. This book became the Bible of West African youth. He returned to Nigeria in 1937 and established the Zik's Press, gaining within a short time unprecedented popularity in the nation. His *West African Pilot* became the daily oracle of Nigerian youth. He put the charm of his magnetic personality into his own column: "Inside Stuff."

Azikiwe is slender, straight, tall, wiry, and athletic both in build and by disposition. The elasticity of his carriage is graceful. In America he played soccer and tennis, swam, and became a well-known collegiate long-distance runner; back home in Africa he took up his tennis again and made good progress in this game, although he never attained championship caliber. Though business-like and serious most of the time, he is nevertheless full of fun and his laugh is captivating. Azikiwe neither smokes nor drinks, and has few close personal friends, choosing rather to be a

[1] His motto for the *African Morning Post*.

friend of all. He has scarcely any time to spend in leisure. He is sometimes very belligerent in disposition, even to the point of cruelty. But he is reasonable, changes from harshness to extreme consideration because of his reason, and can repent like a child.

Among the character traits of Nnamdi Azikiwe is his messianic complex. He moves and lives in a world of vision and mission. He cannot talk or act without an appeal to his *raison d'être*. He is stubborn and tenacious, and loves physical combat almost as well as he loves mental gymnastics. He is intellectually proud and often intolerant of other people's views, especially those that contradict, in his view, the destiny of the New Africa he believes must come.

I have mentioned that there is a kind of cruelty in his character. He is also somewhat ruthless. He has a complex of inflexible inner egoism, but this he carefully hides behind the screen of his unmatchable shrewdness. He is suspicious and calculating. He may forgive, but he never forgets. He has a very strong sense of duty, and is impatient with the lazy and the ignorant.

He is a citizen of the world, and is forever denouncing "man's inhumanity to man." He is sharply opposed to the philosophy of indulgence. He does not want any indulgence and is apparently indifferent to praise. He considers coöperation as the best instrument in human relations. He has confidence in man, but realizes that man is weak and rarely even approaches perfection. Thus he allows much latitude for human weakness, and does not condemn, though he often judges harshly at first sight. He is scientific, but believes in basic African institutions, some of which the world categorizes as mere superstition.

Another characteristic of Nnamdi Azikiwe is his hatred for the flamboyant demonstration of wealth. He makes shrewd use of money himself, and challenges Nigerian kings who forget their public duty while trying to dress and act extravagantly. He indicts those African financial magnates who worship wealth and forget philanthropy. He is communalistic, and will not hesitate to share his plate of dinner with a friend. I remember once how he promptly shared his breakfast with me, explaining later that he

thought it would be much better that way than to have me wait until another was prepared. I had arrived during the night, and he had not been aware of this until he sat down to his own meal.

Another characteristic of Azikiwe is his unusual spiritual experience. "Zik" is a young man and yet deeply sensitive to spiritual things. He is a Christian in that he accepts Christ's ideal, but he realizes that not all Christian principles can be rationally applied to the problem of African redemption. Experience seems to convince him that man respects only the strong; that there is no place for the meek in twentieth-century aggressive philosophy; that Africa cannot be saved by turning the other cheek. This is where he disagrees with "Aggrey of Africa." He disagrees with the philosophy of patronage. Zik does not believe that Africa can develop simply by depending on Europeans. It is Africans that will develop Africa, coöperating on equal terms with Europeans.

Nnamdi is erudite, and can use his erudition in his peculiarly charming way to keep a crowd spellbound. The audience before him is at his mercy. He can stir them to violent action just by his words. He can make them shed tears. He can make them feel self-condemned, or disperse them feeling a great pride in themselves. That is Zik, and therein lies his power.

These qualities in Zik made him a demi-god to the renascent African. In fact, Onyenkuzi, one of my brothers, once asked me whether I did not think Zik was a god born in the wilds of Zungeru who came in the form of a child into the womb of an Onitsha woman! I laughed because I had been close enough to Zik to know that, although he has remarkable qualities and gifts, he is just a human being who happens to be a true African by birth and breeding. He has a mission in life. He has a destiny. He must conquer. But he is a man, and has his times of difficulties and his human limitations. But he is always confident of himself. He is never apologetic in any situation. He is independent.

Nnamdi Azikiwe, through his erudition and vision, through his self-confidence and independence, has become a leader in Africa in this century. He is a leader because he is capable of

bringing the vague trends of other minds and spirits to a focus. In Africa, there were among the masses certain undefined thoughts looking toward a new life. Azikiwe gave form and expression to this vagueness by enunciating his philosophy of a New Africa. Nnamdi did not return from America with foreign ideas; rather, America drew out of him the true character of an African which he so unreservedly exerts on the minds of his fellow men. He is not apart from Africa. Africans are already longing for a "New Africa," and Zik is to them the embodiment of that idea. He is an interpreter of the people and not of himself, but he defines with precision those aspirations which otherwise might remain undefined. The import of his startling message confounds the senses of reactionary Africans who fail to read the signs of the time.

This man, therefore, is unmistakably the embodiment of a new thought—the propounder of a New African philosophy. That is why the author has chosen the word "zikism" to represent the New Philosophy of the New Africa he has in mind. The author is but little concerned with the personality involved. He is rather interested in the ideas and ideals involved in this new way of life in Africa. Even Mr. Azikiwe himself does not know the full implication of the word "zikism" as the author uses it. I should not be surprised if he even disagrees with some of the interpretations I shall give to "zikism" as a new philosophy of life.

Africa has in the past despised her own. But today is a new day, and one of the signs of national growth is the increasing prestige of her national heroes, regardless of their origin and position in life. We do not have to believe *in toto* with a leader in order to follow him. All members of the Indian National Congress do not necessarily agree with Gandhi's philosophy of nonviolent resistance, but they acknowledge and follow him, because, despite their minor differences, they have one goal in common, and Gandhi has finally pointed out to India the necessity for a line of complete unanimity. Azikiwe will do the same for Africa. He is the man whose opinion counts most in Nigeria today. The youth of West Africa look upon him as the

African Gandhi. The merchants rally around him; the school teachers talk in his language; the farmers pray for him; civil servants draw inspiration from his words; musicians echo his name; sportsmen have "zikified" themselves, and the rulers are on his side. A man of the people, this expansive creator of the new is a *renascent African*, a Joshua to whom Heaven has given the staff to lead the youth into the Promised Land of the New Africa, where the ideal of man's humanity to man shall guide human activity.

What Zikism Is Not

Zikism is not just a list of the ideas of Mr. Nnamdi Azikiwe. Azikiwe himself does not actually know what zikism embraces in the mind of the author. His unawareness of the content of zikism as a philosophy was manifested when he published (in the *West African Pilot*) an article that I sent to him in 1941, in which zikism was very briefly treated. Mr. Azikiwe mistakenly entitled that article "A Social Philosophy Interpreted." As we go along, we shall see that zikism is far more than a social philosophy.

Zikism is not a sectional philosophy. It is not only a Nigerian philosophy. It is not only a West African philosophy. It transcends all of these territorial barriers.

Zikism is not nationalism. It is a way of life which may direct the trend of nationalism.

Zikism is neither an old nor a new philosophy. It is both old and new. It is then and now, and it dwells in the future.

Zikism is not a revenge philosophy. It is not a program directed against any race, creed, government, or country, but is universal in scope and intention.

Zikism is not a list of dogmatic principles which are changeless. It does not claim completeness and finality.

Zikism is not a philosophy of the physically young. It does not look at physical age. It is concerned with the age of the mind. If a man is young in body but old in mind, Zikism is not for him. Conversely, if a man is one hundred years old and yet young in mind, this gospel belongs to him.

The "New Africa" has brought with it new ideas. These new ideas are, in part, the results of the impact of Westernization upon Africa. Terrified and encouraged, praised and abused, defended and condemned, relegated to the category of "primitivism" and lauded as the seat of civilization, Africa finds herself, in the galvanizing shock of favor and hate, confused. Nobody understands her. Nobody lets her alone. Nobody cares for her. Nobody spares her. She becomes the "melon" for all the world. She gives and gives of herself until her sanity is questioned by those who receive.

Out of this confused medley of ideologies have emerged some bright constellations of ideals illuminating the millions of yearning hearts in Africa. Among the purveyors of these ideals are those who believe "that the indigenous, black Africans are not destined to accept the old idea of imperialism as revealed when handed down to Moses on Mount Sinai; that the twentieth-century African is bound to be renascent, and that this renascent African must be reckoned with as a concrescent factor in the peace of the world." [2] They believe that the world is yet to awake from the ills of greed and insatiety. They believe in the universal brotherhood of man and the universal fatherhood of God.

Unlike the Africans of yesterday, the New Africans of today have resolved to appear in the "limelight" of the major events of the world. They stand ready to labor and to die for Africa and for internationalism. They strive to make Africa understood among the nations of free men and women. They feel responsible for giving the right interpretation of the African mind. They have undertaken to represent the true Africa, and are determined to reëducate the youth of the New Africa.

The causes of men's actions are as varied as they are innumerable. Some men are motivated by the love of power or the desire for preëminence and glory; some are moved by the quest for

[2] Nnamdi Azikiwe, *Renascent Africa*, p. 7.

economic oligarchy; others are forced by the instinct of self-preservation into tasks that they otherwise would have disregarded. Still others respond to animalistic tendencies to aggression and destruction which have their foundations in what we call "jealousy" and "envy." Among this class of men are those who are willing to sell their own country and humanity for a mess of pottage.

For example, after the Spanish Revolution of 1868, in which Queen Isabella, a Bourbon sovereign, was expelled, the crown was offered to Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, a distant relative of the King of Prussia. Excitement prevailed among the French people, which resulted in the provocative meddling of the obstinate Duke of Gramont, who was at that time the French foreign minister. He presented himself before King William at Ems, impertinently demanding that the King promise not to permit Leopold to accept his candidature to the throne of Spain. This demand was categorically refused by King William, who sent a telegram concerning the incident to Otto von Bismarck at Berlin.

Bismarck used this Ems telegram to provoke the people of France, as well as those of Germany, in order to effect his aggressive designs and intrigues with a view to creating a unified Germany under the leadership of Prussia. "Though his 'editing' can hardly be called a falsification, it was a conscious act of provocation intended as a counterblast to Gramont's impertinent demand. The effect in Paris of this Ems message was electric. Press and public declared that French honor had been sullied and the government, carried off its feet, rushed into war (July 16)," [8] 1870. The resulting advantages of the war aroused by the Ems telegram went to Prussia at the expense of France.

Pericles of Athens, in order to satisfy the desires of a prostitute, devastated the city of the Samnians at the expense of the blood and treasure of the Athenians. Again, Cardinal Wolsey, the Prime Minister of King Henry VIII, to satisfy Emperor Charles V, dragged England into war with France. This he did without

[8] Ferdinand Schevill, *A History of Europe from the Reformation to the Present Day*, Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1938, p. 523.

any appeal to reason or to national policy, and to the hazard of his own country. And in our times the late Neville Chamberlain, better known as Chancellor of the Exchequer than as Prime Minister, in order, among other factors, to perpetuate the something-for-nothing psychology, sacrificed the independence of Czechoslovakia, at Munich, only to find himself an embarrassed politician, not only in his own country but in the whole world of free men and women.

Such are not the ideas of the leaders of the New Africa. Their readiness to express their mind today cannot be associated with any desire to stimulate Africa to her own hazard or to the hazard of any other country. They are not prompted by personal aggrandizement. There is not an atom of vested interest in their moves. Theirs is not a creation of bitterness; it is not designed as a foundation for an edifice of occult nationalism; it is not camouflaging a desire to overthrow any other form of government; it is not a wish to impose their own policy or culture upon others without consent; they are not aiming at policing the world at the expense of the freedom of man. If Africa is interested in the affairs of others, it is only in so far as those affairs affect the collective security of the world in general, and within this generality the New Africans are deeply and seriously concerned only with the affairs of Africa.

But owing to the interdependence of our world, it is time for Africa to start her mission of goodwill—a peaceful mission to Europe and other war-victimized nations, the African mission to the world appealing for collective security, international brotherhood, respect for others, recognition of the rights of others, the denunciation of war, exploitation, and injustice, and the praise of peace. This mission is embodied in the philosophy of the New Africa—*zikism*. This philosophy must be analyzed, synthesized, and utilized.

Zikism embraces the *economic*, *social*, *religious*, and *political* aspects of life. It seeks to employ the broadest rules applicable to all those phases of life, as far as they can promote international understanding between Africa and the rest of the world, and bring home to us collective security and enduring peace.

CHAPTER XVIII

Zikism—A Social Faith

Zikism is more than a political, religious, or economic Philosophy. *It is a perpetual social faith.*

THE PRESENT WORLD is confronted with the consuming flames of human barbarity. Practically all European countries have been made subservient to the designs of totalitarian cruelty. Their fate is suspended in the hands of an implacable enemy of freedom. They are all bewildered and overwhelmed by the tide of popular tyranny, and as their sorrows are aggravated, they seem powerless to flee or resist. In Africa, the soul of man is chained by the strongly fabricated rope of *total* imperialism. All the venomous callousness of which finance capitalism is capable has been given unbridled expression in Africa, where the power of popular resistance is momentarily buried under the rock of human ignorance and complacency. In Asia, the fury of European and Japanese imperialism is no less manifest. Saints and patriots have been chained in prison. In no age, therefore, has the demonstration of grief and mourning been so extensive as we find it today in all communities of men. Even in the countries which we consider comparatively safe, such as the United States, the far-seeing citizens recognize the odium of fate by which democracy is being tested. Those countries themselves which we designate as totalitarian find themselves in the hot waters of social and economic wreckage. There is no peace anywhere. The world is sick. This is not a pessimist's view; rather we are looking at things as they are. To attribute this confusion "wholly to the evil designs of evil men is to accept a superficial diagnosis of the malady that afflicts mankind today." All the present actors in the theatre of world events, be they in Tokyo, Washington, or Addis Ababa,

are the products of the age. In most cases the men are of little importance in the making of conditions as they are. Most of them are a part and parcel of the age itself. The time creates the men; men do not create the time.

In my opinion the bases of the chaotic situation all over the world may be traced everywhere to social maladjustments, and to the disposition of the human mind relative to man-to-man relations, both nationally and internationally.

In all human communities today there seems to be developing a pattern of consistent, though unrecognized, warfare between the old order and the new. The conflict between the old and the new is not a new phenomenon; nor is it new for human nature to be slower than are the forces of change. The gradual but irrepressible growth of new social forces in human society dislocates the joints of the old forces. But the discomforts of the declining process of the old forces are often precipitated by the persistent intrusion of the new forces. With man's limited view, he often fails miserably to see beyond the immediate social horizon. We fear our own images as they are reflected in the mirror of the newer factors of nature when those are introduced into our human experience. Of all the results of such confused social forces, the most outstanding is the loss of a consistent, social ideology or *social myth*.

What is meant here by social myth? By social myth is meant a collective conviction of a people which anathemizes the social evils of their times, while clinging unfalteringly to a definite program which conforms to their moral principles and ethical norms as those, in turn, relate to their material and spiritual yearnings. It is a group decision not to be neutral in matters affecting social destiny; a belief that the voice of the people is the will of God; a resignation to a cause; a will to die in the defense of a choice. It means a definition of means and end, and a determination to attain a particular end by a particular means.

Like George Sorel, I believe that human society must have an all-embracing myth that can arouse whole communities of men into action. A myth leads men to gird on their harness for a com-

bat which will destroy all evils existing in the present order of things. Such a myth, when strongly rooted in a people, strengthens their faith "that men who are participating in a great social movement always picture their coming action as a battle in which their cause is certain to triumph." Note this last phrase: "their cause is certain to triumph." A myth, not being a scientific proposition, does not interest itself in detailed rational programs. Failure does not prove it wrong or right. The believers are in a realm beyond refutation. A myth can prepare men to combat and destroy the intolerables of the present, but it cannot direct them to ideals as utopian programs do. A myth is not an arbitrary and rash theory; nor is it a description of things; rather it is the expression of a determination to act; it is not a matter of true or false precision; it is a conviction, a belief, not always analyzable or refutable. It is not arbitrary, because as a myth it must be capable of holding the human imagination and of arousing deep convictions in a social group. We must not mistake this, however, for a utopian program.

Unlike George Sorel's, however, the kind of myth I am thinking of need not be catastrophic or violent. It need not be a party program of any particular class directed against another class within a given community. I am thinking of a myth that serves to bring a community of men together, and so reducing the yearnings of all nations, races, and classes to a common denominator. Zikism, as we already know, seeks a universal equilibrium in all things. Its aim is to develop theories which in practice can be applied universally. Its social philosophy cannot therefore contain elements of particularism. Social zikism must be a social program: one that has no intention of turning Africa into a social mischief-maker in the community of human beings. Rather its aim must be to direct the energies of our social efforts toward the solution of the real problems which each people face in their different environments.

The discipline of zikist social philosophy is the discipline of free men. In forming the purposes of a social myth in Africa, and in coördinating the human energies necessary for the realization

of those purposes, every man must be made responsible. No class—kings, nobles, intelligentsia, workers, or the like—is to impose its particular philosophy upon the others. We must develop a social myth in Africa which will attract all groups because all will be benefited thereby. Our myth must create tranquillity and happiness in Africa, so that other people from abroad may be attracted. It should not be a utopian movement crying, "liberty, freedom, democracy," without first preparing the conditions which give birth to these things. We must not expect effects from verbal expressions. Any accomplishment has its cause somewhere. Not only should we guard against fanaticism induced by verbal expressions, but we should also be vigilant in curbing those intellectual zealots who seek democracy only in form. Social or political democracy does not lie in its form. I agree with James Lowell when he said that democracy is "that form of society, no matter its political classification, *monarchial, presidential, or cabinet*,[1] in which every man had a chance and knew that he had it."

We are seeking a free society, but *freedom* must be defined, even if inadequately, and I know of no better way of defining freedom than to agree with John Locke that "Freedom of men under government is to have a standing rule to live by, common to everyone of that society, and made by legislative power vested in it; a liberty to follow my own will in all things, when the rule prescribes it not, and not to be subject to the inconstant . . . arbitrary will of another man."

We are seeking a zikist society which by and large will be synonymous with democratic society. But Africa must avoid some misconceptions of democracy. Among the intelligentsia in Africa today some believe that democracy means: (1) a contempt for African political institutions; (2) a complete absence of ostentation—particularly on the part of those who happen to be wealthy or to be persons of distinguished ancestry; (3) a society without formalities in which everyone is treated by everyone else as a family member, "slapping him on the back,

[1] Italics mine.

addressing him by his first name, and inquiring into his intricate personal life"; (4) a society where the individual may do what he pleases, renouncing all social obligations to African tradition, treating the concerns of others and the laws of the African states with contempt; and (5) a society in which voting is the right of everybody and anybody is qualified to hold any kind of office. Some of these views concerning some superficial knowledge of democracy were shared by the "Educational Policy Commission" in their *Education for Free Men in American Democracy*.

Zikism, therefore, while it can be identified with social democracy, seeks to differentiate between genuine and biased views of that system. Misconceptions of democracy must be avoided by zikism.

There is one social myth upon which zikism should grow and spread its branches. That myth is *African Irredentism.* What does that mean? How can it be applied universally? Shall *African Irredentism* turn into *Africa expansione* as *Italia irredenta* turned into *Italia expansione* at the beginning of the nineteenth century? No. *African Irredentism* must mean the redemption of Africa from social wreckage, political servitude, and economic impotency; it must also mean extricating Africa from ideological confusion, psychological immaturity, spiritual complacency, and mental stagnation. It must mean development of a new literature by Africans to interpret African culture realistically to other peoples. The effective way to accomplish this is by finding out what forces brought about the present undesirable conditions. Some of the major causes may be listed as follows: (1) the gradual diffusion of western civilization and the consequent imposition of some new ways of life upon the peoples of Africa; (2) the unpreparedness of Africans in the last few decades to accept the challenge of the modern technological changes brought to them; (3) the tendency of the European nations to take full advantage of the unpreparedness of the Africans, and thereby to perpetuate the conditions which are favorable to their continued leadership and exploitation; and (4) the failure of Africans themselves to unite for common action within their re-

spective countries. These are broad, general statements. There are other and secondary reasons responsible for the fate of Africa today.

African Irredentism is the myth under which these conditions listed above can be eradicated. It can be done by loyalties which will express themselves in (1) social discipline, (2) zikist education, (3) self-knowledge, and (4) free government.

For Africa to survive and contribute to the human culture of a future age, zikist philosophy must rediscover our own indispensable loyalties, scrutinize, refashion, and cultivate them in children, youth, and the aged. This may sound dogmatic, but it is not, for only by doing so can our psychological immaturity be remedied, and African youth be prepared for basic social inventions.

As a universal philosophy, zikism seeks the loyalty of the African in things African, just as Europeans, Americans, and Asiatics urge their peoples to be loyal to their own institutions. Every community recognizes that loyalty is indispensable for its survival. The Americans recognized it when they said that, "The continued existence of any society depends on the presence among its members of common and appropriate loyalties," and that "If these loyalties are not deep and abiding, a society is certain to lack cohesion and integrity. If they decay and disintegrate, society itself decays and disintegrates."

