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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Articles on liberation movements in Africa and in the Third World, on independent black nations, and more generally speaking, on international relations, permeate many of today's Afro-American journals. Although interest in African affairs (political, social and economic) is not a recent one on the part of a segment of the black intelligentsia in the United States, an examination of early issues of Afro-American journals such as Phylon, The Journal of Negro History (JNH), and the Journal of Negro Education (JNE) shows a conspicuous lack of interest on the part of Afro-American scholars in international relations in general and in Africa in particular. Articles that do exist in these earlier journals show that Afro-American scholars analyzed events along lines consistent with the general trend of political thinking of their white counterparts.

This thesis proposes to examine Afro-American social scientists' published writings over a period of twenty-eight years to trace the changes, both quantitatively and qualitatively, of articles published on Africa. These years cover the period after World War II to the present, i.e., 1945 to 1973, and were chosen because they represent a time period which both precedes and includes the advent of the Black Power movement and the concomitant qualitative and quantitative increment change of the majority of Afro-American social scientists on Africa.

My basic supposition is that there has occurred a significant change
in both the quantity and quality of published material by Afro-American scholars on the subject of Africa, beginning in the mid-sixties, with the advent of a Black Power movement which interpreted events occurring in Africa (and subsequently, events in the international arena) from a different perspective than the one found in preceding books and articles. This piece of research will endeavor to determine whether this new perspective is any different from the older one, and whether it fits into the mainstream of political analysis carried out by the majority of (white) American social scientists.

After having analyzed the designated publications for the stipulated time period, my paper proposes to determine the reasons why these changes (or pseudo-changes, as the case may be) occurred. The relative impact on Afro-American intellectuals of the Civil Rights movement, the Black Power movement and corporate and governmental investments in Black colleges shall be examined and evaluated, with tentative conclusions being offered. The influence of American (mainstream) political and social science, and the philosophical and ideological bases upon which it rests shall also be scrutinized in the attempt to shed light on the similarities and differences in Afro-American social scientists' publications and their white counterparts today.

Data for this paper consist of publications by Afro-American social scientists from the years 1945 to 1973. This includes articles written in black-controlled journals, in white journals, and books published by the social scientists. While I have tried to be as exhaustive as possible in collecting material published by Afro-American social scientists, the list is, of course, incomplete. However, the material used for this
study is, I believe, representative of the publications of Afro-American social scientists. I have also utilized articles and books published by scholars who were other than Afro-American who often had conducted intensive research on several issues relevant to this thesis.

A basic term which will be used throughout this thesis is "social scientist". This term has been defined by me as any person who has received at least a Master's degree in any of the social sciences. And, although this definition has drawbacks in that many authors writing in Black Scholar, Black World and Freedomways did not and do not have Masters degrees, a line had to be drawn at some point in order to make the thesis of manageable dimension.

A basic assumption in this paper is that Afro-Americans in the United States constitute a segment of the American society that has been, and is, exploited and oppressed to a greater degree than the total American population, with the exception of the native Americans. A further assumption, based partly upon the first, is that Afro-American intellectuals, who form a segment (or class) within the Afro-American community, have a duty of clarifying for their people the nature of the exploitation and oppression to which their people have been subjected. This might entail repudiating the predominant philosophical orientations used by their white counterparts to explain and clarify events occurring in the universe that surrounds and affects them. Thus, the role of intellectuals springing from an oppressed segment of society should be radically different from those who do not. They should strive towards ameliorating their people's position within the society in which they live, and explain and clarify to the best of their ability the reasons for their exploitation and, if
possible, conceptualize the means by which to end it.¹

I do not regard the Afro-American intellectual class as being mono-
lithic—this is patently untrue if one studies Afro-American scholars over
a period of time. There has always been a segment of the Afro-American
intellectual stratum that has been interested in international affairs
and in Africa since the 1800's, and who saw definite connections between
the destiny of Africa and their own. However, they have been in a minor-
ity until recently.