African Irredentism will be unattainable without a rediscovery of African loyalties in African society. All great movements in the past have been accomplished only by those who were loyal to a certain cause in life. That was true of the French Revolution, the American War of Independence, the signing of the Magna Charta, and the Indian Revolution under Gandhi. All religious movements and their eventual successes were due to the loyalties aroused in the people. People must love their cause. They must believe in it implicitly. They must be ready to die for it. The strongest objects of loyalty have always been in the form of a myth. Any American is ready to die in order to defend his "free-

dom" and "liberty." These words are mythical—not concisely definable nor scientifically ponderable.

Great loyalties will make the zikist cause formidable and heroic, if inspired and sustained by the idea of *African Irredentism.* There will be neither vengeance nor brutality, but rather *service* and *sacrifice*. The African mind must be educated to understand that we live in "one world," where, as Pearl Buck would say, we have to fight for principles of universal application and not just for those rights which would benefit us at the expense of others. It must be clear then that the *African Irredentism* which would conform with the zikist outlook does not include racial, national, or class antagonism. It may resist anything that tends to retard the growth of a broad human spirit in the African youth, but it is not intended to fight against any particular people for the sake of combat itself, or for the sake of unfounded beliefs based on traditional prejudices. In this struggle to generate the human mind for a new life in Africa, we beckon to generous minds everywhere, particularly in democratic nations. I believe that there are still living in our world everywhere men and women whose minds are limitlessly capable of generous work, whose hearts beat with sympathy at the cry of the oppressed and dejected, whose eyes look with pity at the agony of the suffering and the forgotten. I mean those who do not mistake coöperation for paternalism. Those are the allies of the zikist philosophy in all its universal principles. Those are the people to understand and appreciate the need for the *African Irredentism* which is the surest way of making Africa useful to itself and to the world in general.

First, above all loyalties, the African must learn to appreciate his culture—political, social, philosophical, and religious. By this I am not suggesting a back-to-antiquity reaction. I mean that no people can understand the bases of their present behavior without recalling their cultural background and making the most of its best, while rejecting the bad aspects of it by substituting for those better ways, ways compatible with the ever-changing social horizon. Secondly, the African must be loyal to his manhood.

There is something deep and unfamiliar about human personality. Once it is ill-handled or ill-adapted the whole structure of man goes to pieces, while he moves around his daily life like a ghost of the dead. When the individuals in a nation suffer from this disease of ill-directed manhood, the whole people are lost. The African, therefore, must develop a feeling of adequacy, competence, capability, freedom, and security in order to preserve those intangible ingredients that stabilize a wholesome manhood. He must strive to get out of life the materials that enrich the intellectual, moral, and physical aspects of personality, and accept himself as a responsible and worthy member of a society of equals. He must reject all teachings, categories, and measurements that tend to falsify his individual capacity or pretend to put him in a definite quantitative relation to other human beings. He must exhaust all avenues toward a creative quest, making an endless endeavor to unfold his abilities. Through constant self-discipline, the African can invoke a consistent sense of self-respect, dignity, and personal integrity to form part and parcel of his loyalty to his manhood. He should be considerate, but not complacent or unduly passive; and, above all, he should learn to direct all the energies of his manhood to social purposes—to the service of his fellow men, with malice toward none—knowing no enemies except those who oppose the universal principles of human equality and brotherhood.

Second, the African, the zikist social philosophy insists, must be loyal to his fellow Africans—their heroes and heroines. This means that the African must be ready to accept the long-neglected principle of true leadership. It will be the function of a developed manhood to appreciate the talent, training, character, and excellence of gifted individuals in African society. We have already emphasized the need for the principles of human equality which limits itself to the axiom that every man is entitled to equal opportunities for growth and for the development of his innate capacities. But that does not bring us to the conclusion that Thomas Jefferson was wrong when he said that there is in every society what he called a "natural aristocracy of virtue and talent."

Every personality is unique, and some persons are better than others in different fields. There is no reason why we should suppose that all Africans are capable of being effective journalists or prominent administrators or capable mechanics. It is a part of our duty in the development of African manhood to discover the talents of individuals, and direct their energy to useful purposes. The essential thing is to see that a sense of values and of dignity is manifest in all kinds of useful labor for social progress.

Third, manhood is without charm if it has no moral content. The African must develop a sense of loyalty to the idea that good has supremacy over evil. By goodness we do not mean merely the abstract aspect of the concept, but all the concrete, day-to-day, common good. Zikism is very much attracted to industrialism in Africa, but one of the cardinal inconveniences of industrial society is the propensity of the people to neglect the general welfare. The society tends to individualize everybody, and none cares for others except in terms of contractual relations involving the giving and taking of money on a work-ratio basis. But the paradox lies in the fact that the nature of industrial society itself is such that interdependence and co-operation are more important and inevitable than they are in a self-sufficient, agrarian society. African manhood should be made more attractive by the building up of personalities that are less individualistic, only moderately egotistic, socially coöperative, and broadly patriotic. This involves the early training of the child to appreciate what is socially good and useful, and to resist the tempting but disintegrating forces of the industrial community. The original African sense of family loyalty and tribal affinity and coöperation must not be lost in the whirlwind of aggressive competition under a capitalistic regime. The competitive impulse should be encouraged so far as it promotes the spirit of the individual to discover himself, but it must not aim at cut-throat competition which ignores all social values except the amassing of wealth. When man loses all sense of "we" and thinks in terms of what "I" can get for myself alone, the precious aspect of human personality is lost, and manhood loses its charm.

Finally, zikist manhood must be loyal to his duty to get an education. We may be loyal to a myth, to a common good, to our leader, and all that, but unless our intelligence is trained so that we be capable of evaluating things—knowing that big things are big and small things small, our devotion may develop into a sort of bigotry or fanaticism with all their evils.

The right to have an education is therefore one of the most indispensable foundation rocks of zikist loyalty. We have said that zikist society is a society of free citizens, and to remain free one must have the knowledge that will guide one's footsteps in the path of life. No point is more important in zikist society than this question of the right to have knowledge. It has no substitute. It is a *must*. Responsible persons in the community have no excuse to leave African youth without education; for an organized education to develop other aspects of zikist loyalties is inescapable. The school itself has the key to all the doors opening into the realm of effective growth to true manhood. It is only in the process of learning that the teacher has the chance of developing those loyalties in the African child before he becomes a man.

This brings up the question: who will be the zikist teacher? What kind of teacher does the African need to uphold his manhood? This is very vital, since the teacher is the fountain from which the required knowledge will flow. The method used by the teacher, his daily exemplary life, his attitude toward society and the children themselves, his firmness and the direction of his loyalties, have a great deal to reflect upon a growing child.

The teacher must be excellent himself, both as a technician and a personality. He must understand both his object and the subject. But that is not enough. He must be loyal to African culture and understand African character and mentality. He must reflect his convictions, for which he should be prepared to fight. Any evidence of timidity in the presence of "Sir Big Tom" or "Mr. Authority" will disqualify him as a teacher and molder of African manhood, and as a reviver of our legitimate loyalties. His mind must be trained to approach problems with scientific

detachment and with a creative impulse without fear; otherwise a new generation of free men will never grow in the new Africa

The teacher must be capable of defining the intellectual bases of the zikist loyalties as precisely and distinctly as possible. A child growing into manhood must be made to understand the bases of his faith in life. It must be clear to him, as contrasted with other ways of living, or else he will become a mere slave to a social dogma which he does not understand nor be able, if left alone, to transmit to others. We must not build a dictatorship regime to instruct children distorted theories that respect no other. We do not mean to warp the mentality of the African youth in an atmosphere of hate, pride, and arrogance. We mean to train African youth to respect himself and his culture, and also to appreciate others and their cultures.

African Irredentism will rest on the rock of knowledge through organized education: a knowledge of the universe and the immediate physical environment is necessary, as are comparative studies of cultures, world history—political, economic, and social—in their relation to each other and their relation to Africa. Special emphasis will be given to African history as a prerequisite to the study of the history of other peoples. The interpretative history of European imperialism and totalitarianism and their systematic decay in a free world should form an essential part of the African school curricula. The students will be taught not to antagonize but rather to learn the lesson of how man has struggled to curb freedom—only to learn, at last, that though sometimes a lie has a long start, in the end truth prevails. This may confirm their loyalties to the belief that good has supremacy over evil, and thus eliminate any tendency to *Africa expansione* in the future.

The African lives in a great age, pregnant with human achievements. To be a citizen of the world he has the right to know about all great minds—scientists, artists, philosophers, visionaries, and religious leaders. He has to trace the course of the struggle for freedom of thought and action; he has to understand how men have struggled and died in order that all people—all races,

nations, and religious sects—may live as brothers. He is entitled to know what is democracy, communism, fascism, socialism, nihilism, anarchism, triple demism, Satyagrahaism; he has a right to know what religious and educational teachers had to say and what prompted them. He can then make a contrast between all these "isms" and zikism, which is the contemporary philosophy stemming out of African character and experience. He can then feel competent to add more to zikism or to subtract from it, depending on his intellectual propensities and his environmental adjustments.

Such a broad approach to education carries with it the implication that individuals must be trained to be independent, purposeful, critical, attractive, and able to coöperate with others in building a new and healthy society.

But all of this education will be practically useless, if the trained youth has no guarantee of work. That makes it necessary that in closing the discussion of the right to education for us to mention that the right to work is parallel with the right to develop the intelligence. There can be no mental capacity without physical growth, and an independent manhood implies a release from anxiety over security. You cannot stand by a conviction while the stomach is empty. A youth studying in school cannot quite develop free tendencies, if he has no hope that a job is his right rather than a prize for "obedience" to a master. The African student while in school must not be intimidated and grow into a coward—a person who cannot say or act in his own way because he might lose his job. Let me illustrate this point. When this second World War broke out, the British Government in Nigeria closed Yaba and Umuahia Colleges—the only semi-advanced government-supported institutions in Nigeria. A few of the boys from Yaba had to go to Achimota College in the Gold Coast to finish their education. While they were there, the Achimota College authorities dismissed one of them on charges of bad conduct. One of the charges against him was that he wore his hat at an angle, and went about with a walking stick. Another was that he was once late at breakfast. The other charges were similar.

The whole of the Nigerian student body in Achimota College felt that it was an injustice to the student, and decided to return to Nigeria with the dismissed boy. The only reason why this admirable plan failed was that the British Governor in Nigeria, who holds all of the Civil Service jobs in his hands, told these students that if they returned to Nigeria—their own country—he would give them no jobs. This, of course, is contrary to that for which zikist education is striving. In the first place, students must not be trained to fit only into those Civil Service jobs which belong to an imperialistic structure. Second, job getting must be based on the ability of the individual and not on the whims of a dictator.

The existence of this kind of threat justifies the emphasis which we have given to the fact that African education must produce a complete personality. The gulf between intellectual and manual activity must be bridged. A child must be taught the nature of productive industry as a necessary counterpart to his intellectual development. An African child must be brought into close contact with African industries in the first place, and he must know from the beginning the rôle of industry in a dynamic society. Africans also must accept the challenge and build factories, and develop industries to employ their own children when they are ready to assume the position of responsibility. This will enable our teachers to be bold and objective, and will encourage the new generation to dispense with fears and threats of imperialistic masters.

All these points should indicate the direction of our social discipline and the program of zikist education—which implies self-knowledge.

None of these essential factors can be fully concretized without a free government—I mean a government freed of all imperialistic chains, a government that is fully responsible to the people's needs. The choice of such government lies with each country in Africa. In countries where the British have control, the policy is definitely stated that the latter aims at self-government for these areas. Now it is not within the scope of this

book to make conclusions for the people of Africa who are up and doing themselves and who know what they want. The contention here is rather that any society or government which would reflect the African character must be a free and independent government under Africans, working in coöperation with another friendly nation or nations. Anything else is colonialism.

Now our social faith is clear. It means that *African Irredentism* is our social goal; African loyalties are our immediate demand; African discipline is our necessary counterpart; African knowledge our imperative quest; African manhood our legitimate claim. We need a moral awakening, intellectual dynamism, industrial revolution, and political freedom. For the coördination of all of these we need a new leadership of fearless citizens. We need an appreciative society which can see, understand, and follow the leader of a free people—but a leader with no tendencies to dictatorship.

In fear of a dictator, however, the African must not be afraid of his true shepherd. He must distinguish discipline from tyranny. The discipline of free men was well stated by the *American Educational Policies Commission* when they said that "Discipline means the putting of loyalties and knowledge to efficient use, the ordering of life in the light of understanding and toward the attainment of purpose. It involves the subordination of the near to the remote, of the present to the future, of the lesser to the greater good. It involves the restraint of the impulses of the moment, the regulation of desire, the postponement of satisfaction, the sacrifice of the immediate comforts and pleasures, the choice of the harder when the easier way is open. Discipline is never indulgent; it may be rigorously exacting. But it assumes this severe form not because there is virtue in severity, but rather because such is the condition of achievement."

CHAPTER XIX

Economic Zikism

ONE NOTABLE DEVELOPMENT in the world today is that, after the first World War, man became fully aware that his economic organization does not meet the heights of the technological changes. Soon every nation realized that economic life calls for a definite careful planning—a planning which the government has to take into its hands for effectiveness. Some governments approached their problems more wisely; others became imbued with economic nationalism until the breaking point was reached, and everybody was plunged into armed conflict again.

Any nation today embarking upon a progressive social plan must concern itself with the nature of its economic society, or else the whole social fabric cannot be maintained. The crisis of American capitalism was saved by the New Deal under the vigorous personality of President Roosevelt. The Italian and German dilemma was handled by Mussolini and Hitler with misdirected social motives. The Russian economic backwardness was turned into economic triumph by the novel experiment of the present Russian leaders. They have been most successful. African nations have never seriously concerned themselves with economic questions. They have considered themselves apart from all of the great movements of the world. The reasons for this are not far to seek. Most parts of Africa until recently lived in a purely agricultural-family economy. There was plenty of land and its vegetable resources for daily food. The family system provided all needed social security. There was no need for saving money in a bank, because it was the family's duty to take care of the aged. There was no need for insurance. The family is the insurance company, for even the dead could count on the fam-

ily's sense of responsibility to bury the corpse and pay for all necessary ceremonial expenses. Besides, the impact of modern technological changes was too remote. And acting upon all these was the ethical attitude of the African toward trade as a life work. Possession of too much money was not considered ethically correct. It was quite admirable to have plenty of cattle and other tangible wealth, but the possession of money—capital—was frowned at.

These were the notions of the old society in Africa, and these ideas still persist in a more restrained degree today. But a money economy and industrialism, with technological changes, have today in varying degrees become a common concern all over Africa. That concern will be greatly increased after this war.

The problem that confronts the man in Africa today is how he can survive the wave of the present-day economic changes. How is he going to reconcile his agriculture-family economy with scientific-social economy? What are the necessary precautions he would have to take in order to meet the challenge offered by the aggressive European and American business men with their efficiency and sharp—almost merciless—competition? Is he to copy the Russian system and turn communistic—which is indeed nearer to his original communalistic economy—or is he to follow the path of American and British capitalism? Will he rather prefer the state socialism of Hitler or the corporativism of Mussolini? Rejecting all these, will the African develop an entirely new economy based on African economic philosophy and modified by Western influences? Which way do we go as Africans?

Zikism, as a new African philosophy, is seriously concerned with these questions. But the author is not prepared yet to enunciate all the economic policies of zikism. Therefore, we shall deal with the problem quite briefly and superficially at this time.

The zikist principle in other fields is applicable here. Zikism holds that for any plan to be African, it must stem out of African character and origin; that such a plan must bear some elements of universality, so that it can be universally applied to

others without fear of offense. With that as a premise, we assume then that the economic future of Africa will be planned by the Africans themselves; and to give it a universal stamp, a knowledge and assistance of other more economically advanced nations must be sought. But the choice of the adviser must remain with the Africans themselves. There will be no room for officious co-operants.

Unlike the political field in which Africans feel that their system is just as good and in some cases better than the Western nations, the economic field presents a different problem. It presents a problem of scientific planning, administration, and operation which the majority of the African countries lack today. But this feeling will not retard Africa from a bold and all-embracing economic program in each country to elevate the general standard of living, and thereby join the other sister continents in their common struggle to be free from want.

The African peoples can appreciate the fact that Russia, which even in the 1890's was essentially an agricultural country, is today one of the first ranking industrialized nations of the world.

There are many economic theories, and all can be reduced simply to a question as to which class in the society wants to control its economy, or in some cases, which method would fit the ideology of some theorists and social reformers. Zikism shuns fanatical worship of verbal expressions and those tantalizing phrases which have no real bearing on the immediate needs of the people. It believes in theories only in so far as those theories are instruments and not untried keys to enigmatic doors. Zikism is both utilitarian and positivist. It seeks practical and useful results and has no use for verbal solutions. If that be interpreted as anti-intellectualism, it makes no apology.

In setting out our broad economic goals it must be understood that we have no dogmas, but there is a definite point which we do seek to reach. Zikism agrees with the "instrumental" view of the pragmatists who believe, as we do, that "Any idea upon which we can ride . . . any idea that will carry us prosperously from any one part of our experience to any other part, linking

things satisfactorily, working securely, simplifying, saving labor," is the idea we shall cherish—but only for so long as it works for us.

It will be surprising to the people of the West to know that the political philosophy of the original African states before the influx of Western civilization was exactly like that of economic liberalism and utilitarianism. To them as to the African, the individual is more prominent than the state. As they would say, the state was just the "communal policeman." The indigenous African did not consider himself an infinitesimal part of the state. The state could do its policing work, protect the populace from invasion, threaten the socially dangerous persons, revenge all civil wrongs, decide some cases which the family could not handle, but that is all. The state had no other right over the private activities of the individual. This philosophy was particularly true in West Africa. Generally, the land belonged to the families and they were inalienable—even to the state. The right of eminent domain was very remote and scarcely employed except in very serious occasions. In other words, while the African enjoyed the communalistic family life, the state was considered something apart from the control of daily life. The family was really the bedrock of African society.

This political philosophy was good in its own time, but modern economic changes call for an entirely new and pragmatic approach to the problem of the individual and the state.

Family economy with all its attendant good cannot alone save Africa. The vital relation between a single individual and his community outside of the family has to be emphasized. It is the rôle of man as a part of the whole of society that gives him worth and significance. That alone can reflect a complete person ready to make his own vital contribution. Zikism admits all the individual claims to liberty and rights, but for these concepts to have a concrete expression depends on the kind of relationship which exists between a person and his community. It is only the community alone, of which the family is a part, that can really guarantee liberty and freedom to the individual.

Zikism honors family solidarity; it has to be cherished in African society as a definite advantage which most Western nations have lost. But the fusion of this family solidarity with the ever-growing industrialism will be the function of the planners of the new African society. That is the concern of 'zikist philosophy.

There will be no new system to be enunciated by zikism. All that can be done is to synthetize the old and the new. Zikism advocates the African learning now the advantages of state activities. The people must develop a sound and implicit faith in the state—their own erected government.

This does not imply a complete state control of all economic activity: an inapplicable idea in Africa. What is wanted is a society in which no particular class, either capitalist, proletariat, artisan, labor, or any other, shall aim at exclusive control. Zikism wants a *limited-state-control*, with a careful adjustment of production, distribution, wages, hours of work, compensation, and old-age security; a scientific planning to eliminate inflation and deflation—a quest for a constant economic equilibrium. Zikism looks for a social, economic conscience that will repudiate fatalism and enthrone remedial social legislation with a view to the liberation of all of the economic possibilities of man and nature in Africa.

There must be avenues for intelligent labor organizations, and for coöperative enterprises—producers and consumers alike. Zikism certainly does not condone the fascist amalgamation of brutal nationalism and bourgeois syndicalism. Zikism wants a definite solidarity between the worker and the employer but in doing so, it does deny the existence of the natural struggle between the two which, of course, could be remedied with a more incisive social vision and broader economic planning.

Zikist philosophy denies all the pseudo-biological defenses of spiritless capitalism which have precipitated the growth of imperialism. The Darwinian theory of the survival of the fittest has been tragically misinterpreted by the supporters of unlimited capitalism. Zikism does not support this concept. The other extreme, which is communism, is equally defective in certain ways

—particularly where it tends to overlook all human passions and inclinations, and even to ignore the commonsense fact that big things are big and small things small, that among human beings this notion will persist, and that social contributions and want shall never be exactly equal, nor can individual achievements ever be measured with the same tape.

No doubt, the history of capitalism is not all gloomy. There are some bright sides to capitalistic economy, but it seems to the zikists that capitalism increases its social benefit when it allows itself to be controlled by the state without the latter's attempt to abuse its powers. The Russian system has so far shown marvelous results, but it can hardly be called a communistic system today. It is just a Russian system, or at most, it may be termed a "limited communism."

The New African economic program may lie between limited capitalism and the present Russian system. But however it develops, the whole system must reflect a true African temperament.

There are some economic programs which may help the New African society. They will embrace:

(1) The education of the whole people to understand the worth of the African land and vegetable products, the minerals, the rivers, and the manpower.

(2) A policy to elevate the value of the peasants so that an increase in the food supply may be assured, and thereby mutual confidence be established between the agricultural classes and the government.

(3) An increase in agricultural production for export. This can be done through the encouragement of the farmers by the state through the purchase of mechanical appliances on a large scale.

(4) Encouragement of self-governing coöperatives.

(5) Establishment of farmers' banks, either by the governments or by government-supervised private individuals.

(6) A soil conservation plan which will be undertaken by the

government to avoid land sterility, and to this will be added a total war against pests and crop diseases.

(7) Handing over the currency control to each of the African nations. Along with this will be the establishment of African banks on a larger scale than they now exist, and the giving of necessary control to the African-controlled governments.

(8) A definite industrial program, so that African commodities may be produced for international exchange, and at least, for a beginning, the manufacture of some commodities for local consumption.

(9) An intelligent use of our raw materials (Africa has those in abundance), the development of transportation and communication, and wiser utilization of the labor supply, of capital, and of power resources.

(10) Granting of concessions to foreign capitalists which may enable the African to purchase huge machinery for her own industrialization.

As originally stated, we shall conclude the zikist economic philosophy in later writings of the author, but for the present, this will be suggestive of what Africa will be thinking economically when the Western nations pour into the post-war African economic field.

To sum up, economic zikism does not believe in African economic servitude. It advocates that the African business man wants to do business with other nations, but not through "second hands" and "third hands." The African does not accept the principle that his continent will remain a mere field for the supply of raw materials and cheap labor, thus accepting a low standard of living as a gospel of the Western civilization to Africa. The peasants, in Africa, must be encouraged to enjoy the fruits of their labor and the gifts of nature.

A new attitude toward human, earthly destiny is the natural counterpart of a redeemed economic morality. The emphasis is on the individuals to become ends and means alike. The people—

everybody—must be inspired to play a creative rôle in life, and the whole of our civilization will receive a fresh stimulation. Instead of chaos, there will be deliberate planning. There will be no more economic shortage. New avenues of freedom, new roads to liberty, and new opportunities for a creative personality will all be open to the African.

Zikism is a way of life in which there is no room for illusions and anachronisms. The days are gone when Africa turned her face away from painful truths and the penetrating realities of our practical world. Today, Africa has learned the lesson of responsibility, and having resolved to bear the cross that precedes the crown, is stepping into the arena with calm and confidence. Economic zikism calls for the attention of the New Africa to the acknowledgment of the "things that matter." Life is true only when material elements are proportionally combined to support the physical organism to produce a healthy brain *and* brawn. How can the New African live and act effectively without good food, a healthful home, sufficient exercise, creative occupation, and economic security? How can a spiritual life be supported in an unsupported physical body? Can national morale be fostered where there is no physical fitness? Can there ever be a collective thought pointing to a national integrity where there is an absence of individual physical security? *Zikism says that national morale, collective thought for national integrity, and intelligent activity can only be expected in Africa when material resources for building of the body and the mind receive adequate emphasis and attention.*

This is a new quest. Its accomplishment must be brought about by "pulling-together"—by coöperation among Africans.

Economic zikism advocates democracy in economic life. The common man must be free from the discipline and tyranny of restrictions by the big combines. Why should an African employee of the United Africa Company be prohibited from private enterprise of his own, when his salary from the Company is barely enough for mere existence? Why do European companies envelop the African legitimate economic aspiration in darkness?

Economic zikism holds that the worker, the employer, and the farmer shall all have certain advantages for their well-being:

(1) The worker must have a guaranteed paid job.

(2) The worker must have guaranteed leisure.

(3) The worker must have guaranteed immunity against unemployment.

(4) The worker must have reasonably limited working hours per day, according to the nature of his occupation.

(5) He must be assured of holidays with pay.

(6) He must be paid on an equal basis with white workers, and his wage must be the same, if he has equal training, experience, and ability.

(7) He must be compensated in case of accident while working, and in case of illness financial help and medical care must be assured.

(8) He must be free to bargain with the employer in a peacefully organized union.

(9) He must have the right to strike collectively. This is the *ultima ratio* of Trade Unionism.

(10) He must be assured of happy old age by a generous pension.

(11) He must be looked upon (by the employer) as a whole and as a part; he must be regarded as a means and also an end.

(12) African employers must have the right to live in security. They must exercise their relative freedom in the pursuit of happiness.

(13) African farmers must learn *now* to unite and make cooperative decisions. This calls for intelligent planning.

(14) African farmers must have the right and freedom to set the prices for their products.

(15) The government must subsidize the farmers and encourage the best returns for the enrichment of the people, and not only for the fattening of the European combines.

(16) Farmers must be provided with the new technological devices for modern farming, in order to speed up skill in the agricultural science of Africa.

(17) Farmers must develop pride in their occupation so that the push of industrialism may not overbalance the pull of the agricultural life.

(18) African industrialists—miners, manufacturers, bankers, and so forth—must be encouraged by the government.

Zikism, in its universal approach towards everything, advocates the type of economic outlook which can be universalized. It is not the national self-sufficient economic life which has plunged our world into chaos; it is merely the principle which holds that Africans must learn to "plan together" in their economy with relative freedom; that the farmer must have the maximum returns for his labor. But above all, it is that the African shall learn to give a great deal more power for social legislation affecting his economy to the African governments. When the economic life makes African social life a happy concern, and when the social equilibrium is maintained, then Africa will be an asset to the world, not a continent to be ruthlessly exploited by Europeans. It will be a continent willing to exchange what it has with what others have. America, Europe, Asia, and Africa will then have a rendezvous in the temple of international brotherhood.

CHAPTER XX

Political Zikism

Is Government Necessary?

ZIKISM BELIEVES that every community, no matter how distant in the past, no matter how far remote from the centers of material civilization, no matter how rudimentary in form, has some sort of an organized political life. Each individual by law of nature has to belong to one state or another. He may not be interested in the affairs of that state; he may manifest some scorn for the conduct of its business, but he remains, on the one hand, a beneficiary of its services, and on the other a subject of its social norms and political powers.

Man is regarded in the philosophy of zikism as a self-preserving animal. One man is also regarded as the equal of any other man. Both have inherent rights to life: the right to work and reap the harvest of their labor; the right to think and act with relative freedom. This equality in the right to live and to enjoy life does not imply inevitability of conflict; yet man in his attempt at self-preservation has found himself plunged into conflicting desires and ends.

Out of this desire to preserve self, man developed selfishness and egoism. This theory offers a scientific background for the interpretation of human behavior. Of course, modern psychologists see it differently. Man is basically selfish. The idea of coöperation and the notion of *living together* do not originate in man's inherent moral ideas. No. It arises from necessity—a necessity which is indeed beyond control.

Selfish as he is, man finds that it is only through helping one another that men can live together. Whenever man is convinced

that he can do without other men, he has shown a spirit of indifference, with a result in conflict. To curb this tendency of self-preservation from becoming a license for the strong to take undue advantage of the weak, an institution to regulate the conduct of human affairs was created. That is government. In this sense, government is a necessary evil.

Zikism looks upon government as a necessary evil which must be tolerated as long as it tends to govern for the interest of the whole people.

Youth and Politics

Zikism believes that a youth must have a type of education which can make him not only a social and mechanical being but also a political animal. Youth must be educated to understand his environment; to interpret and appreciate behaviors unlike his own; to understand facts about society. He must also be obedient to the cosmic law of the universe. He must understand the fundamental unity through which the universe operates and thereby develop a synthetic approach to things, in spite of the seeming disorderliness of our world. He must seek uniformity in the mutation of occurrence. Most important, he must be politically minded. He must understand that the peace and order of society is the most essential thing to be sought for. He must understand why there is government, why rulers, and why the governed. He must understand what ought to be the basis for justification of human conduct. He must understand what are "right," "justice," "interest," "value," "utility," "ethics," "morals," "ends," "means." Youth must be educated to be free from the naïve consciousness which obeys laws without asking whence they come or by what they are justified. Youth must be trained in the art of ruling, in order to realize that when written laws fail to uphold our cause, it is only just to appeal to the greater equity and justice of the universal law of nature. Youth must know that while it is disgraceful to do injustice, it is equally disgraceful to suffer injustice silently.

Youth, zikism believes, is the age for political life. The aged must not monopolize the game of politics. It is a game for both

young and old. I agree with Mr. Azikiwe that "Without the youthful in mind and in body, the politics of society will degenerate . . . the African socio-economic fabric."

Zikism and Foreign Governments in Africa

Zikism condones government because it embodies order, peace, and security for society. Without authority the people have no means of directing their energy and aspirations. Government has always remained both a regulative and a service instrumentality.

Zikism recognizes that any government must have certain characteristics. First, it must have power. This power enables it to give and enforce orders. To do this there must be courts, police, and soldiery. Government can no longer endure if the power of coercion does not accompany the power to command. Second, it must operate through law. No matter how monarchial, oligarchial, plutocratic, dictatorial, or democratic a government is, it must have law as a connecting link between the ruler and the ruled. Third, the government must have organization. There must be a proper means of arriving at a decision which may become law, and there must be likewise a proper means of executing the law. This may give rise to the creation of different machineries such as the legislative, the judiciary, and the executive. Under these heads we have the necessary personnel which will be paid for out of the public treasury.

Zikism does not quarrel with these elemental "musts" of government. But there is another way of looking at these basic factors upon which governments must operate—power, law, and organization.

From where must the government derive its power? Who are entitled to make the law? Who have the right to organize the government? These are the questions which zikism takes up in considering the presence of the European governments which are established all over the continent of Africa, with little or no regard for the wishes of the Africans.

Concerning the derivation of power zikism does not present a

new theory. It agrees with Locke's idea of contract: that the power of the government depends upon the consent of the governed. By contract the governed agree to be subject to the higher authority on condition that the higher authority is ready to satisfy the basic needs of the community, and protect the rights of the individual with an aim of embracing the happiness of the greatest number in the society. Rousseau, unlike Locke, holds that the people and not the legislature shall have the sovereign power. Sovereignty must be inalienable and indivisible. To Hobbes this inalienable and indivisible sovereignty belongs to a beneficent monarch; to Locke, it belongs to the legislature; to Rousseau, it belongs to the people. And zikism agrees with Rousseau.

In making the law, the objective must be clear that law is the expressed opinion of a people: the result of their long-cherished customs and traditions as they see fit to bring peace and justice into human relations. Law, in this sense, must be considered as "an expedient against confusion, a restraint upon all disorders," in order to prevent men's passions and inclinations from becoming license. Collective interest is therefore the ground for setting up laws. It is also the only reason for obeying them. It follows that obedience to the law is justifiable in so far as it contributes to the collective interest of the individual, and in so far as that law is within the popular mandate of the expressed will of the people.

In this sense, law makes itself illegal if it does not originate in the place of its application. How can an Indian consider a law legal that was made in England and executed by a British viceroy for the people of India? If law is the expressed opinion of a people as the result of their cherished customs and traditions, how can the people of Nigeria have any respect for a law which emanates from English soil, is interpreted by an Englishman, and is applied by British officials to the people of Nigeria who have their own customs and traditions? Must the Emirates of Northern Nigeria bend their heads to the proclamations of one Englishman

in Lagos called the Governor of Nigeria, who talks and thinks English, and whose sole interest is British and not Nigerian? [1] Is there any moral obligation or natural duty which will justify the people of Africa and Asia in accepting a European imperialism which does not consider the opinions, customs, and traditions of a people except when these people have guns to shoot?

Zikism holds that obedience to law is limited. The only kind of law which zikism accepts is the law made by the people through their own erected institutions. It is an act against God and man to accept a law that does not have a relation to the temper and values of the people. A law ill-adopted, ill-interpreted, ill-adapted, cannot receive any moral or physical support from the believers in the philosophy of zikism.

Concerning the right to organize the government, zikism differs from a school of thought in Africa—the school which believes in "catching more flies with molasses." Zikism does not necessarily believe in applying vinegar, but as a universal philosophy it believes in positive and clean-cut statements in any social issue. It believes in telling the truth, even to the enemy.

There is no argument to prove that the progress of any people depends on the type of government under which they live. The organization of the government and the policy which it adopts determine the degree of individual and collective progress of the people. Economic progress, educational opportunity, and the social freedom of a people depend largely on the nature of their governments and their goals. In totalitarian governments, such as that of Germany, where every phase of the individual and collective life is channeled within a total scheme, animated by a single objective, and subjected to a single hand, the government is imposed from the top. Economic, educational, and social interests are subordinated to political ends. The state looks upon itself as the organic unity which stands above all institutions within it

[1] One must be thankful that the British, by introducing the system of Native Administration in Nigeria, have rightly insisted that Nigerian laws and customs must be the bedrock on which the Nigerian political future would stand, but this theory must be made real in Nigeria by abolishing the present colonial system.

and, like a boat, carries the everlasting glory of the German people and their culture to the ends of the earth. We have already seen how far the structure and policy of the German government affect the progress of the German populace. Scientific and liberal thinking is relegated to the background, while the individual has been educated to love war instead of peace. He is taught to forget his personal rights in order to satisfy the policy of the state.

Take another example. In the Soviet Union, where the structure and broad policy of the government is to build a society in which all political, economic, and social aspects of life are intelligently coördinated to serve the people's welfare, there appears a new organization of economic life, based on defined principles differing from the capitalistic system. Individuals become means and ends alike. The community, rather than special individuals or special classes or special races, stands in the center of the picture. Education, social equality, and economic security are the equal heritage of all. But in a democratic system of government where the fundamental philosophy is based on rugged individualism, capitalism has enveloped the economic system, and has left a profound imprint upon the nature of the social institutions within it. This capitalistic system, which rationalizes its existence in a political philosophy exalting "the freedom of the individual," at the same time exploits the masses by its profit-making motive, its incredible wastage of wealth, and its artificially induced shortages which promote intensive poverty amidst plenty, in turn stratifies the society into social classes on the basis of wealth.

According to the school of thought in Africa which believes that "more flies could be caught by molasses," there seems to be no need for any political or economic principle in Africa other than that imposed by the European governments. Its adherents are in a strange mental state which sees errors in every new and original proposal for Africa. Their type of politics is that of "Uncle Tomism"—what one must do in order to please the European high officials. Nehru of India well describes such individuals when he says that "by criticizing everything they consider extreme they experience the feeling of being virtuous and moder-

ate and good. This method helps them in avoiding painful and difficult processes of thought and in having to put forward constructive ideas." [2]

Zikism calls this group of thinkers the old Africans. They are not necessarily old in limb, because quite a number of them are young graduates from Western universities. They are old because their dull sense of moderation and conservatism, their effort to avoid that which they call risks and sudden changes, are evidence of old age. "They have no understanding of human convulsions like the great French Revolution or the Russian Revolution. The complex, swift, and cruel eruptions of human desires long suppressed, frighten them. For them the Bastille has not yet fallen." [3]

According to the African view of life, moderation and compromise are part of a good life. But you cannot compromise unless you have two extremes. You cannot moderate unless you have an excess. Yet these groups of young-old Africans believe that Africans of this age should be moderate, should compromise with the governments of imperialism, even in the absence of extreme anti-imperialists who would come forward to denounce any and every thing—bad for or indifferent to the freedom of Africa. They believe that there is no need for a new African government which is not based on the European imperial way.

Zikism thinks differently. The organization of an African government must be the sole function of the African people. It must be based on whatever is desirable remaining of African political institutions, and electrified by the new political inventions of Africans themselves as they see fit to promote the welfare of Africa and the world. Zikism does not see any salvation for Africa by its going through any artificial A.B.C. stages, any colonial, mandate, or dominion status. That is neither practical nor desirable because it assumes that Africa must accept a government organized and imposed upon her by other peoples, according to the latter's own values and special interests. Such organization, by its

[2] *Toward Freedom*, the Autobiography of Jawaharlal Nehru, The John Day Company, p. 261.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 263.

origin and aims, stunts and narrows the higher human aspirations in the African's politico-economic progress. It has no moral impulse, no attraction, no appeal, no *raison d'être*.

The European governments, particularly the British, have set up certain standards in Africa; these standards have physical and psychological bearings on African life in some parts of Africa. The Europeans are supposed to be the nobility, owning the best houses built in the most desirable parts of the country, while the Africans must confine themselves to the humble and discarded houses and quarters. In South Africa, the Africans must be relegated to the menial vocations of shoe-shiners, cooks, and carriers. They must accept the status of hewers of wood and drawers of water. They must work with their hands on the cocoa farms while the European must be the supervisor, kicking the servants with heavy shoes when he feels like doing so. These facts are unfortunate, but not surprising. There are some Africans who accept imperialism as natural. Their only seeming ambition is to become "gentlemen," whose prestige may come through slave-diplomacy, looking with envious eye to a respectable position in the hierarchy of His Majesty's government. These people do not desire such change as zikism advocates in the organization of the African government. They can only conceive of a future in which they, or those who think as they do, would carry over without change a European type of government, with its system of legislature, trade, and industry into the new African government. They hate to create or originate.

The difference between zikism and this type of thinking is fundamental. The latter condones the perpetuation of imperialism. To them imperialism is inevitable, and for the time must be looked upon as "the mover unmoved."

Zikism seeks a new organization, a new society built upon a new state. The nature of the state, its policy and quality, will be determined by the Africans themselves. It is not the purpose of this book to determine what they must be, but from the popular trend it is evident that the present colonial governments must go. A new state must be born, the basic philosophy of which must be

the acceptance of the inherent ability of the African to manage his own home. There must be a plan to take the place of riot and disorder. The interest and welfare of the whole people must replace the interest and welfare of a select group or race. The government must seek harmony in all things—between religion and science, between consumer and producer, between capital and labor, and between all classes of men. In fact, the new states in Africa will aim at a social order in which no particular spots on trains and buses are reserved for one color and others for another, such as is the practice in India and in the southern parts of the United States of America.

The New African state which zikism contemplates is a state with a conscience. There must be a patriotic sense of nationalism, yet the objective of the state must be based on unreserved love for humanity as a whole. No state can enjoy the full measure of life till all enjoy an equal measure. There must be opportunity for new experiments and their application to the African social order. The people do not want the old structures of imperialistic government which bind Africa hand and foot and reduce her men to the position of beasts under the yoke of violent human greed. The state must be sanctified. It must refrain from any undertaking which may lead the world into another war. It must shake off the shackles of colonialism and put on the badge of internationalism.

Let us not misunderstand zikism at this point. It is not antagonistic to Europeans or to the British people. I have tried to show all along that zikism is a universal philosophy. It only advocates that which can be done for everybody, including Africa. It only seeks to have a free people under a free government, chosen by their own free will. England has a free government at home. Africa wants a free government in Africa. African self-government and British self-government are by no means incompatible, and both demand respect in the full sense, if the security of all is to be attained.

What zikism objects to root and branch is the rule and domination of one nation over another, instead of coöperation. Africa

is not upholding isolation. She is rather pointing out that to have a perfect whole the parts must be perfected. There cannot be a healthy international body politic with Africa lying on a sick bed while other countries remain healthy. To have a truly free Britain, there must be a free Nigeria. Zikism does not believe in the type of state sovereignty which has generated world anarchy, but if Africa shall surrender part of her sovereignty it must be in the measure that others are willing to surrender their own. Africa will never coöperate in the international brotherhood of nations while wearing the badge of colonialism. If that must be, then we must not only accept the Second World War, but expect a third, fourth, and fifth World Wars. The path of the A.B.C. mandatory system and the Dominion status do not encourage any further confidence or spirit of coöperation between the East and the West.

In short, zikism does not quarrel with law and order and political organization in Africa, but the law must be the law of the people to be legal. The order must come from the popularly established authorities of the people to be obeyed. Political organization must be the handwork of the people, for the people, to be accepted. It does not aim at a change of authority in an old imperialistic structure of government, but a totally new state which will usher in a new Africa.

CHAPTER XXI

Religious Zikism

THE ATTITUDE of zikism toward religion may be called what I have arbitrarily decided to name "excuse-recessism." [1] By excuse-recessism I mean the logic of reasoning with God, the philosophy of "forcing" God to be on our side in executing our designs. The world is made up of individuals whose psychology has been conditioned to the conception of certain unknowable, invisible, omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient factors. There may be atheists, yet they consciously or unconsciously have some ideal to look upon as something higher than themselves. If their emotion is appealed to in terms of that ideal, they will automatically respond.

Excuse-recessism sanctions the belief that God is "manufactured" by the human mind. The morality and holiness of God seems to change with the morality and holiness of man. The disposition of God seems to change with the disposition of the human mind from place to place and from age to age.

Let us glance into the long history of the Jews and show how they manufactured God from place to place and from time to time. Bible literature has not been arranged chronologically; we shall therefore ramble over the stages of development of the God-idea among the Jews. What we shall keep clearly before us is that all attributes of God throughout history are the reflection of the people's own moral ideas.

During the earliest Jewish history God was supposed to be a local deity whose interest was in military exploits. He was imagined as a localized, moving object which might be seen and heard by men. That was why Cain heard his voice from the heavens.