I think my study is important for several reasons. To my knowledge,
this will be the first systematic study of how Afro-American social scien-
tists have regarded in the past and in the present, international rela-
tions and Africa. Secondly, the study will have important implications
concerning Afro-American social scientists in particular and Afro-American
intellectuals in general. If it is found that my sample of Afro-American
social scientists have not presented to their constituency (or the general
public) a different picture of international relations than has the white
community of social scientists, if they have not presented a different
conception of the role black people should play or want to play in inter-
national relations, or if they have only succeeded in parroting the prin-
ciples, basic suppositions and conclusions of their white counterparts,
then important conclusions may be drawn about Afro-American social scien-
tists, that they stand squarely in the mainstream of American political
science, sociology, anthropology, economics and psychology, and therefore

¹Mack Henry Jones, "Responsibility of Black Political Scientists to
the Black Community," to be published shortly by Howard University Press
in Black Political Scientists and Black Survival: Essays in Honor of a
Black Scholar, edited by Shelby Lewis Smith.
one should not expect them to offer any meaningfully different solutions, analyses or even challenges to problems that their people face. In other words, they cannot envisage or initiate meaningful change in the society wherein they exist.
their struggles for equality in the United States.\(^1\) An added reason why the earlier Back-to-Africa movements were opposed by the majority of black intellectuals was that these movements were supported by members of the white race who wished to relocate the total black population in the United States to Africa, and were supported by white organizations such as the American Colonization Society.

It seems that at every turn of history when the black population in the United States was facing peculiarly trying circumstances, a resurgence of the interest in Africa and the wish to settle there, emerged. These movements have been, on the whole, consistently opposed by Afro-American intellectuals who have viewed that the struggle of black people in the United States, while not necessarily precluding interest in Africa, is based on circumstances and can only be resolved here in the United States. Thus, we find that after the Civil War and the so-called Reconstruction period, after World War I with the disillusionment that followed it, there have been exponents who have argued that the only salvation for black men in the United States lay in emigrating to Africa.

The most important exponent of the Back-to-Africa theme in this century is Marcus Garvey, who not only had a mass following in the United States but also influenced African nationalists such as Nkrumah and Clements Kadalie in South Africa.\(^2\) European governments in Africa were

\(^1\)George Shepperson, pp. 301-302.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 303.
extremely wary of Garvey's influence in their respective colonies, and took steps to limit his influence there as much as possible.

After the demise of the Garvey movement and the onslaught of the Depression, the interest in Africa on the part of most Afro-Americans waned considerably. However, Afro-American influence on African nationalism did not cease, as Afro-American missionary activity continued to influence Africa's politics and black colleges still attracted African students. ¹ Indeed, in the 1920's in certain parts of Africa there was the widespread belief that Afro-Americans were going to invade Africa and set Africans free.²

Although it is difficult to measure how much ideological influence Afro-Americans had over the development of African nationalism, it is clear that they did play an important role in the conceptualization of attitudes of many prominent Africans who led nationalist movements in Africa.

Garvey's movement coincided with a movement largely initiated by Carter G. Woodson and other Afro-American intellectuals to promote pride in African culture. Thus, although the leading Afro-American intellectuals were opposed to Garvey, this did not mean that they rejected their African heritage.³ Indeed, much of the material meticulously gathered by Woodson on African culture was used by Garvey in his advocacy of racial pride.

¹Ibid., pp. 311-312.
²Ibid.
Carter G. Woodson organized the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History on September 9, 1915 in Chicago. One year later, he had published the first volume of the *Journal of Negro History* (JNH). The aim of the Association was to collect historical and sociological data pertaining to Afro-Americans and to all peoples of African descent, with the ultimate aim of publishing these works and promoting harmony between the black and white races.¹

Both Woodson and DuBois wrote about black history because they believed

... it would elevate the position of the Negro in American society by reeducating both Caucasians and Negroes to a greater appreciation of race and would inspire the latter to greater achievement,²

and that black history could be used as a weapon in fighting for racial equality.

The JNH had financial difficulties from the onset, and it is interesting to note that in 1921 the Carnegie Corporation appropriated $25,000 to the Association. In the same year, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial appropriated a like sum to be paid to the Association to be used by it to study the free Negroes before the Civil War and during the Reconstruction Era.³ Thus, six years after the Association had been established, it already had strong financial linkages to corporate interests—a phenomenon we shall discuss later on in the paper.