[1] This, in a special sense, is a legitimate translation of the Ibo expression, *Ofoism.*

And at another time and place "the Lord spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend." [2] At this time this localized deity was supposed to be an embodiment of vengeance and cataclysm. He was a bloody God who would order the people "to go in and out from gate to gate throughout the camp and slay, every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every man his neighbor." [3] He condones sending spies to Jericho and plans the method whereby that city "shall fall flat." Later, God became the resident of an Ark. The presence of the Ark was the presence of God and its absence was God's absence. When the Ark was captured, the God of Israel had left His people. At this time God sanctioned special classes in society so that only the Levites could touch the Ark of God. He was a God Who did not appreciate generous service of "unselected" persons; hence when Uzzah held the Ark from falling, "the anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzah; and God smote him . . . and there he died by the Ark of God." [4] The judges of the pre-prophetic days also viewed God according to their own human standards. They depicted God as being behind His leaders who employed dark deeds and deceits to gain their national ends. Hence the Lord was behind the left-handed Ehud when he invited Eglon, King of Moab, to a peaceful summer conference, and when the former, having hid two daggers under his raiment, pretended to have "a message from God," thrust one dagger into Eglon's belly.

When, however, by the eighth century B.C., as the human mind grew more ethical and as the Israelites suffered several defeats from other and stronger nations and underwent captivities such as that in Babylon, certain prophets like Isaiah and Ezekiel began to point out that God is the universal Father of all nations. And as we come to the closing chapters of the Old Testament we see that man through his own experience made God increasingly ethical, spiritual, and divine.

With the advent of the Father of Christianity, the whole con-

[2] Exodus 35:11.
[3] *Ibid.*, 32:27.
[4] Samuel 6:7.

ception broadened. Deity became the God that hates swords. He condemned revenge. He became a kind father Who ought not to be feared like a whirlwind. He became a loving God and an appreciative Deity Who looked at His children without the class distinction which prevailed in Uzzah's time. Yet even at this later date, the God of St. Paul did not see anything wrong with slavery. In the history of Israel and its God, we see the same Deity changing His principles endlessly from a revengeful, bloody God to a universal Father with a loving heart. What is important in this account is that when Moses interpreted God to suit his own convenience for national purposes, when Ehud used His name in a treacherous act, when Joshua destroyed Jericho for the good of his own people, and when St. Paul sanctioned slavery, God did not say "no."

The early Christians invited the world to fix its attention upon the world to come, where God lives, and not upon ephemeral pleasures of this world. Poverty was exalted because there was a reward for it in the life beyond the grave. At that time there was no industrial revolution, there was no capitalism; hence man said that God exalted poverty, and God did not say "no."

The Roman Empire, after its attack upon Christianity, finally protected it under law by the edict of 313 A.D. Following this, Emperor Constantine the Great presided over the General Council at Nicaea in 325, and Christianity was exalted. Soon afterwards, the human hand came in again. With the political separation of the Roman Empire there began the division of the Eastern and Western Churches, which culminated in the schism of the ninth century. The continent of Europe witnessed the establishment of two churches: one was called the Greek Orthodox Church, because it considered itself nearer to the original Christian Church; the other came into history as the Roman Catholic Church. In 1582, the Russian Church was also founded, and by the constitution of the Holy Synod in 1721, it established its independence. In 1870, the Bulgarians separated their own partiarchate. Motivated by differing political and other human considerations, all these separate institutions were nevertheless, in their

own views, executing the will of God. It was His will to have a Russian Church, and it was His design to have the Greek orthodoxy. Note that all these churches bear the names of their nations. But that was the will of God, for God never said "no."

At the time when England became nationally able to shake off the burden of Roman Catholicism, there appeared on the royal scene a typical Tudor dictator, Henry VIII, who in order to accomplish his personal and political plans, convinced his "servants of God" that God was not in Rome but in London. That conviction gave impetus to the Protestant Reformation which culminated in the creation of the Church of England. But God made no objection. Then came the greater movement of the Industrial Revolution which precipitated the immediate need for European expansion for markets and raw materials. That gave rise to a scramble for a place in the sun. To accomplish this, the Bible was employed. The heathen must be converted! To gain the gold, use the gospel! European imperialism, the origin and entire motivation of which have always been economic, was rationalized into God's work. It has been sanctified on the altar of humanitarianism, Christianity, and civilization. This is what I call "excuse-recessism."

Whenever any nation wants to carry out any program affecting its destiny, it must find some way to employ God as the author of that program. Totalitarian Hitlerism and German "master-race-ism" are planned by God. Japan was created by Heaven to deliver the Eastern hemisphere. Everybody feels that God is on his side. All these claims constitute what zikism terms *ofoism.*

When man wants to go to war he forces God to go to war with him. When nationalism carries him beyond the boundary of safety, he makes an alliance with God and makes himself the spokesman for the Almighty. When hunger knocks at the door, man moralizes his economic quest. Because of this human tendency, man has made God a contradictory being, a Deity who kills today and saves tomorrow, the God of Rome today and the God of England tomorrow.

Is there really a God? He must be a miserable being—having

no home, no set morals, and no set ideals except as interpreted by man to suit his own convenience.

The problem before zikism is to understand God as revealed in history and to relate this knowledge to the religion of the New Africa. Clearly enough, God as revealed in Jewish history and through the organization of Christianity, is the conception of the human mind. Organized religion, under whatever color, has no claim to immaculateness either in origin or content. In the history of religion we find men and women of the highest character, but it will be wrong to conclude that this fact saves religion from unreality. Supposing that we have a few men of character, for instance, in the Church of England, shall we say then that Henry VIII was really defending his faith in God or that British imperialism has not been baptized by the Church of England?

Zikism is not denying the existence of God nor affirming it; it is only interested in finding the reality of religion. History does not encourage zikism to an intelligent belief in God's existence. But there seems to be order in the universe. There are evidences of cause and effect. Physical events appear to be designed; otherwise how does it come about that the complex parts of the human organism are so correlated that they in their multiplicity serve only one purpose? Let us call the origin of these things "God" for want of better terminology. Our mind is feeble, it wants some resting-place, and cannot feel satisfied without coming to a conclusion, even though it may be hypothetical. To zikism, God in this sense is a hypothesis. Man has seen so far that the world is purposive; the beginning and the end he does not know yet. He therefore called that beginning and end "God."

In the same way there appears to be a conscience: Something in us which demands fair dealing. It points out to us, even when we become stubborn, that this and that act is not good. It informs us when others wrong us, and in turn condemns us when we err. It points out noble things, high ideals, and purity of thought. It gives us satisfaction when we treat others kindly and candidly. And finally, we find ourselves in a constant struggle to go higher and higher, to better our way of dealing with others. This tend-

ency to go high is a quest for moral perfection. We do not know the nature of perfection. Here again, man faces uncertainty. But to have some peace of mind in his process of imagination, man calls this perfection God.

God becomes a hypothetical moral perfection for man, and we all worship and adore Him. If man falls short, he feels he is offending that perfection which is God; if he does anything good, he is fulfilling His will.

By this process of reasoning, zikism evolves the following statements which will form the basis of relationship between zikism and religion, and which in turn will be the basis upon which the New Africa shall find its relation to religion.

(1) There is "excuse-recessism" which enables men and nations to employ God in executing their designs of whatever nature.

(2) Our physical world appears to be orderly and purposive, but its beginning and end are not yet explored by man; for convenience, the hypothetical assumption is that there must be a designer of ideal things. Some call it nature, others call it God.

(3) Thus man has a sense of value in the sphere of morals. He has conscience. He distinguishes between right and wrong.

(4) His judgment as to the rightness and wrongness of an action depends largely on his state of mind, previous training of his conscience, the demands of the place, and the exigency of the time.

(5) We do not deny the existence of God, nor do we affirm that he is any less interested in the affairs and conduct of man than in the whole cosmic world, of which man is an infinitesimal part.

(6) The will is the axis about which all things revolve. We first have external sense impressions and experiences, and therefrom construct our ideas. Memory and imagination help us through inductive and deductive reasoning to conclude whether our ideas are tenable. Then, the power of our will, coöperating with the physical body, transmutes these intangible ideas into tangible manifestation. If this be so, man is not a mere plastic

organism. He has free will to change his environment, or at least his will can control the effects of environment upon him. He can thereby project the results of the activities of his subjective mind until they appear objective, and his voluntary actions shall seem involuntary in the process of carrying out his desires.

(7) For God to be a God with a universal stamp, there must be a set standard in His terms without respect to time and place. No nation, no race, no church, no organized religion shall have the exclusive interpretation of man-to-God relationship. The interpretation must be universal in order to allow universal application.

(8) New Africa must insist upon the universal interpretation of God in order to elevate a universal brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God.

(9) God being a universal Being and Africa being a part of that universe, African *ofoism* claims that the program of Nzoputa-Africa is a part of God; that the quest for *African Irredentism* is a God-sanctioned plan. Anybody opposing this plan is kicking against God Himself; for our program is sacred. It is a universal destiny! It must be accomplished!

(10) No people, no theologian, no philosopher, has made a claim to have an adequate knowledge or conception of the Ultimate Reality or of God. All definitions are limited to a limited view, and no attempt should be made to make any final statement on the nature of God. We are playing a humble part by interpreting God through our experiences in the physical universe—a universe which we are yet scratching only on the borderline of its immensity, intensity, and complexity.

Zikism is not dealing in final words. But Azikiwe's statement on this question will help elucidate my closing remarks. Zik said:

> I believe that man is a product of the physical universe.
>
> I believe that that *I-Know-Not-What* which is so supreme and which is the final cause for the existence of this universe and other universes has spiritual affinity with man—mere man, who is an infinitesimal fraction of the Great Universe.

I believe that man, therefore, is a spiritual being, because of his spiritual affinity with the Governor of the Universe—be they material or spiritual—and thus man's spiritual essence is obvious.

In simpler language, I believe in God, as the Father of Man, and I believe in Man, as the brother of Man.

Fatherhood implies love, just as brotherhood implies service.

Thus to me, life has a meaning—Love and Service.

That is why I believe that once I love God and serve my fellow man, I have done my duty to my God and to humanity.

If I love God and serve humanity, it is obvious that I am not oblivious of the spiritual relationship of God and Man, on the one hand, and of Man and Man, on the other.

Thus, it is obvious that I am conscious of eternal realities, and that I have faith in God and in humanity.

Where I come to a parting of ways with some human beings is when an attempt is made by any sections of humanity to formulate theses or to interpret ideas or to systematize beliefs culled from any ramifications of the philosophy of religion.

I am thinking of Theology—that is, Dogmatic Theology.

I still find it difficult to reconcile my religious ideas with some aspects of theological ideology.

Being non-theological should not make man non-religious.

And when Zik was asked where he expected to go after death, he continued by saying:

My answer is that if I served God and humanity in the spirit of love, befitting the spiritual affinity of Man with God, I shall go where others of like ilk have gone.

As to the exact location, geographically speaking, I cannot speak with authority, because since the death of the first human being, the mouths of all other human beings who have lived and died have been sealed in eternal silence.

To attempt to describe whither I am bound would be a contemplation of the human mind, which is finite and not infallible.

The above explanation is also applicable to my belief in hell,

according to the denotation or connotation of that word, either in Hebrew or in Aramaic or in Greek or in English, bearing also in mind the various versions in the translation of the Bible (Authorised, Revised, Douay, Moffat's, etc.). . . .

I am no unbeliever, but I am no blind worshiper of a cult whose existence is only justifiable by tradition and by the forces of human history.

Rather, I am a product of the material universe into whose nostrils has been breathed the breath of life, and in my odyssey on this earth, I owe it a duty to Love God and to Serve Man.

And when this fleeting flame of mine shall have departed from my mortal frame, I shall be satisfied, wherever I may be, that I have lived my life with a philosophy which is conscious that Life has a meaning—"Love to God and Service to humanity."

SECTION VII—BEYOND ANIMALISM

CHAPTER XXII

The Tragedy of the Limited View

For God himself hates violence; he wishes
That not by rapine but by honest toil
We riches gain. Let wealth be scorned that not
By right has come. Common to man the air is,
And also earth, on which 'tis meet that each
His home make large, if his hands restrain
From things of others, and from violence.

—EURIPIDES

MAN STARTED from his infancy, during his stage of *lex talonis*, to search for peace, without security. He has failed dismally, because he has either not learned or else has refused to recognize the only effective bases of peace. He has always limited his view to the needs of his immediate now, and has been blind to the broad horizons of the future.

Mesilim, King of Kish during the governorship of Entemena in Lagash in 2800 B.C., initiated the first recorded arbitration between Lagash and Umma. The King of Kish condemned war as an act in which "everybody bites, and everybody gets bitten." But neither his settlement nor his wise words set a lasting example for future generations of still-fighting men. Again, in the quest for peace the prophet Shemiah in 795 B.C. negotiated a settlement between the ten revolting tribes and the rest of the children of Israel, which ended the struggle between the two groups. Our next example of the frantic and quite futile maneuvering for peace and security among men comes in 478 B.C., when the first Delian League was created to confederate the Ionian

cities for collective action in case of foreign invasion. "In the confederacy of Delos in 477 B.C., for the first time in the history of the world an International Police Force was instituted. . . . The instrument of enforcement was the confederacy's fleet. A definite obligation to provide equipped ships or money was placed upon each city."[1] But this instrument was no more effective than any that had been tried before, and Aristophanes later indicted and ridiculed the futility of war in his *Lysistrata*, 411 B.C. So too, in 357 B.C., "Isocrates demonstrates the benefits of peace and, in scathing condemnation, the dangers of imperialism."[2]

In the quest for peace, in 280 B.C., the Achaian League was formed. Its aim was federalism. There were districts and sovereign states within the nation, and the Lykian League, formed later in 168 B.C., which was destroyed by Claudius, was in quest of permanent peace among its constituent cities. The Egyptian Pharaohs, as early as the fourteenth century B.C., entered into treaties with neighboring kings which "provided for the recognition of their mutual sovereignty and equality, as well as for the extradition of political refugees and immigrants."[3] David, Solomon, and later Hebrew kings made treaties with neighboring states (except for the seven marked for extermination), "and instances are to be found showing a care for the faith of treaties and a recognition of the sanctity of the ambassadorial character . . ."[4] while, in another but allied connection, the drafters of "The Indian Code of Manu, about 500 B.C., prescribed humane treatment of prisoners and non-combatants and forbade the use of poisoned weapons and other excesses of warfare."[5]

And as the last example of the various efforts made in the ancient world to "seek peace and to preserve it," we would mention that the negotiators of the "second treaty of alliance between Sparta and Argos in 418 B.C. stipulated that [the two na-

[1] V. J. Lewis, *The New Commonwealth*, Vol. 1, May, 1933, p. 8.
[2] *Ibid.*, June, 1933, p. 7.
[3] Charles G. Fenwick, *International Law*, D. Appleton-Century Co., Inc., New York, Second Edition, 1934, p. 7.
[4] *Ibid.*
[5] *Ibid.*

tions] should submit their differences to arbitration 'on fair and equal terms, according to their ancestral customs.' " [6]

The ecumenical Roman Empire first introduced the concept of *jus gentium*, which in time came to be associated with the *jus naturale*. In 1306, Pierre Dubois made a proposal of alliance among Christian countries (1) for the maintenance of peace, (2) for the establishment of a Permanent Court of Arbitration,[7] and in 1461, "the King of Bohemia adopted the scheme of his Chancellor, Antoine Marini, and negotiated with foreign courts the foundation of a Federal State to consist of all existing Christian States with a permanent Congress, seated at Basle." [8]

We now take a broad jump from the futilities of ancient and mediæval history to instances of the even greater ineffectualities of modern times, in this catalogue of man's failures in attempting to establish a social condition which he earnestly desires but is unable, through his own ignorance, blindness, and viciousness, to attain. There are, of course, a great many examples that can be given of peace gestures made between those mentioned above and the birth of Christ, and from the birth of Christ to that first modern-world instance which we shall give here. The necessity for such a jump is too obvious for express statement. Neither in this book nor anywhere else in the world of men do we have eternity at our disposal. Time is our only continuum, and marks the limits of our finitude; eternity is infinitude, and belongs to Deity.

These were of course neither the first nor the last great moves for international amity. Grotius wrote his *Law of War and Peace* about 1626, the occasion for this treatise being the involvement of the Dutch East India Company in a controversy with the Portuguese. The peaceful Mennonites, having rejected physical combat, yielded place to the barbarous East India Company. The Company, therefore, employed Grotius to make a legal study of the case. This he did, and his resulting work put the world a long

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[7] Oppenheim, *International Law*, Vol. I, p. 58.
[8] *Ibid.*

stride forward in its thinking about international peace. In 1648 came the treaty of Westphalia, which "was an attempt to secure the equal rights and develop the autonomy of the separate States that were liberated by the Thirty Years' War from the pretensions of the Holy Roman Empire." [9] And in 1693 William Penn endeavored to demonstrate the principles upon which judicial procedure can take the place of war. This he summarized as follows:

1. As justice is a preserver, so it is a better procurer of peace than war.

2. Government is an expedient against confusion; a restraint upon all disorders.

3. Government is the prevention or cure of disorder, and the means of justice to overrule men's passions and resentments, that they may not be judges in their own causes nor punishers of their own wrongs.

4. There appears to be but three things upon which peace is broken:

a. To keep what is one's right from the invasion of an enemy; in which I am purely defensive.

b. To recover by violence what my ancestors have lost by the arms of a stronger power; in which I am offensive.

c. To increase my dominion by the acquisition of my neighbors' countries, as I find them weak, and myself strong. To gratify which passion, there will never want some accident or other for a pretense; and knowing my own strength, I will be my own judge and carve.

5. Representatives of sovereign nations . . . to agree to meet in an international parliament and thus establish rules of justice for sovereign nations to observe one to another. All differences of one sovereign nation to another to be brought before this parliament for adjudication. If any of the sovereign nations constituting the parliament shall refuse to submit their claim or pretensions to the parliament, to abide and perform the judgment thereof, and seek remedy by arms, or delay their com-

[9] Hill, *Problem of the World Court*, Longman's, Green and Company, pp. ix-xi.

pliance beyond the time prefixed in their resolutions, all the other sovereign nations, united as one strength, shall compel the submission and performance of the sentence, with damages to the suffering party and charges to the sovereign nations that obliged their submission.[10]

To all of which the Swiss jurist, Vattel (1758), in his *The Law of Nations*, has added: "Arbitration is a very reasonable means, and one that is entirely in accord with the natural law. If the claims of justice may be misconceived by arbitrators, it is more to be feared that they will be overthrown by the chance of war." [11]

Frenchmen, Germans, Swiss, Dutchmen, the English, and Americans are among those who have tried to set the world and humankind on a sound basis of peace, parity, and progress, without tears or blood. That they and their efforts have met with tragic failure is the result of a fundamental weakness, the statement of which is the purpose of this chapter. Before the statement is made, however, we must hear much more about these men and their theories, more about the various conferences, conventions, and leagues, and the proposals and agreements resulting from them. For the number, recurrence, and impressiveness of these peace moves is the measure of the tragedy of their failure, and to assure any reasonable success in future efforts—of which there are bound to be many—we must at least learn the content and color of the past attempts.

In his *Judgment on the Perpetual Peace*, 1761, Rousseau laid down three premises from which he logically concluded the possibility of enduring peace:

> (1) that there prevails among all peoples a social connection, imperfect but more compact than the general and loose ties of humanity; (2) that the imperfections of society make the condition of those who compose it worse than would be the

[10] Penn's "Essay on the Peace of Europe;" as published 1693–94. Reprinted by American Peace Society, Boston, Massachusetts. (Quoted by Wyres, *op. cit.*)

[11] Vattel, *The Law of Nations*, p. 224.

deprivation of all society amongst them; (3) that those primary bonds which render this society harmful make it at the time easily capable of improvement so that all its members may derive their happiness from that which actually constitutes their misery, and change the state of war which prevails among them, into an abiding peace.[12]

Immanuel Kant (1795), in his *Perpetual Peace*, said:

(1) No conclusion of peace shall be held to be such, which is made with the secret reservation of the material for a future war.

(2) No state having any independent existence, whether it be small or great, may be acquired by another state, through inheritance, exchange, purchase, or gift.

(3) Standing armies shall after a time be abolished.

(4) No national debts shall be contracted in connection with the foreign affairs of the State.

(5) No state shall interfere by force in the constitution and government of another state.

(6) No state at war with another shall permit such kinds of hostility as will make mutual confidence impossible in time of future peace; such as the employment of assassins, of poisoners, the violation of capitulation, the instigation of treason, in the state against which it is making war.

(7) The first definitive article for the securing of perpetual peace—the Civil Constitution in every state shall be republican.

(8) Second definitive article for the establishment of perpetual peace—International right shall be founded on a federation of free states.

(9) All actions having relations to the rights of other men, whose maxims do not allow publicity, are unjust.[13]

In 1797 Tripoli and the United States negotiated a peace treaty signed by President Washington and confirmed in Tripoli on January 3, 1797. Here the two parties accepted arbitration, instead of war, in case of friction. Each nation agreed to abide by

[12] Scott's Introduction to Ladd's *Essay on a Congress of Nations*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

[13] Kant, *Perpetual Peace*.

the arbitration decision. The year 1815 witnessed Metternich and other reactionaries of Europe searching for peace in that great concert which at Vienna aimed at something like a League of Nations. The same year witnessed the formation of the first Peace Society of the world, entitled the "New York Peace Society," which was founded by David Lou Dodge in the month of August. In the following year, 1816, "The English Peace Society" was founded in London.

Jeremy Bentham published his *Plan for an Universal and Perpetual Peace* in 1839, and emphasized two ideas: to reduce and fix the implements of force among nations, and to regenerate dependent nations for ultimate universal peace. A common court of judicature, proposed Bentham, may be built for the decision of differences between nations, although no coercive powers should be allowed to that court. The next year, 1840, William Ladd, in his *Essay on a Congress of Nations*, published in Boston, proposed establishment of a congress of ambassadors and a court of nations composed of the most able civilians in the world. Mr. Ladd summarized his idea as follows:

> The Congress of nations is to have nothing to do with the internal affairs of nations or with insurrections, revolutions, or contending factions of people or princes, or with forms of government, but solely to concern themselves with the intercourse of nations in peace and war. 1st; To define the rights of belligerents towards each other; and endeavor, as much as possible, to abate the horrors of war, lessen its frequency, and promote its termination; 2nd; To settle the rights of neutrals, and thus abate the evils which war inflicts on those nations that are desirous of remaining in peace; 3rd; To agree on measure of utility to mankind in a state peace; 4th; To organize a Court of Nations. Those are the four great divisions of the labors of the proposed Congress of Nations.[14]

With all the anti-internationalism of Hitler today, we must not

[14] Scott's introduction to Ladd's *Essay on a Congress of Nations*. Copyrighted. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, pp. xxxix and xliii.

forget that in 1848, yearning for peace, the German Parliament moved:

> That as armed peace, by its standing armies, imposes an intolerable burden upon the people of Europe and endangers civil freedom, we therefore recognize the necessity of calling into existence a Congress of Nations, for the object of effecting a general disarmament of Europe.[15]

On January 8, 1849, the National Assembly of France submitted:

> Seeing that war between nations is contrary to religion, humanity, and public well-being, the French National Assembly decrees: First Article—the French Republic proposes to the governments and Representative Assemblies of different States of Europe, America, and other civilized countries, to unite by their representation in a Congress which shall have for its object a proportional disarmament among the powers, the abolition of War, and a substitution for that barbarous usage, of an Arbitral jurisdiction of which the said Congress shall immediately fulfil the functions.[16]

From France to America is no great distance, as world relations go, and four years in the history of mankind is nothing at all. Thus, in 1853, under the urge of Mr. Tuck in the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate of the United States made the following resolution:

> That war is an evil of stupendous magnitude in its effects upon the physical welfare of mankind, no one can deny who regards and reasons upon incontrovertible facts. Nations, by a reference of their disputes to arbitrators, might reasonably calculate that, however onerous the award, its fulfilment would not cost as much as the resort to war. If its execution presents a burden somewhat oppressive, still that which would be sad-

[15] Sumner, *The War System of the Commonwealth of Nations*, p. 83.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

dled upon the people by war, in all probability would be more grievous. It sometimes happens that the "point of honor" between nations seems to demand immediate action, and a blow is given without time for deliberation. The nation struck resents, and war is the consequence. Treaty stipulations requiring arbitration would be a salutary remedy in such a case. The point of honor would then consist in adhering to the treaty.[17]

During the month of May, 1872, Senator Sumner brought be-
›re the United States Congress for approval a proposal for,

> the establishment of an international tribunal before which any questions or agreement which might be the occasion of war or of misunderstanding between nations could be considered; a tribunal whose true character should be such that its authority and completeness as a substitute for war may not be impaired, but strengthened and upheld to the end that civilization may be advanced and war be limited to its sphere.[18]

To wind up the cataloguing of the peace moves and the over-
ures in behalf of world harmony made in the nineteenth century
t is necessary to mention, briefly, (1) the Universal Post Union
naugurated at Berne, Switzerland, in 1874, after the Franco-
?russian War; (2) the first Pan-American Conference in 1889,
ıeld in Washington; (3) the 1890 Brussels meeting of seventeen
ıations in the interest of suppression of the slave trade in Africa;
(4) the First Hague Conference, initiated by the Czar of Russia
in 1899 for the consideration of arms limitation and the promo-
tion of general world peace through international laws and rules;
(5) the formulation by twenty-eight nations of an international
navigation code in 1899.

The above is by no means an exhaustive list, but space limitation precludes its extension. Besides, there are the important cases of our own present and pregnant twentieth century which must be noted. We shall mention first the agreement among thirteen

[17] Cory, *Compulsory Arbitration*. Copyrighted. Columbia University Press, p. 13.

[18] World Peace Foundation, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 10.

nations for the suppression of the white slave traffic, 1904; the creation of the International Institute of Agriculture, with its seat at Rome, 1905; the institution of the International Red Cross program, 1906; and the initiation of the international code for the use and control of wireless telegraphy about the same time.

In 1910, President Taft said: "I do not see any more reason why matters of national honor should not be referred to a court of arbitration than matters of property or matters of national proprietorship," [19] and in his letter of December 14, 1910, Andrew Carnegie, creating the Carnegie Endowment, states his noble purpose:

> To hasten the abolition of international war, the foulest blot upon our civilization. Although we no longer eat our fellow men, nor torture prisoners, nor sack cities, killing their inhabitants, we still kill each other in war like barbarians. Only wild beasts are excusable for doing this in this twentieth century of the Christian era, for the crime of war is inherent since it decides not in favor of the right, but always of the strong. The Nation is criminal which refuses arbitration and drives its adversary to a tribunal which knows nothing of righteous judgment. Honor is the most dishonored word in our language. No man ever touched another man's honor; no nation ever dishonored another nation; all honor's wounds are self-inflicted.[20]

Cozier, in his 1914 plan, submitted to President Wilson on August 18, 1918, proposed,

> A new, separate, and supreme Government of Governments created and controlled by civilized nations of the world on the representative plan. They delegate none of their sovereign powers to the Nation of Nations, but individual nations agree to limit themselves. That is all there is to it, except that each nation financially is to support the international police power and equip it with ample and suitable means for protecting and supporting nations against the wanton attacks of other nations.

[19] *World Peace Foundation*, April, 1911, Part II, p. 17.
[20] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *Year Book*, 1936, letter on p. 1.

Each nation is to elect its equitable portion of the members of the Supreme Senate of the Nation of Nations, so that it will be fully represented in the conduct and management of the Government of Governments.[21]

In 1916 the American Institute of International Law declared:

(1) Every nation has the right to exist, and to protect and conserve its existence; but this right neither implies the right nor justifies the act of the state to protect itself or to conserve its existence by the commission of unlawful acts against innocent and unoffending states.

(2) Every nation has the right to independence in the sense that it has a right to the pursuit of happiness and is free to develop itself *without* interference or control from other states, provided that in so doing it does not interfere with one or violate the rights of other states.

(3) Every nation is in law and before law the equal of every other nation belonging to the society of nations, and all nations have the right to claim and . . . to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them.

(4) Every nation has the right to territory within defined boundaries and to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over its territory, and all persons whether native or found therein.

(5) Every nation entitled to a right by the law of nations is entitled to have that right respected and protected by all other nations, for right and duty are correlative, and the right of one is the duty of all to observe.

(6) International law is at one and the same time both national and international: national in the sense that it is the law of the land and applicable as such to the decision of all questions involving its principles; international in the sense that it is the law of the society of nations and applicable as such to all questions between and among the members of the society of nations involving its principles.[22]

Later the Fabian Society made an international living-together plan whereby an International High Court, an International

[21] Cozier, *Nation of Nations*, p. 95, Steward and Kidd, Cincinnati, Ohio.
[22] Scott, *Peace Through Justice*. Copyrighted, American Peace Society.

Council, and an International Secretariat should function to settle judicable issues between nations, and on January 8, 1918, President Wilson presented his famous Fourteen Points, and in his "Four Principles" enumerated in Congress February 11, 1918, he explained:

> 1. That each part of final settlement must be based upon the essential justice of that particular case, and upon such adjustments as are most likely to bring a peace that will be permanent;
>
> 2. That peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were chattels or pawns in a game, even the great game, now forever discredited, of the *balance of power;* but that .
>
> 3. Every territorial settlement involved in this war must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the population concerned, and not as a part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims amongst rival States; and
>
> 4. That all well-defined national aspirations shall be accorded them without introducing new or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonism that would be likely in time to break the peace of Europe, and consequently of the world.

On June 28, 1919, the European powers signed the Treaty of Versailles, intended to guarantee peace, and containing the Covenant of the League of Nations. A year later, forty-two nations gathered at Geneva at the League of Nations. "Lauded and abused, defended and condemned, relegated to the dead and praised as the great hope of the future, the Geneva League of Nations suggests the words of Schiller's Prologue to *Wallenstein's Camp:* 'By party favor and by hate confused, his image staggers down through history.' " [23]

President Harding waxed dramatic during the closing of the Washington Conference of 1921, saying:

> Gathered around this table nine great nations of the earth . . . have met and have conferred on questions of great import

[23] Herbert Kraus, *Germany in Transition*, p. 75.

and common concern, on problems menacing their peaceful relationship, on burdens threatening a common peril. In the revealing light of the public opinion of the world, without surrender of sovereignty, without impaired nationality or affronted national price, a solution has been found in unanimity, and today's adjournment is marked by rejoicing in the things accomplished. . . . There were no victors to command, no vanquished to yield. All had voluntarily to agree in translating the conscience of your civilization and give concrete expression to world opinion.[24]

On October 16, 1925, seeking the shortest route to the citadel of peace, the world powers, "anxious to satisfy the desire for security and protection which animates the peoples upon whom fell the scourge of the war of 1914–1918," signed the Locarno Pact.[25] They signed the Pact of Paris on August 27, 1928, to outlaw physical combat, and in 1932, Germany, Belgium, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Japan, Italy, and France held the Lausanne Conference, agreeing to reduce the World War I reparations to a point within the paying ability of the debtor powers.[26]

On May 16, 1933, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, appealing to the fifty-four nations, said:

> The way to disarm is to disarm. The way to prevent invasion is to make it impossible. I have asked for an agreement among nations on four practical and simultaneous steps:
>
> First, that through a series of steps the weapons of offensive warfare be eliminated;
>
> Second, that the first definite step be taken now;
>
> Third, that while these steps are being taken no action shall increase existing armaments over and above the limitations of treaty obligations. . . .
>
> Our people realize that weapons of offense are needed only if other nations have them, and they will freely give them up if all the nations of the world will do likewise.

[24] Hughes, *The Pathway to Peace*, Harper and Brothers.
[25] Preamble, The Locarno Treaty.
[26] See *International Conciliation*, No. 282, September, 1943, p. 334.

Almost ten years later Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt met to formulate the "Atlantic Charter," which sanctions the right of nations to live, each in its own way, with a due amount of economic and political security, after the war.

In the end, here is man, miserable as ever, struggling since 2800 B.C., until today, 1944 A.D., to create peace, only to find himself in the greatest war ever known in history. It seems that we have no confidence that man, even with all his amazing knowledge and technical resources, can solve the problem of peace. The ominous shadow of armed conflict has subjected man to the deepest anxiety as to what may come from all the scientific mechanisms with which he has surrounded himself.

As civilization advances, wars become more frequent, more protracted, and more destructive, and it seems to us, the observers, that "the appeal to arms," as Treitschke said, "will be valid until the end of history." [27] It seems to us that in spite of all his lip-service to peace, man subscribes to the belief that egoism is a universal biological law. It seems to us that man believes that this earth, and all that is therein, is not adequate for all the races of mankind and that the weaker groups must perish in the flames of competition and common struggle. Man, it appears, views the relics of the hecatombs of militarily weaker peoples of the world as the stepping-stones on which the "superior" class of mankind must arise. Thus war becomes the norm of our civilized world. It becomes a selective instrument between nations. For whether we believe in war or not in our theories, the fact that we have always fallen back on it as the only criterion of greatness proves that we agree with the advocates of natural selection who defend their case by showing that war has a dysgenic effect which is, on the whole, an asset to mankind.

Man has not yet shown that he can live as a peaceful animal, even though he realizes the unsatisfactory logic of the selectionists. Neither history nor ethnology has yet supplied us with data for a closely reasoned argument to establish conclusions that wars

[27] Treitschke, quoted by F. W. Coker, *Recent Political Thought*, D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., New York, 1934.

in the past have elevated rather than degenerated the general trend of civilization. There is no proof yet that success in wars has been due to superiority in the virtues of the conquerors. We have no data even to generalize that military conquest has spread civilization on earth. Evidence is lacking to support the claim that displacement of "backward" peoples by "advanced" peoples is an inevitable result of the latter's higher efficiency and fecundity. Today the students of biology generally repudiate the interpretation of the theory of natural selection as meaning that war is a normal and indispensable phenomenon in the relations between states. On the contrary, they hold that the doctrine of natural selection serves only to show how the survivors have succeeded by adapting themselves to the conditions of survival. That does not mean that the method of adaptation must be by war of everybody against everybody. They do not mean that conflict is better than coöperation between those that struggle to survive.

Man cannot help himself by words alone. The way to do something is to have it done. Many centuries of talk about peace have left man with more frequent wars than ever, and of increasing cost and destruction. What, then, is the moral underscoring the persistence of war in the midst of a persistent and continuous peace offensive? And where do we go from here?

The answer to these questions, it seems to me, lies in the argument which, as I mentioned before, forms the thesis of this chapter. The point is that peace treaties of themselves cannot and will not obviate war or safeguard peace. Treaties as such are not their own dynamic, and cannot be expected to play the part of an internal-combustion engine, generating its own power and setting all the necessary belts and wheels in motion. Even this type of machinery is not independent of human direction toward final ends and aims and destinations. The chauffeur, the conductor, the pilot, are necessary to successful operation.

For the organization and establishment of perpetual peace, even more than the above is "required reading." Not only must men draw up treaties in the letter, but the great principles of which treaties never fail to be the expression must also be carried out

actively and thoroughly by men, in the spirit in which they are set forth. An entirely new approach to the establishment of peace is needed: the powers-that-be must in the future avoid the illusion, the mirage-in-the-desert illusion which has led them persistently to repeat old methods, old procedures, old formulas, and old arguments which have taken them nowhere and have instead led the rest of the world from one catastrophe to another. Second and more important: the principle of the "interest of all" involving the "representation of all" must be lifted out of the morass of mere lip-service into the realm of hard fact, namely, that no duplicity in international affairs will survive beyond the duration or power of its own crooked motivation.

Surely it is a chronic illusion to think that "more-favored nations" treaties and clauses have anything better in them than the germs of confusion and chaos. Surely it is fantastic to believe, and hope, that the interests of the conquerors and the so-described "principal" nations are the end-all and be-all of any peace conference, and that, these taken care of, naught remains but for the rest of the world to fall in step behind their "leaders." How can they hold a Berlin Conference and an Algeciras Conference, involving the fate of Africa but not of Africans, and then expect peace—even "peace in our time"—to follow from it? How can our leaders today lead a sovereign people of more than four hundred million population in colonial countries into war, out of war, and into war again, without consultation and without consent, and then expect peace—any kind of peace—to follow? Must we make Brest-Litovsk treaties all the time, and Alsace-Lorraines out of all small countries? How many Clemenceaus are going to be allowed to crucify how many Woodrow Wilsons for how long? Are these things the foundations of the perpetual peace of which they talk interminably, but for which they work not and in which they do not really believe?

Peace with security will never become a reality, but will remain a theme and a theory for philosophic dissertations and pulpit effusions—the while humanity perishes in its own battle-blood—unless the principle of the interest of all is given substance by

the true representation of all. For power-politics and the philosophy of force have failed miserably and discredited themselves in progressive disastrousness; while the struggle between right and might, which is the same as the struggle between freedom and empire, continues unabated from Pericles to Churchill. Lin Yutang (studying Thucydides) says,

> *Greece perished because she failed to solve the problem of empire versus freedom.* European civilization must also perish if it fails to solve the problem of empire versus freedom. Unlike Nostradamus, we cannot foretell how perdition will come about. But the by-plays of the conflict of forces and the episodes and the different phases of development, which may take generations for us but are only moments in the eyes of God or of mankind's history, will be essentially the same as those that brought about the suicide of the Greek world.[28]

Therefore, while we wait to see the final days of this war, when the United Nations shall emerge triumphant over the forces of tyranny and sit at the peace conference to decide the destinies of nations, may the leaders heed Kant's maxim that "No conclusion of peace shall be held to be such, which is made with the secret reservation of the material for a future war." [29] We hope that they follow wholeheartedly the path of a successful peace dominated by a broad and inclusive view of life in one world. Any other peace offensive with the doctrine of "we" or "they" in terms of nationality, race, or creed will be guilty of a "limited view" which our peace terms have been subjected to for generations. But man can broaden his view, enlarge his interest, humanize his doctrines, and concretize the principle of universal brotherhood in his international relation for the sake of peace rather than plunge the future generations into the tragic handicaps of *the limited view.*

[28] Lin Yutang, *Between Tears and Laughter*, New York, The John Day Company, 1943, p. 24.
[29] Immanuel Kant, *op. cit.*

The Citizens of the World

WHO ARE THE citizens of the world? By that phrase, I mean those men and women, who, in such a time of spiritual imbecility and moral degradation as ours, can act the prophet to their own generation. I use the word "prophet" advisedly. The prophet has specific qualities and anticipates certain things from society. He must be rigorous, aloof (even though he is in the society), inflexible, alert, and impersonal. To accomplish his aims within the society, he must be capable of humble disposition and of noble indignation. He must be ready to ignore the scorn of the ignorant masses and the pressure of the privileged men. He must understand the ultimate values for which he stands and toward which he wants to direct the society. Those values must be dynamic—things that satisfy tomorrows and not the limited worship of the transient satisfaction of todays.

History has a list of men of this caliber. Socrates acted a prophet to his generation, and yet lived not in the todays of his time but rather lived in the future. His life was devoted to Athens, and yet the Athenians put him to death. His ironical life was consumed in the service of the eternal. He was a serious moralist who, although he spent almost all of his time in Athens, was yet a citizen of the world. Woodrow Wilson—a soul of all times—is another example of a world citizen who sacrificed his life in the service of the eternal. Like Socrates his generation understood him not. He was called ambitious, eccentric, idealist, and all that. To the renascent barbarians Woodrow Wilson was vague and foolish. The compass of his mind was too wide and too noble for the many small minds and circumscribed souls of his day. His "Four Principles" were ignored; his "Fourteen Points" were ridi-

culed. European diplomats termed him "undiplomatic," and his own Americans found it difficult to comprehend his language. He died, but he is living again—and shall live for all time—a citizen of the world.

These men compelled the attention of their contemporaries to the vital questions of those ultimate values for which men live. They saw life as a chain of connected and inter-related movement punctuated with a continual change. They were not afraid of change. Rather they asked: Why do men live and what do they live for? They showed that life is synonymous with service and forgetfulness of self: living beyond egoism. They indicted idle reliance on patriotism alone; to them patriotism was not enough.

Among a number of contemporary world citizens may be mentioned Henry Wallace. Our "practical" men have already ridiculed him for suggesting, by implication, that Hottentots should be given quarts of milk after the war, just as will the children of Europe. It was in the same way that Woodrow Wilson was ridiculed when he preached equality and democracy. And Mahatma Gandhi is another contemporary world citizen. Now we say shamelessly that his non-violence principle is anachronistic; but we rarely stop to remember that we who adore Christ today appreciate him for scolding Peter when the latter cut Malchus' ear. We also think that Christ was wonderful because on the Cross he said: "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do." We want to be called Christians today, yet we condemn those of Gandhi's eternal principles which Christ practiced.

The inability of man to see the heights of his contemporary is a historical axiom. The reason is not far to seek. Marzieh Gail, a young Persian writer, gives the best answer to it by saying:

> When a man appears calling himself a Messiah, he does not look as people expect him to look. There is no light around his head—the light is added by painters long after he has died. He eats, walks, talks. He comes from a community where he has been known for years. And when he suddenly announces him-

> self as a prophet, as one with a new message . . . his community laughs at him. . . . The laughter grows to anger. Why is he so obstinate in his claim, this man they have known since he was a child? A few listen to him and bear the hatred of the rest. The laughter stops. The hatred rises. The prophet is shut away —chained—perhaps killed. But his voice goes on. People far away listen to it. Then painters draw the circle of light back of the head that is now earth, and men and women across the world build temples in the name of the man whose own people put him to death.[1]

Such is the fate of those who act as prophet to their own generation. The citizens of the world must therefore develop an attitude to meet the affronts of their contemporaries—their inertia and cynicism. This spirit of vigilance can make us free from illusions. Dr. McLlyar H. Lichliter enumerated the kind of illusions I have in mind as the illusion of optimism, the illusion of the normal, and the illusion of an easy process of change.