²Ibid., p. 16.

³Ibid., p. 111.
The achievements of the Association and the JNH are many. It helped nascent black historians in publishing their works and furnished them stipends to do research, among other things. Woodson himself was a prolific writer, and sought to popularize Afro-American history, using every opportunity that presented itself. By the 1920's and 1930's, his movement had found broad acceptance among Afro-American intellectuals.

Black historians, as a whole, have been trained at Harvard, and have been affected by intellectual currents that dominated the larger society within which they lived and worked. Most of the Afro-American intellectuals before the 1930's showed a strong belief in education as a panacea for racial inequality. Marxism, or any other "rigid" school of thought, had not influenced too many of them.

Apart from the contention that the race is inherently the equal of any group, black historians generally have not adhered to rigid schools of thought. Where their interpretations have become broad they were generally eclectic. Few besides DuBois have followed any varieties of Marxism or Socialism. This histiography \( \text{i.e., till 1930} \) has been to a large extent defensive.

It is revealing that after World War II, the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History spent several annual meetings discussing as to whether their very \textit{raison d'etre} had been removed from them, many persons believing that to continue to teach and popularize Negro history would only tend to accentuate the uniqueness of Afro-Americans, while the main objective of Afro-Americans was that they should be given the same

\[\text{1 Ibid., pp. 112-115.} \]
\[\text{2 Ibid., pp. 192-193.} \]
\[\text{3 Ibid., p. 193.} \]
treatment as other Americans. It was proven beyond a doubt, these people argued, that Afro-Americans were capable beings, and thus Negro history should be taught in general American history courses and the Association should disband.1

Garvey epitomized the disillusionment of black Americans with the outcome of World War I, who had hoped that by fighting in the War, democracy could be introduced in the United States. However, Wilson's Fourteen Points was not to be applied to the United States; and the growing number of Afro-Americans who had obtained relatively lucrative jobs in the North, and who had left the South to get better jobs, were soon laid off.

A resurgence in the interest in Africans on the part of the general population of Afro-Americans began when Mussolini invaded Ethiopia, and was reinforced when black troops fought outside the United States in World War II. This interest was again reinforced when the "winds of change" began to blow and nationalist movements began to stir in Africa when it became obvious that the colonial powers had become greatly weakened as a result of World War II.

However, Afro-American intellectuals' interests, as evidenced from their writings after World War II, were not devoted to analyzing the changing world scene. Black scholars were, on the whole, still interested in analyzing the domestic conditions and researching black history, even though events were occurring in Africa (and the rest of the colonized Third World) that were to have important implications upon the black

struggle in the United States. The McCarthy era in the '50's might have had the impact of discouraging research or publication in areas which, even faintly, might be considered radical or 'non-American'.

It is difficult to begin to measure the impact of McCarthy on American intellectuals in general and on Afro-American intellectuals in particular, since very little of substance has been written about this topic. There is little doubt, however, according to one American scholar who had been accused by McCarthy of being pro-Communist, that

... the danger of suppressing freedom of scholarship and opinion is, of course, not merely a threat to scholars, it is a direct and immediate danger to the national interest. Attacks of this sort which have the effect of intimidating scholars and researchers are bound to affect the quality of their work, to circumscribe their sources of information and to inhibit the freedom with which they state their facts and conclusions.1

One of the more interesting side-affects McCarthyism has spawned among American intellectuals has been that some scholars, in analyzing the successes and the bases of McCarthy's support, have come up with several theories to explain the McCarthyite era in American politics. Daniel Bell, Seymour M. Lipset and Talcott Parsons among others, argued that insecure groups such as lower-class Catholics in Eastern cities, used McCarthy to express their "status resentment" against the social and intellectual elites.2 This theory has had interesting implications in the sphere of political theory—as some intellectuals began to distrust the "masses" and their emotions, and their faith in popular democracy

began to decline. This resulted in what was named the New Conservatism, or pluralism, wherein the intellectuals argued that "direct democracy" was a threat to individual liberty and that power should be therefore distributed to intermediary institutions such as interest groups and associations to stop the masses from participating directly in politics, since they had proven themselves untrustworthy in their support of McCarthy.\textsuperscript{1}