The illusion of optimism must be overcome. The citizens of the world cannot destroy the evils of the age and the inertia of the teeming millions by merely denying them. The path through which to move is dangerous—not much hope or prospect is in sight. The number of people who see the world as a single whole, those who sincerely want to see human beings share in the bounties of the earth after this war, and at all times, are indeed very much smaller than we should like to imagine. But the bedrock upon which the citizens of the world stand is their spirit of independence, their ability to resist suppression, and their capacity to remain happy without many friends. Pessimism is not to be the outlook, but the illusion that the battle will be in our favor without great sacrifice is to be avoided. Like the "elite" of Harold J. Laski, the citizens of the world I have in mind must accept that "life at best is a battlefield where the first obligation is offensive."

The illusion of the normal is another dangerous situation which must be eliminated. Some may think now that after this war things are going to take their usual course, and the good old life

[1] "A Symposium," a Bahai Press Publication.

will all come back again. But the reality of the future is that things will be anything but the same. We may get a worse world or a better international order. But there must be a change. The citizens of the world will be on the lookout for the change. There may be a radical departure in the economic order. Social norms affecting racial and religious classes may be appreciably changed. We may enter into the century of the "common man." The world may come to its senses and make radical changes in the present ineffective international law system. Who knows? It may be that man may decide to act the beast once again, and plunge our future generation into another cataclysmic era. The function of the world citizens is to be vigilant in pointing out the ultimate values, asking the ultimate question: What do human beings live for? They must not allow themselves to be drifted away by the urgency of the mob pressure. Rather they will always put the question before the crowd: Where do we go and why? The change is bound to come. There is nothing like back to normalcy. Our attitude must be geared to the inevitability of the change and to the rôle which the world citizens have to play in order to keep ablaze the burning light of human brotherhood. The nature of change can thereby be controlled.

The illusion of an easy process of change cannot be overcome unless we look back to see that any great changes in history were marked by great sacrifices. The change from feudal autocracy to constitutional monarchy was not an easy task. The change from slave economy to legitimate trade created a great tension and civil wars. Change from imperialism to internationalism is not going to be easy. Change from localism to globalism cannot be expected to be made merely at the price of talking. Transition from one sanctioned social order to another takes great devotion, strength, determination, and sacrifices. Worshipers of tradition and contemporary institutions are not fit for such a pioneer work. But it is manworthy. It was Harold J. Laski who said that "No great fight has ever been won save where men and women were prepared to be militant about the ideas they held. Christianity did not conquer the empire by hiding its light under a bushel."

World citizens must be ready to speak out against the causes of our present unrest. There are so many things to be cut from the rock; racial discrimination, religious intolerance, anti-semitism, imperialism, or colonialism, unbridled economic inequalities, and the problem of empire versus freedom. These are some of the most pressing issues of our time. From them stem out all the causes of this war and the wars yet to come.

Now we are clear as to the functions of the citizens of the world. But the citizens of the world have many allies on their side. Nature testifies their cause. Time sanctions their belief. Present cricumstances raise a voice in plea for them. All the evidence of history points to the rightness and even the inevitability of their prediction. The trans-nationality of the world is more clearly apprehended today than ever before.

In other words, we are living in a new age—the age of science, and as J. H. Breasted puts it in his *The New Past:*

> the result of science is to illustrate, emphasize, and increase the interdependence of men and nations. This revelation through science of interdependence and unity arises from the very nature of science itself. Science is not interested in individuals. . . . Every scientific law that is discovered is a new revelation of unity and draws nature into a new community life while it makes the world about us smaller as each new likeness is revealed.

The unity that pervades the physical world as revealed by science has been revealed in the universal social world. We cannot at present divorce ourselves from the results of what happens in other continents. History has given expression to this unity of our world. We have seen that an event in one section of the world has its repercussion throughout the whole world. All particularly important periods of history have produced world-wide stimuli, although we seem to overlook this fact. The concept of a united world cannot be realized without a full recognition of the fact that the world has always breathed, lived, and functioned as a unit. Was it an accident that, in the sixth century B.C., after

the Jews had returned from captivity led by the prophet Ezra, Judaism was reformed; that about the same time Sadducees sprang from the Pharisees through the influence of Persian thought; that Pythagoras, the father of Greek philosophy, was born; that the same era witnessed the birth of Lao Tsu, the founder of Taoism; that Confucius, the architect of Confucianism, flourished; that Shaka, the greatest Buddhist of India, lived; that Zoroaster, the sage of Persia, also lived?

Is it a mere coincidence that at the same time Christ was born to preach His gospel of goodwill, challenging the social order of His time, Amida Buddha was born in the Middle East while Mingti's vision was pregnant with his dream which culminated in the introduction of Buddhism in the Far East? Who can conceive that Gandhi of India, Lenin of Russia, Sun Yat-sen of China, Azikiwe of Africa, all of whom live in this age, are mere accidents of time and place? Do they not face identical universal problems, even though their locations are far and wide? Are their respective philosophies not expressive of a reaction against a universal stimuli? Are they all not the products of unfortunate blind imperialism created by the forces of the present system of commercialism? Are they all not consciously or unconsciously resisting the forces of the impositions of a government-supported, indifferent, economic method? In common reaction, do not the people of Russia brand religion "the opium of the people," and deify Lenin? Is Sun Yat-sen not becoming another Confucius in China? Is not Gandhi the living soul and spirit of modern India? Is Azikiwe not the youthful and accepted prophet of the New Africa today? Why do these men appear on the scene of action at the same time, and why is their message to the world identical? The answer is that outstanding events in culture do not occur at isolated periods, although they may appear to be far apart geographically. Historic events are entirely unaware of any absolute of space or time such as our unmathematical sensory impressions tend to impose upon our imagination. Historic events can co-exist simultaneously, although other observers may think they exist differently in time.

Our world is therefore trans-national. When cotton- and tobacco-growing increased in America, slave-trading increased in Africa. When the Industrial Revolution pervaded Europe, and the quest for raw materials grew intense, the whole world found itself on the eve of a new era in human civilization. Not only Europe, but also America, Asia, and Africa began to witness this empire of mind and industry, which has penetrated the whole world, planting its cities as it goes, binding the whole together by the railroad and telegraph, until the thing we call civilization has drawn the isolated communities of the old regime into a greater world organism, with its afferent and efferent nerves of news and capital reaching to its finger tips in the markets of the frontier. A nickel spent for thread in Uganda sets the spindles going in Manchester. Fellaheen by the Nile may be starving because the cigarette factories are building marble palaces for their owners on the banks of the Hudson.[2]

In cultural development, do we need a great deal of argument to prove that the cultural life of every people, yellow or brown, is interwoven with that of the rest of the world? Let us consider Christianity as a form of accepted religion in the Western world today. Could the people of Israel have conceived the idea of one God, if they had not been influenced by the African country of Egypt where they were slaves at the time when Egypt itself was pregnant with the "One God" idea which King Ikhnaton introduced? Wandering about, despised and rejected, bruised and beaten, yet always wandering on, the people of Israel developed the idea of God by narrowing down His fatherhood solely to their own race, until the advent of a different thinking Jewish son—Christ. He saw God as a universal father of universal brothers—a return to the original idea of Ikhnaton of Egypt, who had lived many centuries before Christ. And at this point, the son of Tarsus, the erudite Paul, introduced the Christian doctrine to the Gentiles and, in consequence, Europe was awakened from her

[2] J. T. Shotwell, "The Industrial Revolution" (Lecture at Teachers College, Columbia University).

spiritual slumber of centuries. But today (such is the irony of history), the spreading of the same Christianity comes from the West to the East, where its founder was born. The world is trans-national. Cultures have no home. Ideas have no relation to space and time as absolute entities. The philosophy of isolationism is anachronistic.

This view of trans-nationalism is the theme of those who are qualified to be the citizens of the world. It is their mission to the renascent barbarians who have eyes but see not. The bell tolls in no uncertain terms that the scheme of the world is not completed by ending our plans with our particular countries. The vital questions are: How dearly must we cherish the knowledge we gain today from our spiritless isolation in a trans-national world? Shall we not prepare our minds to control the future by obeying the laws of nature? Shall we be content to live in an age which feels its scheme completed? Or shall we play a humble part like

. . . those humble men of heart
With no completed scheme,
Content to play a modest part,
To test, observe and dream,

Till out of chaos come in sight
Clear fragments of a Whole;
Man learning nature's ways aright,
Obeying, can control? [8]

Man in his action as a part of the multitude, has no time to reflect on what he does, consequently he fails to appreciate the limitations of his final decisions on matters of social importance. He does not want to subject himself to the pains of discipline involved in constant suspension of judgment which alone makes the citizen of the world free from the ties of provisional conclusions. Man is obliged to be active about the convictions he holds. But it may be necessary to revise the fundamentals of these convictions in the light of experience. Experience has shown man

[8] Hilfield Dorset.

that interest in families and clans and principalities are not enough, and hence we have the doctrine of nationalism. Now, experience is sounding clear that nationalism is not enough. It is well and good to be a citizen of Nigeria, but it is not enough to confine our interest to the citizens of Nigeria. The prisoner of his own environment is fanatical in preaching his local "isms." This is very dangerous today. And the task of those who are already world citizens is not easy in any way.

Courage is necessary. The poisonous scent of the blind nationalists must be carefully wiped out from the minds of the future generation. The citizens of the world need not develop any party or organization to oppose other parties and organizations. Like the elite of H. J. Laski, they

> could grow without organization and influence without ceremonial. It would be a priesthood without a church, a religion without theology. By harnessing the noblest of human emotions—the love of freedom—to service of intelligence it would direct through society a stream of tendency which would seek insistently to place first things first. It would not clamor for recognition which incurs the odium of vanity; nor would it search for security which perverts all loyalty to ideals. . . . Its members could go quietly about their daily lives, an unconscious brotherhood who found one another only in the mysterious alchemy of kindred devotion.[4]

The hope in the citizens of the world is evidence of a continued confidence in man. It indicates that although the war is on, and man has been criticized for his barbarity, there still looms a ray of hope that among men can be found those whose hearts beat at the suffering of the oppressed; those whose sympathy goes wherever man is under the yoke of the ruthless forces of another man. Our future generation has some people to depend upon—the citizens of the world. The coming generation in oppressed countries of Europe can depend on this great and legitimate faith.

[4] Harold J. Laski, "The Elite in a Democratic Society," *Harper's Magazine*, September, 1933.

The African youth have a rendezvous with life in the strength of this conviction.

This new confidence in man is not based on vague assumptions, for in all countries one can point out some of these great world citizens. Sometimes we do not recognize them among us. Pearl S. Buck, Wendell L. Willkie, Eleanor Roosevelt, Henry Wallace, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harold J. Laski, Hewlett Johnson, Joseph Stalin, J. Nehru, Emperor Haile Selassie, Madam Chiang Kai-shek are among our contemporaries who have lifted up their countries from the sin of seclusion. Their struggle against the odds are well known, but their stars illuminate the hearts of millions everywhere. They exemplify the true spirit of dauntless courage which is so necessary in our time. They have aroused the sleeping peoples of the earth to the pressing questions of the day. As I have consistently said, they do not fight against peoples and persons and objects—they fight for and against principles in terms of their intrinsic and extrinsic values relative to human existence and happiness.

What then can prevent the citizens of the world from becoming more militant and vigilant? The effort is worth the price. The battle is a battle of self-preservation, an enduring self-defense against future wars—it is a direction toward a new avenue to freedom. Man shall cease to think as "I" but as "We," and nations shall mold their destinies in terms of the destinies of other nations as a final condition of unconditional security. Here lies the reward of the world citizens—that security is not local but global, and that man at last is able to see himself as an agent of faith in himself and his fellow man anywhere in the world.

CHAPTER XXIV

Without Bitterness

We come to the end of this work, and I feel it a duty to point out the ultimate bases upon which *Without Bitterness* is written. It is written out of a clear consciousness of the nature of things in regard to Africa and to the world. It is not in anyway a defense, for I have a great belief that an ordinary pen cannot defend Africa. The continent itself is a monument; it is nature's work and therefore its own interpreter; it is perfect within itself. No history of world civilization can be told without remembering Africa. The depth of its antiquity, the height of its culture, the immensity of its treasure, the character of its people, the story of its torture, its rise and decline, are too much for my limited mind and knowledge to comprehend—let alone to interpret to others. The kind of writing which will portray Africa truly and place it within a proper frame must remain to the pens of African Gibbons.

But I have endeavored to show that although Africa needs no interpreter of my limited talent, yet the Western world must be made to realize that the African soul is a living thing, and that the past and present conditions in Africa can no longer be viewed without concern. Since this war began, I have turned up the pages of pamphlets, read recommendations of commissions, individual solutions, newspaper comments, and listened to radio discussions about the present and post-war world, but I have found nobody in anyway seriously concerned with the humanity in Africa. Can it be that my Africa is without brothers?

Out of the land area of the globe, Africa covers about twelve million square miles. The population of the indigenous inhabitants is over one hundred seventy million; yet only about seven

hundred seventy-five thousand square miles, populated by twenty-two million people, are ruled directly by Africans of different ethnic origins. The rest of the continent—or shall I say the whole of the continent?—is painted in an atlas in the nice, gleaming colors which designate different European powers. It is the eighth wonder of the world that such a huge giant as Africa could be controlled, cajoled, threatened, and enslaved by comparatively tiny Europe.

But the purpose of this book has not been to dwell on a comparison of Europe and Africa in terms of the evil that one has done to the other. Rather, I have tried to point out that imperialism in Africa has done much wrong to the rights of man in Africa, and that it has come to that point at which the arrow must leave the bow: the point at which imperialism must stop, or else all of us will have to accept the impending catastrophe which will result from a revolutionary era in the post-war Africa. Actually post-war Africa means the Africa of today. And the danger of the upheaval is too great to be minimized or exaggerated.

Looking at the world as a whole and forgetting Africa for a moment, it seems that the forces of evil against right have been no worse there than elsewhere. Japan has done her worst to impose force upon her Asiatic neighbors. Germany has virtually enslaved all of Europe except Russia and Great Britain. South American dictatorships are only recently using a softer tone. The racial problem ravages the United States. Within Africa itself there are classes of outcasts and free citizens. In India, apart from British imperialism, social castes are still maintained. These things indicate that the wrong done to the African people is akin to that practiced elsewhere in some measure. But the difference in the question of Africa lies in the fact that the wrong there seems to be accepted by the rest of the world as a normal thing. Nobody ever reckons with it; there seems to be no alarm.

It must be granted that a few people have discussed the problems of post-war Africa. But the general tone is that while the European states, now incapable of governing themselves because

they are under Hitler, should be granted their former independent governments, the African countries must continue to be worked into a scheme of European control. That is considered by many as giving Africa a break! And the people of Africa, with their sense of dignity and self-respect, are supposed to be thankful for such a solution.

In other words, there is a tacit assumption by the Western world that the African peoples are yet incapable of governing themselves. Yet Thomas Jefferson is still asking everyone of us this question: "Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question." Jefferson had confidence in the people; American democracy may be said to be synonymous with a people's sovereignty as opposed to a benevolent despot.

And most writers, including Americans, seem to believe that a benevolent despotism, while a bad business, will yet for the present do for Africa. I wonder how anyone can imagine that European countries, which obviously have failed to control themselves or to live in peace, can bring peace to another people. Nobody can give what he does not possess. Europe has no peace. By and large it is the scene of greater chaos than is found in all the other continents. How, then, can we entrust millions of souls in Africa to the hands of those unable to manage their own affairs?

Why must we worry lest African countries left alone will become prey to other countries? To which countries will Africa be prey? Evidently only to certain European countries. So, in the last analysis, the trouble continues to lie with European countries. They lack the necessary discipline to achieve that true neighborliness essential to a permanent peace. It is not that Africa is "backward," but that Europe has no "discipline."

There is no need to love Africa as though it were an infant which we are afraid to trust without a nurse. Jefferson, in considering peoples and their rights said, "if we think them not en-

lightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education." But most of the time the Western world justifies withholding control from the African peoples as a remedy for what is termed "immaturity" in African political experience.

Without Bitterness has not been written only to point out these unfortunate aspects of the situation, but also to focus our attention on the fact that these and similar problems of the post-war era cannot be solved *with* bitterness. But a good heart alone cannot remove bitterness, if no action is taken to eliminate the factors that harbor it. It will be an illusion to imagine that bitterness can be blotted out when someone is being continually hurt.

Africa knows what wrongs have been inflicted upon her, but she feels that these things can be forgiven and forgotten. But to forgive and forget implies that others must repent. A new sense of relationship and duty has to be developed, and a new discipline introduced.

It is only without bitterness that our world of tomorrow can find salvation for itself. When the war is over, and the United Nations triumph over Germany and Japan, the solution to an enduring peace will be found in an attitude that has no acrimony.

It is true that I shall join the band of those who would educate the African youth, and I know that the type of education that is safe for our peace is the education that has no bitterness in it. Whatever the relationship of Great Britain and Nigeria, I shall oppose that Nigerian who strives to develop bitterness against England and her people, just as I equally shall oppose any Englishman who is vengeful toward Nigeria and the Nigerians.

The Atlantic Charter contains elements that may lead to a world that has no bitterness. How far it will be applied will determine whether history has taught us anything about the bitterness that stemmed from 1918.

Without Bitterness has simply tried to point out that the growing spirit of revenge that is taking its final shape among the

African people (a fact, even though we may refuse to accept it now) can be redirected into a better channel by beginning now to give Africa her legitimate place without waiting for her to demand it. A spirit of hate is gradually taking that form which I fear ever to see in Africa. I am one of those who hate imperialism, but I certainly cannot help confessing that humanity is more important to me than is the particular nation in which I happen to have been born. But I love my country, Nigeria. I am loyal to the kings who rule over the several states of Nigeria. In the words of Sir Donald Cameron, an "immemorial custom" has imposed that upon me, and I do not regret it. But I would rather see my love for Nigeria expressed in terms of human brotherhood and mutual faith among peoples. That is why this book has been written: to bring the whole troublesome matter to the consciousness of men and women in the Western world, as well as to help responsible Africans in their herculean task of diverting the embittered spirit of the growing youth to a saner attitude that will perpetuate peace. The West cannot accomplish this by plotting against Africa. It cannot do it by holding the key to material progress from the Africans. It cannot be accomplished by making all the world except Africa free. It can be done by showing goodwill to Africa—by accepting Africa for all that it is, and not as others have described it.

Without Bitterness, as I have said, is also an appeal to the people of Africa. The African must learn that two wrongs cannot make one right. Imperialism has wrought its dark deeds; it has imported artificial poverty into Africa; it has deprived citizens of their legitimate homes; it has taken many forms. In some cases, it has developed a complete racial barbarism as in South Africa; in others, it has taken a form of cultural and spiritual disintegration. All this is true. But European imperialism has unconsciously introduced some of the goods of mechanical civilization—railways, telephones, airplanes, automobiles, and the like. It cannot be denied that these things are conveniences which man needs. They are not, however, excuses for the denial of the right of man to live a free life. But Africa must not train the coming age to

hate Europeans because of the evils imperialism brought in the past. Our fight must be for principles and not against peoples. . . . That is why this book is written and dedicated to the heart of humanity.

The African must learn that the mechanical development of the West is not all evil—as it sometimes appears to be. There are certain great moral principles that enlarge themselves side by side with that mechanical civilization which grows by leaps and bounds in the West. Nor do I think that the East has attained the moral heights to which I refer. Western civilization, divorced of all mechanical inventions, has grasped certain great ideals which are unsurpassed by anything else yet brought by human minds. And some of those moral ideals have their origin in mechanical progress. In his writing in *Whither Mankind?* Hu Shih said, "The spiritual element in science is its skepticism, its courage to doubt everything and believe nothing without sufficient evidence," and then he adds, "but the most spiritual phase of the modern civilization of the West is this new religion which, in the absence of a better name, I shall term the religion of democracy."

Hu Shih maintains that although the spread of Western civilization in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was marked by robbery and piracy, "and under men like Drake and Hawkins, even Columbus, their glory and spoils were justly shared by state and sovereign. They had no scruples for their religion which taught love for all men, or for their morals which condemned even usury"; but he continues by saying that the eighteenth century was pregnant with the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity, and that in the middle of the nineteenth century the ideals of socialism crept into the picture. These developments are spiritual forces scarcely existent in the East.

By the above statement I do not deny that the East has developed religions which taught universal love. After all, we should remember that Christianity is an Eastern religion, and there are numerous others. But I do say that the concretization of these ideals has been carried much farther in the West than in the East.

It expressed itself in such geographically and historically diverse forms as the American Revolution, the French Revolution, and the Russian Revolution. These ideals have not been fully practiced in the West, but there is evidence that in Western institutions are the expressed faith and hope in a religion of human equality, brotherhood, and freedom. The way to find out what people really are is to see what they cherish. The really great Americans—those who are honored after their death—are those who stood and died for high ideals and high principles. That is why Abraham Lincoln and George Washington have few equals among American heroes. True, there is racial discrimination in America, but no American writer with a true American spirit has ever brought forward a leader of the Ku Klux Klan as a symbol of the American spirit. Wherever such is mentioned, it is with regret and shame, and his name is always limned among the ills of society.