Another side effect of McCarthyism is that at least one of the organizations set up by Afro-American scholars to promote interest in Africa, the Council on African Affairs, was forced to disband. (See Chapter V). According to at least one author, however, Afro-American intellectuals began to be critical of the Truman administration in the late '40's and '50's, and were publishing critical articles in newspapers despite the muzzling affect that McCarthy had on the majority of intellectuals in the country.\textsuperscript{2}

A large number of Afro-American intellectuals began to evince an interest in African affairs only when it became apparent that African nations were on the eve of obtaining their (nominal) independence. This took place in the late 1950's, but the interest only gathered momentum after the emergence of the Black Power movement, which linked the struggle of Afro-Americans in the United States to the struggles of exploited peoples in the Third World. For, after all, events were not only changing

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., pp. 131-132.

the face of Africa, but those involved in the Civil Rights movement, realizing that a total restructuring of the American society would not be forthcoming from the civil rights struggle to integrate public institutions and utilities, looked elsewhere for both support and new ideas. This was to have important effects in the conceptualization of the problem by many Afro-American intellectuals, who began to conceptualize the struggle in the United States as a colonial one. Whether this conceptualization (and concomitant implications for the resolution of the black struggle in the United States) had any broad appeal to the black masses beyond the ready acceptance of the black masses of certain superficial aspects of Africanization, is debatable. And whether the more "radical" interpretation of events in the United States was really radical at all, whether it entailed a modification, rejection or superseding of intellectual tools used by mainstream American scholars is a question that is entirely open to debate.¹

¹For a different interpretation, see Martin Kilson, "The New Black Intellectuals," Dissent, July/August, 1969.
CHAPTER III

SOCIAL SCIENCE AND THE POSITION OF SOCIAL
SCIENTISTS IN AMERICA

Insufficient space and time make a thorough-going critique of the philosophical bases underlying social sciences in America impossible. However, for our purposes here, it is important to briefly delineate the premises which directed and continue to direct the thrust of American research on underdeveloped countries.

Suzanne Bodenheimer analyzed American political science publications on underdeveloped countries in Latin America and found four major, interrelated themes which stemmed exclusively from American values which were applied to non-American situations.1 These values are implicit in the theories of development, underdevelopment and international systems developed in the United States, and stem from the reality of the American situation and from the "liberal-democratic", capitalist-imperialist environment in which American social scientists live. These commonly-held concepts, whose substantive contents reflect the concrete interests of particular social classes, seek to maintain or improve their position relative to other classes, both domestically and abroad. In every society,

such as the American one, where the dominant classes or interests determine the structure of rewards in the social sciences as well as in political activity, it is difficult for the researcher to resist the interests of those classes, and the assumptions that social science is value-free, objective and therefore non-political only serves to propagate and continue the over-all status quo within the society, and the continued domination of certain classes and interests over other classes. Thus, research work done on international relations is, generally speaking, but an outgrowth of the realities of the position of the United States within the international system.¹

On the issue of development, the author found four integrated themes in the theories advanced and which have corollaries to issues in the epistemological level. These assumptions are advanced as general presuppositions of political science, and are: (1) the continuum model of development, which presupposes cumulative knowledge; (2) stable and orderly change, which means a concern for prediction and the search for universal laws as aims of social science; (3) the end of ideology—supposing objectivity as the basis of social science, and (4) diffusion from "modern" to "traditional" sectors of society, which assumes the transference of the conceptual framework from developed societies to underdeveloped ones (i.e., ethnocentrism).

These themes not only distort the studies undertaken on foreign countries, but are actually expressions of an ideology that is not universally accepted. For example, the diffusion theory maintains that development

¹Ibid.
requires the stimulus of capital and technology, given through foreign aid and investment. However, in reality, this has resulted in a net outflow of capital from the underdeveloped countries to the developed nations. Another example is the viewing of education as the panacea for underdevelopment. The whole cult of education in American social science literature is directly related to the diffusion thesis of development, which in turn, is related to the conditions of development experienced by these "developed" nations. The main distortion of all versions of the cultural diffusion thesis is their tendency to divorce attitudes and social institutions from their economic roots, and thereby ignore much of the essential for the superficial.

Other factors to consider when analyzing American social science is the position of the social scientist within American society. Any social scientist working within the confines of an academic situation, is legally an employee and has institutional factors limiting what he will work with and write about. ¹ These inhibitions lead to a self-intimidation that becomes internalized to the extent that the scholar is unaware of it.

Such control is naturally furthered by Hatch Acts, by politi- cal and business attacks upon "professors", by the restraints necessarily involved in the Army's program for the colleges, and by the setting up of committees by trade associations of subjects, like history, which attempt to standardize the content and effects of teaching. ²

Another factor which must be taken into consideration is the fact that


²Ibid., p. 297.
research in the social sciences is dependent upon funds and grants from foundations, which indubitably limit a scholar's ability to advance unpopular ideas and theses.

Since World War II, America has become increasingly embroiled in the affairs of foreign nations. Concomitantly, foreign area institutes have developed on Africa, the Far East, and South-East Asia, much of the money coming from the Carnegie Foundation, and later, the Ford Foundation. In 1953, for example, the Carnegie Corporation set aside 4.5 million dollars to universities for area studies.\(^1\) Many scholars worked closely with the United States government during and after World War II, supplying it with needed information enabling the government to plan and implement its foreign policy. This association has continued down to the present, and the obvious question arises: do these links between social scientists and the United States government and corporate interests affect the substantive questions which social scientists will ask in their research, and do they hinder their academic integrity (if such a thing can exist)?

A further angle by which one may view this issue is that the intellectual and scholar in American society do not have the ability to control the means by which their work is published and disseminated to the general public. In short, the material basis for the intellectuals' freedom is not in their hands, but is outside their control.

All these problems are further compounded when one analyzes the situation of Afro-American intellectuals and social scientists. For the

dominant culture in America reflects the culture of the majority, i.e., white, Anglo-Saxon and Protestant, and it is this ethnic group which controls the media, and therefore, chooses the piper's tune. The financial support of the black intellectual, and the recognition given to him if he excels, does not come from his own community, but from the white one.¹ And although under the guise of liberalism, a certain amount of dissent to the dominant norms and values might be expressed and may even be fashionable at certain periods, black intellectuals cannot express total disenchantment with existing society and the wish to dismantle it or revolutionize it and expect financial kudos from various foundations.

The material basis for the insecurity of Afro-American intellectuals is further complicated by racism, which, in the past made it difficult for black intellectuals to publish articles in white journals. Carter Woodson, it is interesting to note, was able to establish the Associated Publishers as a private corporation, with 90 percent of the stock owned by him, to handle publications and the sale of books. He established the Associated Publishers because he felt that white publishers were not interested in publishing works by black scholars.² This, however, was one of the few successful ventures of black efforts towards trying to control the means of printing and disseminating black scholarly output. Most of the other ventures failed.


²Earl Thorpe, Black Historians: A Critique, p. 112.
Thus, not only have Afro-American scholars suffered from the disadvantages of their white counterparts, but have also had to contend with other factors as well, some stemming from racism, others stemming from their materially insecure bases, both within the larger society and their own community.
CHAPTER IV

AFRO-AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENTISTS AND THEIR PUBLICATIONS ON AFRICA FROM 1945 TO 1965

Turning now to an analysis of the major publications of Afro-American social scientists between the years 1945 to 1965, i.e., after World War II and before the advent of the Black Power movement, I found that, generally speaking, there was an obvious lack of consistent, systematic study of the relationships between Third World countries and blacks within the United States. Whole areas, both geographically and in subject matter, have been left out and ignored. In all three journals, the Journal of Negro History, the Journal of Negro Education and Phylon, the articles show a lack of analytic depth, and an unquestioning acceptance of Western ideals and models for development. The outlook of most of the articles is segmented, by which I mean that the authors rarely see the world functioning as a totality, but prefer to study isolated segments of it, never drawing any broader conclusions from their studies. Historical articles which are concerned with black experiences are rarely used to elucidate current happenings, and are also segmented in that they do not view, express or analyze the similarities and/or differences of oppressed peoples throughout the world. The articles also do not contain an element of dynamism—a realization of the forces operating in the relations between different nation-states themselves. The authors acknowledge the
preponderance of the U.S. vis-a-vis the rest of the world, but are oblivious as to how this preponderance affects the rest of the world, especially the underdeveloped countries, or see it as potentially, if not actually beneficial. In every journal, however there are exceptions to my conclusions where I found lucid, coherent, well-thought out articles which dealt with the questions of development, imperialism and the colonial question. However these articles were of a miniscule number and interestingly enough, were not followed up or debated upon, although their contents were in complete contradiction with the majority of the articles found in the journals. My conclusions about the writings of black scholars will, I hope, be substantiated by the following analysis of articles found in three major black journals.