I maintain that the African must be aware of some of those virtues which Western civilization has evolved. And while the African is appreciating those, the man in the West, too, should endeavor to give more substance and life to those virtues which make the West what it is. The spiritual element in science "to believe nothing without sufficient evidence," must be applied by the Western nations in post-war Africa. There is no need to believe that the African cannot govern himself when there is no true proof for that proposition. It is a *superstition* and *worship of authority* to believe any statement about Africa merely because it is an "official" statement of one of the imperial powers. That is inconsistent with that Western spirit which has long revolted against both superstition and authority.

Not seeing things eye to eye with Spengler, I have faith in continuity and in greater possibilities for the Western civilization. I believe that the resurgence of new life and new people in the East does not mean doom to the West. It does not mean conflict or hate. It simply reflects the eternal growth of humanity—the expansion of its domain over all other nature's work. Humanity has the right to infinite growth. And there is a future

for that; that future lies in our ability to live and plan without bitterness. Man can elevate himself above a wolf diplomacy, outworn power politics, and ruthless imperialism—all of which are self-destructive.

There is a hope in the future. Africa has a great zest for living and has a strong affection for its human brotherhood. I believe that all men everywhere are capable of the same passion. It is in quest of this brotherhood that *Without Bitterness* is essentially dedicated. Humanity, to survive, must acknowledge this doctrine, or perish. The citizens of the world must carry on their work of prophecy in an indefatigable spirit and with unfaltering zeal. The road may be dreary, but the conquest is ours, for no matter what happens we are marching toward a new day.

Appendix I

The Atlantic Charter

WASHINGTON, Aug. 14 (AP)—The text of the declaration agreed on by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill follows:

The President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to trade, and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

Fifth, they desire to bring the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security.

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from want and fear.

Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

Eighth, they believe that all the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, and air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential.

Appendix II

Christian Nations in Post-War Africa

Charter for the African Woman

That womanhood may enter a new world in the twentieth-century Africa, the author lists what, in his opinion, constitute the corner-stones in *the creation of a new woman for a new man in a New Africa:*

1. Woman in Africa shall share with man in a new equality in education, in political rights, in skilled work, in social status, and in culture.

2. Woman in Africa shall be allowed to form the soul of Africa's fight for freedom.

3. Woman in Africa has never shown any evidence of cowardice in times of national danger. Therefore, her strength, her contempt of death, shall be given full avenue for outlet by free access to creative occupations.

4. Woman in Africa shall be free to share in the administration of the common life.

5. Woman in Africa shall be free to vote on an equal basis with man. She shall be free to aspire to any position to which man aspires in the national life of the New Africa.

6. Woman in Africa shall be given freedom to marry or to avoid marriage. But she will be educated to the extent that she may freely avoid in African society the endemic disease of Western society, which is a "divorce complex."

7. A married woman in Africa shall be free to have as many children as she wants. This will encourage the African woman's passion for children, and at the same time assure posterity to the New Africa.

8. Woman in Africa shall be encouraged to place the greatest value on the sanctity of love and marriage.

9. Woman in Africa shall be encouraged to abide by the African tradition of family integrity, and thus produce children who have reverence for family and the community.

10. Woman in Africa shall no longer be made economically dependent on man. Husband and wife shall be dependents of each other.

11. Woman in Africa shall be educated to encourage motherhood. She shall be insured against the hazards of childbirth.

12. Woman in Africa shall have freedom to associate with men. Manphobia must be uprooted. Co-education must be encouraged by all educational institutions so that platonic love and romanticism may have a blending. There shall be, as it has always been, a purity in mutual relations between man and woman of the new destiny.

13. Woman in Africa shall have freedom to worship. No woman shall be bound to any form of religion on the ground that her husband or her family prefers that form.

14. Woman in Africa shall be free to travel all over the world in search for knowledge, in the same measure as man.

15. Woman in Africa shall be educated to say what she wants to, when she wants to, and where she wants to, without any fear of social pressure or economic strangulation.

16. Woman in Africa, when employed, shall receive exactly the same salary for the same worth as man.

17. Woman in Africa must be given the opportunity to participate more actively in the economic life of the New Africa.

When the consuming thirst for knowledge is quenched for the African woman; when her mentality is freed from all inferiority complexes occasioned by her weaker constitution; when her fear of want is removed; when her quest for new experiences and love is fully acknowledged; when all her undesirable social barriers are no more; when she feels free to participate in all phases of the cultural life; when, without blemish, the African maiden enters

into the arena, fighting for the "African Irredentism": then man and woman, as God made them, shall enjoy life together, work together, fight together, and, if need be, die together.

Appendix III

The Children's Charter

President Hoover's White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, recognizing the rights of the child as the first rights of citizenship, pledges itself to these aims for the children of America: *accordingly, the New Africa pledges these rights for her children:*

(1) For every child, spiritual and moral training to help him to stand firm under the pressure of life.
(2) For every child, understanding and the guarding of his personality as his most precious right.
(3) For every child, a home and that love and security which a home provides; and for that child who must receive foster care, the nearest substitute for his own home.
(4) For every child, full preparation for his birth, his mother receiving pre-natal, natal, and post-natal care; and the establishment of such protective measures as will make child-bearing safe.
(5) For every child, health protection from birth through adolescence, including: periodical health examinations and, where needed, care of specialists and hospital treatment; regular dental examinations and care of the teeth; protective and preventive measures against communicable diseases; the insuring of pure food, pure milk, and pure water.
(6) For every child, from birth through adolescence, promotion of health, including health instruction and a health program, wholesome physical and mental recreation, with teachers and leaders adequately trained.
(7) For every child, a dwelling place safe, sanitary, and wholesome, with reasonable provisions for privacy, free from

conditions which tend to thwart his development; and a home environment harmonious and enriching.

(8) For every child, a school which is safe from hazards, sanitary, properly equipped, lighted, and ventilated. For younger children nursery schools and kindergartens to supplement home care.

(9) For every child, a community which recognizes and plans for his needs, protects him against physical dangers, moral hazards, and disease; provides him with safe and wholesome places for play and recreation; and makes provisions for his cultural and social needs.

(10) For every child, an education which, through the discovery and development of his individual abilities, prepares him for life; and through training and vocational guidance prepares him for a living which will yield him the maximum of satisfaction.

(11) For every child, such teaching and training as will prepare him for successful parenthood, homemaking, and the rights of citizenship; and, for parents, supplementary to fit them to deal wisely with the problems of parenthood.

(12) For every child, education for safety and protection against accident to which modern conditions subject him—those to which he is directly exposed and those which, through loss or maiming of his parents, affect him indirectly.

(13) For every child, who is blind, deaf, crippled, or otherwise physically handicapped, and for the child who is mentally handicapped, such measures as will early discover and diagnose his handicap, provide care and treatment, and so train him that he may become an asset to society rather than a liability. Expenses of these services should be borne publicly where they cannot be privately met.

(14) For every child who is in conflict with society the right to be dealt with intelligently as society's charge, not society's outcast; with the home, the school, the church, the court, and the institution when needed, shaped to return him whenever possible to the normal stream of life.

(15) For every child, the right to grow up in a family with an adequate standard of living and the security of a stable income as the surest safeguard against social handicaps.

(16) For every child, protection against labor that stunts growth, either physical or mental, that limits education, that deprives children of the right of comradeship, of play, and of joy.

(17) For every rural child, as satisfactory schooling and health services as for the city child, and an extension to rural families of social, recreational, and cultural facilities.

(18) To supplement the home and the school in the training of youth, and to return to them these interests of which modern life tends to cheat children, every stimulation and encouragement should be given to the extension and development of the voluntary youth organizations.

(19) To make everywhere available these minimum protections of the health and welfare of children, there should be a district, county, or community organization for health, education, and welfare, with full-time officials, coördinating with a state-wide program, which will be responsive to a nation-wide program of general information, statistics, and scientific research. This should include:

a. Trained, full-time public health officials, with public health nurses, sanitary inspection, and laboratory workers.
b. Available hospital beds.
c. Full time public service (welfare) for the relief, aid, and guidance of children in special need due to poverty, misfortune, or behavior difficulties, and for the protection of children from abuse, neglect, exploitation, or moral hazard.

Appendix IV

Colony or Protectorate?

Colony or Protectorate—which?

Some one may say this is a purely technical point, and that it is solely for purposes of convenience that the Gold Coast is called a colony at all. But it must never be forgotten that technical points have before today been the means of saving many a wretch from the hangman's noose, and technical points have con-

signed an innocent victim to perdition. We cannot, in these circumstances, afford to minimize the importance and effect of such points. If by doing away with them, once and for all, there is shown a possibility of ensuring the safety, honour, and welfare of the body politic, we shall have accomplished more than enough. The comparative study of Her Majesty's foreign possessions accentuates the fact that our country holds a unique position upon the world-wide map of the British Empire. We know of no other place similarly situated. We labour in vain to find one spot where the people possess in their own right such a rich and unhampered legacy of liberty, freedom, and enfranchisement as we should enjoy on the Gold Coast. If the sovereignty of the people is entitled to recognition and respect, we, also, have undisputed claim to such political distinction. This undeniable status is not unknown at the Colonial Office, Downing Street, London; and, therefore, from facts which are happily historic, he wins golden opinions whoever manfully strives to bring the country in line with others; and it is just here that, as a society, we must, at all costs, maintain our individuality, come what may.

There is nothing new under the sun; but the old, old story must be rehearsed.

From Stormouth's English Dictionary—a book that has found its way to the Gold Coast through the Government—we learn that a "colony means a body of persons sent out from their native country to a distant district or a new country, in order to settle and cultivate it; the country thus settled or planted."

From Webster's International Dictionary, we read:

Colony: (1) A company of people transplanted from their Mother Country to a remote province or country, and remaining subject to the jurisdiction of the parent State, as the British *Colonies* in America.

(2) The district or colony colonized; a settlement.

(3) A company of persons from the same country sojourning in a foreign city or land; as the American *Colony* in Paris.

(4) (Natural history) a number of animals or plants living or growing together beyond their usual range.

Settlement: The act of peopling or state of being peopled; act of planting as a colony; colonization; occupation by settlers, as the settlement of a new country.

Settler: (1) One who settles, becomes fixed, established; (2) especially, one who establishes himself in a new region or a colony.

Our contention is this: If, as Aboriginals of the country, we have allowed and still do allow ourselves to be described as a colony, without transplantation or emigration, we should not resent, we cannot legitimately and reasonably resent, when we are called settlers, and the only rights sought to be conceded to us—settlers' rights!

But a colony, as you are aware, is not only so called by transplantation from the Mother-Country or by emigration alone; it is often so by treaty cession, or conquest, or transfer, or by annexation. In the archives of the Government we are supposed to be a colony by treaty cession. But there are treaty cessions *and* treaty cessions. Gibraltar, for example, was acquired by treaty cession in 1713; but the student of English history knows this much, that that rocky promontory was captured by the combined forces of England and Holland during the war of the Spanish Succession in 1704, under Sir George Rooke, and that it was after that insanguinary war that Gibraltar was ceded by the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713. It cannot, therefore, be urged that we should be treated in every respect as all countries obtained by the British Government by treaty cession. It is the incumbent duty of the members of the "Gold Coast Aborigines' Rights Protection Society" to digest inwardly the precise terms of the treaty by which the Gold Coast became part and parcel of the British Empire.

These necessary informations are set forth in the plainest possible language, as shall be seen in the Bond of Fantee Chiefs, dated March 6th, 1833; Lord Stanley's letter to Governor Hill (November 22nd. 1844); draft of an order of the Queen in Council determining the mode of exercising her acquired power and jurisdiction within the Gold Coast Colony (Osborne House, 6th day of August, 1874); the Earl of Carnarvon's letter to Governor Strahan (August 20th, 1874); "the proclamation defining the nature and extent of the Queen's jurisdiction on the Gold Coast"; British Letters Patent constituting the office of Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Gold Coast Colony, and providing for the government thereof (January 13th, 1886)—a welcome collection of which Mr. Mensah Sarbah, barrister-at-law, has most timeously embodied in his invaluable work *Fanti Customary Laws*. A careful, diligent, and intelligent perusal of these highly important documents, which form the exclusive bases of whatever

powers, authority, and jurisdiction Her Majesty exercises in the Gold Coast, will not only disclose the extent and limit of such powers, authority, and jurisdiction, but will likewise incidentally bring to the light of day in how many instances the local Government have, from time to time, infringed the law, and trespassed upon our sacred rights and privileges, thereby breaking with impunity the contract or bond betwixt us, made and provided before our alliance with the Queen, and to which Her Most Gracious Majesty most solemnly plighted her troth.

The very names or titles of King[1] Tackie of Accra, King Ghartey IV of Winnebah, King Amonoo IV of Anamabu, and King Dawuna of Christianborg are proofs, positive, irrefragable and final, if proofs were needed, that the Gold Coast could not be thought or spoken of in the same sense as Australia, the Straits Settlements, Jamaica, or, to come nearer home, Sierra Leone. The natural concession of kingship to us while Her Majesty remains the Queen of England and the Colonies is in itself significant of much. Mention anywhere else but in West Africa where kings reign concurrently with Victoria Alexandrina; and the logical inference is that Her Majesty's Government simply exists *by usage, and by the sufferance and tacit assent* of the natives of the soil.

Our rulers are our friends and nothing more—valuable acquisitions, friends in need and in deed, true friends, good friends—to use Governor Griffith's time-honoured formula, but still friends; and being friends, and nothing but friends, to seek insidiously to enslave us, to brand us with the hall-mark of conquered subjects, is to outrage good faith and commit a breach of confidence. But Punic faith is impossible to the genius of the British Constitution, and our budding ideas of British jurisprudence are fraught with peace, fair play, and justice—especially justice. From sources of information available, we learn that Elmina is the only place that may be rightly called a settlement or colony, having been founded by the Portuguese in 1481,[2] under the auspices of King John II.

[1] There has been of late years a curious tendency of describing our provincial or district Kings as *Chiefs* or *Recognized Chiefs*. This is very much to be regretted. The erroneous appellation is obviously a disturbing element in the native economy of concentric government.

[2] Some writers make out that Elmina was founded by a French Company of Dieppe and Rouen, who built the first Gold Coast fort in 1383.

We can have no objection to this statement so far as *Elmina* is concerned. The Portuguese may have founded *St. George della Mina*, but certainly not *Dina*, so that even this point can only be conceded with a very large grain of salt.

How then did we come into contact with Her Majesty's Government?

Three hundred and sixty-one years ago, in the reign of Edward IV, certain English adventurers made their first appearance on the coast in competition with the Portuguese traders already in possession. It was not until eighty-eight years after, however, when James I was King of England, that the successors of those enterprising English merchants obtained a firm footing in the country. They found their way to Grand Cormantine, where in course of time they established friendly relations with the people and built a fort, in 1624. Not being molested by the natives, they extended their borders. In process of time Europe scrambled for places on the coast where she might be permitted to trade, and so it came to pass that not only Portuguese and English, but Dutch, Danish, Swedish, French, and German merchants arrived in our midst and established forts and factories. But they proved to be treacherous specimens of European civilization. These colonists, or settlers, who will ever merit the severest censure and the utmost reprobation, repaid the kindness and hospitality of our ancestors, by making human traffic a most lucrative industry, and by deporting thousands of the people as slaves for their cotton-fields in the West Indies and America. In 1662, a charter was granted to an English company for the purpose of trading with the Gold Coast. Ten years subsequently the Royal African Company appeared on the scene, and after making some extensions and improvements on the castle at Cape Coast Castle, proceeded to build other fortifications, such as Fort James (Accra, 1662), Commenda (1681), Sekundi (1685), Dixcove (1691), Winneban (1694), and Anamabu (1753). Seventy-eight years afterwards "The African Company of Merchants" was constituted by Act of Parliament, "with liberty to trade and form establishments on the West Coast of Africa, between 20 degrees N. and 20 degrees S. Lat."

These places, known as settlements from the point of view of the natives, by reason of the Europeans who had settled in the country, were transferred seventy-one years afterwards, rightly

or wrongly, to the Crown and placed under the Government of Sierra Leone, from which they were finally separated in 1874 under the ill-starred title of the Gold Coast Colony.

In 1872, the Dutch Government exchanged their forts (fifteen in number), *and only their forts*, with Great Britain (which had prior to that taken over by purchase all the Danish forts), an action the clumsiness of which brought about the Ashanti War of 1873–74.

So, then, history establishes the fact that the term Gold Coast Colony, or Settlement, has no reference to us whatsoever as natives of the soil, but is exclusively applicable to those European merchants and followers who came to settle in the country for the purposes of trade, in years gone by. British possessions on the Gold Coast, therefore, are the actual forts dotted here and there on the littoral, *many of which are today inhabited by colonies or settlements of bats and moles*. We somehow, either through lack of intelligent appreciation of the fact, or through the peculiar conditions of scattered interests in political matters in the country, acquiesced in a sense to be called a colony, where we should have made a firm stand against the applicability of the misnomer; and thereby hangs our tale of woe. But if not a colony or settlement as natives, what then is our relationship to the British Empire? How should we be designated? There is happily another word with which we are all familiar, and which accurately explains on the face of it the position of affairs, and that is the term "protectorate." Up to the time of His Excellency Sir William Brandforth Griffith, K.C.M.G., and until quite recently, the country was officially known as the "Gold Coast Colony and Protectorate," to distinguish, let us suppose, the people inhabiting the littoral and those in the far interior. And what is a Protectorate? We refer to Webster's International Dictionary again: "The authority assumed by a superior power over an inferior or a dependent one, whereby the former *protects* the latter from invasion and *shares* in the management of its affairs."

The description portrayed in this definition suits the country and its inhabitants most admirably, and the Government should, therefore, be known as the Gold Coast Protectorate and not a colonial Government pure and simple. If we had insisted on this ancient but correct title, such anomalous Ordinances as the Native

Jurisdiction Bill, the Land Bill, 1897, the Compulsory Labour Ordinance, and others after their kind, could never have had in this country a local habitation and a name.

Hitherto our successive Governors have been leading us on a downgrade tendency in respect of our inalienable aboriginal rights; it was left, however, for the present Administration to give the stroke of policy, hence the vigorous attack of the Legislative Council to make null and void the immemorial titles of the natives to the land of their ancestors. Yet in our heart of hearts we cannot in strict justice or in reason blame our present Governor.

Sir William Maxwell hails from the Straits Settlements, or Colony—for the terms are interchangeable—on the West Coast of the Malay Peninsula to the Gold Coast Settlements, or Colony, on the West Coast of Africa. He arrives with preconceived notions and ideas. He comes fully *au courant* of those elements that constitute a colony. If he leaves one colony to administer the affairs of another colony under the same authority and power, he cannot be held as having committed an unpardonable offence if he proceeds to carry out conscientiously and faithfully the *regime* that obtains in the colony from whence he comes. He shows himself more consistent than most of his predecessors, and for taking such a bold attitude he should be worthy of our admiration and respect; for until he learns more of the peculiar history of the Gold Coast, until he is forced to admit that there must have been a reason, an irrefutable reason, why those he succeeds could not promulgate such a law as the Land Bill without detriment to the ethical code of civilized Governments, we should be charitable enough to put the very best possible construction upon all measures he may innocently introduce against our interests.

Just a word or two touching the *locus standi* of the Straits Settlements from a political standpoint. We have all the more reason to do this since His Excellency the Governor appears to be fond of making, in season and out of season, invidious comparisons between West Africans and Asiatics without any appreciable regard being paid to the number of years the formative and civilized influences that raise up one nation above another had been in active operation in the Orient before the tide broke its maiden spray over this part of the world. Our usual catalogue of sins of omission as they appear to Europeans with centuries of schooling,

discipline, and advantages of time behind them might indeed be tolerable if due consideration were given to such indispensable factors as time and tide. But enough of this, and perhaps more than enough. The Straits Settlements are:

(1) Singapore—first occupied in 1819, and finally ceded to the British Government by the Sultan of Jahore in 1824.

(2) Penang—ceded to H. M. Government of India in 1786 by the Rajah of Kedah.

(3) The Province of Wellesley—also ceded by the Rajah of Kedah in 1800.

(4) The Dindings—included in the Settlements for administrative purposes under a Resident Councillor.

(5) Malacca—captured by the English in 1795 and retained until 1818, when it was given back to the Dutch; but in persuance of the treaty in Holland in 1824, it became a British possession, the place having been exchanged for British settlements in Sumatra. We need hardly point out that there are other States, such as Perak, Selangor, Nigri Semblia, and Pahang, which by reason of the fact that they have never been conquered or ceded, are called the Protected Malay States, administered under the advice of the British Resident-General, and subject to the paramount authority of the Governor of the Straits Colony; and we take leave to submit that the case of the Gold Coast is analogous to that of the Protected Malay States, governed by native rulers as chiefs under British control.

The Legislative Court, therefore, fails to understand the pertinence of our claims to respect, and the reasons which compel a hostile attitude against any drastic Bill wherein the liberty, property, and other rights of the subject are seriously threatened.

We urge then that the Gold Coast Aborigines' Rights Protection Society, with or without the coöperation of other organizations for the protection of aboriginal races in the British Empire, must begin by claiming the rightful name of "Protectorate" for this country, and all other things will follow in time as a matter of course. *Sublata causa, tollitur effectus*—"Remove the cause and the effect is destroyed."

Such a change of front might at once secure authority for our kings and chiefs, and all coercive measures be done away with forever. Once get England to acknowledge and baptize the colony

with the old name, and their sense of the moral fitness of things would naturally induce Englishmen to afford us such protection as is consistent with our dignity and place in the Empire.

If the society omits to regard and labour this initial step, and we still continue to vegetate under the blighting name of Colony or Settlement, we may clamour, clamouring never so loudly, but nothing good will come out of the effort; the society will be, in that case, but another mountain in labour, and then this splendid organization, which we feel sure is divinely inspired, will only exist to make confusion worse confounded; but the consummation devoutly to be wished will still elude our grasp when so near to it.

We implore the society first and foremost to clear the ground by casting away the rock of offence to which we allude, lest, with mighty protestations in other directions and a loud fanfare of trumpets, the Gold Coast Aborigines' Rights Protection Society parades a great name and pretensions which, on being subjected to the test of exact logical deductions, may be found wanting; lest its precious promises of something exceedingly great may be inevitably accompanied by a performance ridiculously disproportionate.

One word of assurance. The patriotic members of the society have no need to furnish or secure arguments in justification of their name and title. We are the lineal descendants of the Aborigines of the land known as the Gold Coast. We scorn to descend into puerilities in refutation of those ill-advised deliverances which regard the natives of this country as foreigners because forsooth our forbears were immigrants from Timbuctoo or Takieman, through Mohammedan aggressions and consequent expatriation. First principles should teach us all that the Garden of Eden is the only battleground for rival claimants to acres of land in their absolute right. Such are the consolations of the exhaustive process on the last analysis. As human beings we are not sufficiently developed to create by successive *fiats* islands and capes, mountains and plains, and so on. But the English law provides sufficient *data* in support of those who by long possession lay claim to any portion or portions of our planet as their very own. We do not base our indefeasible rights on the fact that as natives we originally sprang from the soil like the products of the teeth of the dragon Cadmus slew in Boeotia. We do maintain with the emphasis of

simplicity that we are *ab origines*, and that, therefore, every inch of ground is ours and ours irrevocably, to have and to hold and to administer, and all because our ancestors were the first and earliest inhabitants of the protectorate, thousands of years ago, even before the traditional voyage of Hanno the Carthaginian to the Gold Coast. The Latins, first settling in the Apennines and afterwards in the Lower Tiber, have always been acknowledged in the history of pre-Roman Italy as *Aborigines*, and we might go on *ad infinitum* and show in what respects England, France, Germany, and other European countries could be said to be the *bona fide* possessions of the English, the French, the Germans, etc. But to what end? We are the undisputed masters of the soil, and that should suffice. Let unity of thought and unanimity of purpose prevail, and your love for the Motherland, its institutions and traditions, be without dissimulation. Above all, strain every nerve to remain loyal to the Queen, our Protector. Quit you like men, standing square to the great work before you, and with a pull, a long pull, and a pull altogether, depend upon it there is nothing that will ever be impossible to our beloved country, the Gold Coast Protectorate.

This extract is quoted from *Gold Coast Native Institutions* by Casely Hayford, Sweet and Maxwell Ltd., 1903, Appendix B, pp. 311-326.

It is intended to enlighten those who have misunderstanding or doubt as to what a Protectorate means to Nigerians and the people of the Gold Coast. Some Africans have neglected the importance of the technicality of this problem, which has or may have serious practical consequences in our political future.

Abeokuta, 139
Abyssinian mountains, 8
Achimota College, 313 - 314
Addis Ababa, 46
Adler, Alfred, 260
Africa - Basic religious and social philosophies of,
all men are not born equal, 205
asceticism, 202
atonement, 202
compromise, 203
conservatism, 204
contentment, 203
dualism of man, 199
fasting, 204
freedom of the individual, 206
happiness, 208
humour, 207
hospitality, 205
immortality, 201
man is the end: God is the means, 201
monotheism, 199
mysticism, 200
personal existence of God, 200
right to revolution, 206
sacrifice, 201
universality, 202
climate, 9
dowry, in, 261 - 262
eastern regionals, 7
geographical location of, 5
marriage in, 260 - 262
mineral resources, 10
northern coastland of, 6
northern desert regions of, 6

physical features, 6
size, 5
southern area, 7
wild life in, 10
Aggrey, kwegyir, ideas and philosophy, 288 - 293
Aggreysim Vs Zikism, 292
Aguyaragu, 74
Ahuma, Attoh (Rev), 159
Akitoya,king, 128
Alafin of Oyo, 83
Albert,Viton, 18
Alexandria, 32
Algeria,10, 266
Ali, Maher, Pasha, 32
Amenhotep Iv, 199
America,
see United States of America
Anderson, Marian, 281
Angell, Norman Sir, 190
Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of Alliance, 31 - 32
Angola, 266
Anidinma, 109
Arabs,6
Aristotle, 165
Atlantic Charter, 232, 234, 358, 270, 375
Atlantic Ocean, 5,6
Atlee, C.R., 56, 232, 236
Austin, Augustine A., 283
Awka College, 162
Azikiwe, Nnamdi, 102, 232, 235, 367, 342 - 344
personality and Character, 293 - 298

Bantus, 7
Barclay, President, 24
Barnes, H.E., 167
Barnes, Leonard, 104, 189
Baro, 72

Battle of Adowa, 53
Bauchi Plateau, 74
Baunch, Ralph 283
Bedingfield, 130
Belguim Congo, (now Zaire) 10, 36, 266
Belguim, 357
Bengula lo, king, 135
Bentham, Jeremy, 351
Benue River, 72
Berbers, 6
Bergson, 198
Berlin Conference, 14
Bethune, Mary McLeod, 279; 281
Beveridge, Senator 184
Bey, Hassan Mohmoud, 33
Bittinger, 62, 65, 66, 112
Bismarck, Otto Von, 300
Blue Nile, 8, 49
Boer War, 37, 36
Bonin O- Longare, Count, - 54
Bornu, 133
Bourdillion, Bernard Sir, 142
Breasted, J.H., 366
Britain, *see* Great Britain
British South African Company, 192
Bruce, Commodore, 128
Buck, Pearl S., 43, 244, 308, 371
Buchanan, Thomas, 22
Burns, C. Delisle, 288
Bussa, 72

Calockan, 139
Cameroon, 266
Cameron Donald, Sir, 261, 131, 376
Canada, 10
Cave, Stephen, 27
Carver Washington George, 281

Claperton, Captain, 133
Cape Province, 38 - 40
Cape Town, 37
Cape Verde, 6
Cathedral of St. George, 46
Carter, Gilbert, Sir, 131
Casablanca Conference, 24
Carnegie, Andrew, 354
Carvantes, 18
Chamberlain, Neville, 301
Chautaugua, Institute, 269
China, 155, 206
Church Missionary Society (CMS) 139
Churchill, Wiston, 232, 237, 358
Clifford, Hugh Sir, 12, 100, 131
Coatman, John. 186
Cocier, 354
Columbus 18, 64
Committee on Africa, 235
Congo river, 8
Congregationalist, the, 139
Confucius, 148, 206
County, Maryland, 22
Covilham, Pedro da, 48
Cromer, Lord, 30
Cunningham Andrew, 42
Czechoslovakia, 56

Dahomey, 223
Daily Service, 230
Dakar, 223
Dante, 18
Darwin, 18
David Lou Dodge, 351
Da lima, Rodriguez Don, 48
Delian league, 345
Denham, Major, 133

Descartes, 18
Dewey, John, 198, 215-216,218
Dirre- Daoua, 46
Dim - Orachi, 242,
Dingaan, 35
Disraeli, 27
Dutch East Indian Company, 34
Eastern, Nigerian Guadian, 232
Eden, Anthhony, 247
Edo, 77
Egerton, 131
Egypt, 22, 24 - 33
Einstein, 18
Eket, 137
Emmanuele Vittorio III, 57
Emmanuel, Victor II, 51
England, 28, 27, 26, 29, 30, 215
England in Egypt, 25, - 33
Entoto Mountains, 46
Ethiopia, 7, 22, 44 - 58
Euripides, 345
Eze-Enefeanya, 242
Ezeifekaibeya, 242
Ezeodumegwu I, 242
Ezeugbonyamba I, 121

Fabian Society, 355
Fichte J.H., 183
Firestone, Harvey S., 23
Fisk Univerity, 280
Forcados, 9
Fort St. George d' Elmina, 106
Fouad I University, 25
Faurah Bay College, 161
France, 22, 27, 28, 155, 357, 50, 26, 25
French Guinea, 223

Freeman, Governor 130
Fulani, 77
Futa Jalon Mountain Range, 8.

Gabel Awlia Dam, 25
Gail, Marzieh, 363
Galileo, 18
Gambia, 223
Gana, da Christofore, 48
Gandhi Mahatma, 168 363, 367,
Gardiner, Kweku Ata, 225 - 226, 289
Gaza, 25
Geary, M.N., 137
George, Lioyd, 55
Germany, 32, 330 - 331, 357
Ghana, *see* Gold Coast
Gibbon, Edward, 197
Goethe, 18
Gold Coast, (now Ghana) 10, 19, 23, 161, 223, 266
Gold Coast Aboriginal Society, 230
The Gold Coast Bond, 230
Graziani, Marshal, 33
Goldie Taubman G.D., 132
Great Britain, 22, 179, 189, 357
  in Ethiopia, 49
  in South Africa, 37
Greek, 62
Grotius, 18, 347
Guest, Haden, 236
Gulf of Aden, 5
Gulf of Guinea, 9

Hailey, Lord, 249 - 250
Halifax, Lord, 33
Hall, Jerome, 123
Harris, Major, 48

Hausa, 77
Hassan Sabry Pasha, 32, 33
Hawaii, 266
Hebrews, 61
Herbert Macaulay, 230
Herodotus, 63
Herskovits M.J. 280
Hitler, Adolf., 59, 187, 249, 232, 250, 316
Hiram, King of Tyre, 62
Hoare, Samuel Sir, 53
Hobbes, 145, 329,
Hobson, J. A., 70, 197, 229
Homer, 63
Hume, 18

Ibi, 72
Ibibio, 77
Ibo, 77
Ijaw, 77
Ilorin, 133
Imodu, Micheal, 142
India, 266
Indian Ocean, 5
International Peace Conference, 43
Isabella, Queen, 300
Ismail Pasha, 26 - 28
Isthmus of Suez, 5
Ita, Eyo, 163
Italy, 50, 179, 357
Ivory Coast, (Now Cote d'voire) 23, 223

Jaja (King of Opobo), 248
Japan, 357
Jefferson, Thomas, 309, 374
Johannesburg, 10
John Alfonos d' Aveiro, 63 - 64
Johnson, Hewlett, 196, 220

Johnson, Mordecai, 281
Johnson, Wallace, 230
Jones Captain, 128
Jones, Thomas Jesse, 228 - 233

Kaffirs, 7
Kaishek, Chiang, 371
Kalahari, 9
Kallen, H. M. 217
Kano, 74
Kant, Immanuel, 18, 350, 361
Kanuri, 77
Khartum, 8
Kilimanjaro Mt., 6
Kipling, Rudyard, 184
Kosoko, King, 127
Kruger, President, 36

Ladd, William, 351
Lagash, 345
Laird, Mac Gregor, 131, 133
Lake Albert, 7
Lake Chad - 8
Lake Edward, 7
Lampson, Miles Sir, 33
Lander, Richard, 133
Las Casas, 18
Laski, Herold J., 110, 175, 244, 365, 370
Lausanne Conference, 357
Lenin, 367
Leone, Branca, Francisco de, 48
Lewanika, king, 192
Lewis, John L. 142

Liberia, 22 - 24, 265
Libyan Desert, 6
Lichliter, Mcliyar H., 364

Life Magazine 41
Lincoln, Abraham, 243, 378
Lion of Judah *see* Haile Salassie,
Livingstone, David, 63
Loango, 223
Locarno Pact, 357
Lock Alain, 283
Locke John, 144, 305, 329,
Logan, Langford, 283
Lokoja, 8, 72
Longare, Bonin Count, 54
Lord Dufferin, 30
Lugard F.J.D. Sir, 130, 133, 183
Lykian League, 346

Macaulay, Herbert, 106
Macrizi, 60
Madagascar Island of, 5
Madariaga, Salvador de, 156
Maiduguri, 9
Makurdi, 72, 74
Manchuria, 56
Maryland County, 22
Mediterranean Sea, 5, 8, 24
Menelik, 50, 51
Metabele, *see* Rhodesia,
McCoskny, 130
Mecca, 66
Mediterranean, 179
Mena, king of Egypt, 25
Micah (prophet), 14
Miche, Langelo, 18
Miller, brothers, 132
Milner, Lord, 31
Montaigne, 18
Mohamet, Ali, Pasha, 25 - 26
Morland T.N.L., 134
Morocco, 10

Mower, Edmund, 164
Mozambique Channel, 5
Murdoch, A., 106
Musa, Mansa, king, 66
Mushet, J.H., 41
Musilimin, Emir Attahiniel, 133 - 135
Mussolini, Benito, 61, 180, 187, 250, 316
Mussolini Signor, 55

Nanto - Boredelaise, 50
Napoleon, 59
Nepoleon of Ajaccio, 25
Naraguta, 74
Natal, 10, 35
National Peace Council of England, 236 - 237
Nehru, Jawaharlal, 161, 331
Newton, 18
New York, 75
Nguru, 75
Nile valley, 24
Niger, 8, 23
Nigeria, 57 - 58, 223, 266
  amalgamation of, 138
  chiefs in, 93 - 97
  christians in, 105 - 108
  commoners in, 85 - 86
  education in, 99 - 102
  geographical location, 72
  harmattan in, 3
  history British occupation of (1851 - 1943), 127 - 143
  kings in, 82 - 83
  nobles in, 97 - 98
  outcasts - osu, 89 - 92

  relationship with England, 241 - 252
  slaves in, 87
  strangers and outcasts, in, 108 - 110

warriors and nobles, 83 - 85
Nigerian Democratic Party, 230
Nigerian Eastern Mail, 230
Nigerian Labour Union, 230
Nigerian Youth Movement, 230
Northern Rhodesia, 10
Northwest University 280

Onitsha, 73, 83
Orange Free State, 38 - 40, 35 - 36
Orizu, Onyenkuzi, 296
Oron, 137
Otoukpom, 74
Ottley, Roi, 285
Ottoman Empire, 25, 26
The Overseas, Daily Mail, 227

Pacts of Paris, 357
Palestine, 61
Palmerston, Lord, 127, 130
Paris Peace Conference, 31
Park, Mungo, 63, 133
Penn, William, 123, 348
Perhan, Margery, 140, 233
Pharaohs of Egypt, 60
Phelps - stokes Commission, 140
Phelps - stokes Committee, 233, 234
Phelps - stokes fund, 228, 232
Philippe, louis, 48
Philippines, 266
Pierre, Dubois, 347
Pinnock, James, 132
Port - Guinea, 223
Portugal, 105
Powel, Adam Clayton, 281
Pretoria, 37
Punic wars, 63

Queen of Sheba, 61

Raid, Jameson, 36
Randolph Philip A., 281
Reddick D.L., 283, 284 - 285
Red Sea, 5
Rembrandt, 18
Rey, C.F., 45, 47
Rhodes Cecil, 36, 220
Rhodesia, 8, 191 - 192
Richardson Aurthur, Sir, 131
Rico, Puerto, 266
Rift Valley, 7
Rio Muni, 223
River Benue, 72
River Niger, 8, 72
River Nile, 6, 8
Robeson, Paul, 279, 281, 283
Rochet d' Hericourt, 48
Rodgers A.J. 283
Romans, 63
Roosevelt D.F., 24, 245, 357 - 358, 232, 316,
Roosevelt, Eleanor, (Mrs.), 243, 371
Rousseau, 18, 145, 329, 349
Royal Niger Company, 132
Rudin, 187
Rudolph - lake, 7

Sabon Gari, 75
Sahara Desert, 9
Salvation Army, 139
Scheitzer, Albert, 162
Schiller, 198
Schuyler George, 283
Selassie, Haile Emperor, 42, 57, 61, 371
Selassie, Schala, 48
Semites, 6
Senegal, 223

Shakespare, 18
Shih Hu, 377
Seventh Day Adventists, 139
Sierraleone, 23, 72, 223
Smith, 18
Smith Edwin W, - 230
Smuts, Jan Christian, General, 41, 56
Socrates, 150, 209, 362
Solomon king, - 61
Somalilads, 7
Sorel, George, 303
South Atlantic, 8
Seymour, Admiral, 29
Soviet Union, 331
South Africa, 34, 43
Spain, 155
Spaulding C.C., 281
Spengler, Oswald, 14, 77, 151, 291
Stanley Colonel, 227, 237
Statue of Menelik, 46
Stoddard Lothrop, 183
Suez Canal, 29, 26, 31
Sumner (Senator), 353
Sultan of Turkey, 28

Tchaka, 35
Taft, - President, - 354
Tana, lake, - 49
Tanganyika, - 6, 7
Tanganyika lake, - 7
Taoism, - 200
Tewfik, Pasha, 28
Thales, - 198
Thomson Graeme, Sir, - 131
Titus, H. H., - 211
Tiv., - 77
Tocqueville de Alexis, - 267

Togoland, - 223
Trade Unions, Congress of Nigeria, - 230
Transvaal, 10, 35, 36, 38 - 40
Treaty of Uccialli, 50
Tripoli, 350
Tuck, 352

Uganda, - 7, 19
Umma, - 345
Union of South Africa *see* South Africa
United States of America, 215, 224
  ideas and practice of democracy in, 265 - 268;
  and limited imperialism, 265;
  and policy on post-war Africa, 270 - 271;
  similrity between and Africa, 263 - 264;
  Negroes relationship with Africa, 278 - 286.
University of Pennsylvania, - 280
University of Al-Azhar, 25
United Presbyterian Church, - 39
Uzuakoli Institute, - 162

Vattel (jurist), 349
Victoria Falls, 7, 8
Victoria lake, 7
Victoria Nyanza, 8, 25
Villard, Henry S., 269 - 274
Voltaire, 18
Wafdist Party, 33
Wallace, Henry, 245, 363

Wal Wal, 55
Washington, Booker. T., 279
Washington, Geroge, 279, 350, 378
Wesley Charles, 285
Wesleyan Methodist Mission, 139
West Africa, 60, 223 - 240
West African Congress, 230

West African Pilot, 41, 109, 169, 174, 230, 232
West African Press Delegation, 230, 234 - 235, 273
West African Students Union, (WASU) 232
Wigmore, J.W., 123
White Nile, 8
Wilberforce, William, 243
Williams George W., 280, 286
Willkie, Wendell, 59, 232, 371
Wilson, Woodrow, President, 354, 356, 362 - 363
Wright, Richard, 281

Yasu, lej Emperor, 49
Yat-sen, Sun, 67 - 68, 367
Yola, 72
Yoruba, 77
Yutang, Lin, 361.

Zaghlul, Zaad, 31
Zambesi, 8
Zaria, 74
Zikism, - African Universal Philosophy -
African Irredentism, definition, 306
Concept of "excuse-recessim, definition, 336
Concept of loyalty, 307 - 312
Economic Zikism, 316 - 325
Philosophy of, 287
Political Zikism, 326 - 335
Religious Zikism, 336 - 344
Social Myth -definition, 303
Social Myth, 303 - 307

Social Zikism, 302 - 315
Origin of 293
What it is not, 298
the Zikist teacher, 311 - 312
Zulus, 7

REVIEWERS' COMMENTARIES ON WITHOUT BITTERNESS



A.A. Nwafor Orizu 1944

● "An unusual book, written by an African for readers in America and written with far more understanding of both Africa and world problems than such writers usually exhibit."
-W.E.B. DUBOIS N.Y. Herald Tribune

● A sincere and interesting book... about Africa, the state of its civilization, its past, its future... by an intelligent young son of a Nigerian ruling house, who must be the most literate prince alive today." —The New Yorker

● "One of those rare statements by a native of a colonial which not only presents the native point of view, but presents it vigorously, judiciously and without rancour, and with a full comprehension of its setting in world history and politics. For most persons, his book will reveal a new approach to the colonial problems. Certainly it should be read by all who are concerned with long-range questions of establishing and maintaining world peace. —DR. MELVILLE J. HERSKOVITS, The New Republic

● "Never before have we been reached with such a powerful appeal to realize the potentialities of that enormous mass humanity which lives on the Dark Continent." —DORATHY CANFIELD

● "One of the few things published in America about modern Africa and the best I have ever read. Orizu has a mind brilliantly cut, a mind widely informed by the best from many cultures of the East and West... he has a vigorous, scintillating style, beautiful diction... wonderful command of ideas and sources." —Chicago Daily Law Bulletin

● "A grim grave warning levelled at the peoples of Europe and America at the leaders of the United Nations." —N.Y. Time Book Review

Printed by Ochuemba Press Ltd., Phone: 042 - 335716 Enugu