I first began with the journal Phylon and an analysis of the articles from 1945 to 1965 reveals several trends. In order to simplify the analysis, I will divide the articles according to subject matter. These categories will be the following: articles on Africa and international relations (including any systematic effort to conceptualize the international system); and a category which includes articles written about Afro-Americans and their linkages to Africa. I chose these categories because of their relevance to my research.

---


From the years 1945 to 1965, the total number of articles on Africa in *Phylon* were twenty-eight, on international relations seven, and on the links between Africa and Afro-Americans, three. From the years 1953 to 1965, one finds the majority of articles on Africa published (numbering twenty-five), while on international relations, there is not one article published during these same years.

From the years 1946 to 1950 one finds that the articles published on Africa are on Liberia. Logan, in his article "Liberia in the Family of Nations", makes the following remarks: that the government of the U.S. gave only $100,000 to the Negroes to help them settle in Liberia and gave them very little after that, and that Liberia had periods of prosperity only when Liberian coffee had a high price on the world market. However, Liberia's independence was threatened when Brazil began to successfully compete with it in coffee production and by the imperial powers which occupied Liberia's neighbors. He blames the U.S. for never stating clearly its concern over the welfare of Liberia. Liberia, however, needs help to develop. This does not make it a beggar-nation, as the U.S. itself had to have the help of "the capital of foreign nations... strong arms and the fertile brains of millions of immigrants," to develop. Since Liberia is the "foundling" of the U.S., the U.S. has obligations towards it. The author prescribes the following solutions: that the U.N. 

---


engender international cooperation to help developing countries; that the feelings of superiority on the part of the developed nations should be removed; and that Afro-Americans had obligations towards Liberia, and should utilize their skills and knowledge for that purpose. "By so doing, we will advance our own cause since, . . . many persons in this country and in other parts of the world evaluate our capacities in terms of the accomplishments of Negroes in other parts of the world."¹

In later issues of Phylon, from 1953-1964, we get a broader range of Third World countries and issues discussed—Ethiopia, Kenya, Ghana, Nigeria, Pan-Africanism and African nationalism.² However, considering the number of African and Third World countries that had gained their independence during the years 1945 to 1965 and the different liberation struggles going on in the same period of time, the number of articles dealing with these events and their analyses of the different situations is disappointing. There is a concern in these articles with the role of the United Nations (never doubting its efficacy), the need for more U.S. and foreign investment in underdeveloped countries, a concern for democracy and democratic procedures and the emphasis on the whole being is on evolution rather than revolution.

In later issues the concentration of articles is on Ghana and Nigeria, where the authors discuss the internal affairs of those countries which

¹Ibid., p. 11.

have gained independence. For example, R. W. Howe's article (mentioned in the last footnote) analyzes the trends of Nkrumah's government, emphasizing the need of Ghana to allure foreign investments for development projects.

Only three articles dealt specifically with relationships between Africa and blacks within the United States. In one of them, the author states that, because Africa is rich in resources needed by America, then America should help African leaders realize their ambitions so as to keep Africa within the "Free World". Thus, America must give material assistance to win the hearts of the free nations of Africa. Due to the fact that some Africans have been educated in the United States and have an affinity to Afro-Americans, this should be used "as a springboard to cement better Afro-American relationships". He notes with regret that very few Afro-Americans have gone to Africa, and that black universities offer few courses on Africa.

The last category of articles deal specifically with the question of international relations, or of "world views", or how the authors perceive the world around them, and how they arrange phenomena into meaningful categories. One of the most articulate articles is by L. L. Bernard, who begins by saying that man today still has basic elements of savagery within him, morally and socially, but that instinctive nature does not

---


2Ibid., p. 170; see also George Shepperson, "The U. S. and East Africa," Phylon, XII (1925), 25.

mean an insurmountable barrier towards an "ethical civilization". Moral and ethical advancement has most obviously failed in international affairs, where Machiavellian principles are still at work. International struggles between nations correspond to class interests of different groups within different nations. "The new imperialism is the chief cause of wars. Back of imperialistic policies of course lie great national industries, financial and commercial interests." Not only do certain classes gain from war, but the masses of people also gain, especially those living in "over-industrialized. . .countries which cannot feed themselves from their own soil or provide work for themselves without the aid of imperialistic holdings abroad. Imperialism is as much a bread and butter consideration for them as it is of profits for the industrial, commercial and financial exploiters of foreign peoples." The author then discusses the Eight Points of the Atlantic Charter, showing how the countries that signed them have consistently disregarded the Charter, which should not have surprised him as he had stated earlier that Machiavellian principles functioned in international relations. The sixth provision in the Atlantic Charter is for men to "dwell in safety within their own boundaries. . .all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want." It is interesting to see that the author quotes the Zionist Jews in Palestine as being oppressed. The author then posits several remedies for the rectification of the world situation. The most important remedy is that

---

1 Bernard, p. 106.
2 Ibid., p. 112.
3 Ibid., p. 113.
"the world should limit its population to the supply of food and other essentials that can be produced. . . ."¹ War can be eliminated by removing the gains different classes achieved from wars, so "Perhaps the only way to do this is to socialize wealth and remove the private profit motive from operation."² International struggle for power can be eliminated by internationalizing "political control and . . . work(ing) for democracy through international government."³ The ethical and intellectual standards of the masses of mankind have to be raised—and this cannot happen unless more information is given about social and political conditions. Since the Church and schools have failed to lay down practical everyday rules for moral behavior, and have not prepared their clients to live in this world, the author suggests that it is only through social science that mankind can progress ethically and morally.

The second articulate piece of writing on "world-views" is an article by B. Davis, who says that the reason why he joined the Communist Party was because he was "impressed with the militant, uncompromising fight of its members for the freedom and equal rights of Negro Americans, . . . ."⁴ He has a clear conception of the class and international dimensions of the black struggle. "The struggles of the Negro people are an inseparable part of the struggles of the working class of America, and of the workers, common people and colonials all over the world. We Communists agree with Abraham Lincoln that "the strongest bond of human sympathy, outside the

¹Ibid., p. 118.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
⁴B. Davis, p. 109.
family relation, should be one unifying all working people, of all nations and tongues and kindreds.' If this is 'subversive', then the Communists are in mighty good company."\textsuperscript{1} He goes on to say, "Capitalism is the main root cause of the discrimination against Negroes, Jews, the foreign-born, Catholics and other minorities."\textsuperscript{2} Capitalism developed the theory of 'white supremacy' and 'racial inferiority' to be used against the Negro population. Capitalism also initiated anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism to be used against other minorities. It is the U.S.S.R., he says, where true brotherhood is taking place, where "more than fifty nationalities, many of them darker peoples, live in freedom and equality."\textsuperscript{3} The main international issue facing America is that it "should throw its weight, within the framework of the United Nations, on the side of the democratic anti-fascist forces, for the purpose of extirpating the remnants of fascism and securing freedom for colonial and semi-colonial peoples, and establishing international security and an enduring peace."\textsuperscript{4}

As I said above, this is one of the most explicit articles, one which is most aware of the fact that oppression and exploitation is world-wide, but even this article shows flaws in its reasoning. For example, he advocates that the U.S. secure the freedom of colonial and semi-colonial peoples, although previously admitting the fact that capitalism is the root cause of discrimination against minorities. This shows a poor understanding of the nature of capitalism operating in the international context.

\textsuperscript{1}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 110.

\textsuperscript{2}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{3}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 111.

\textsuperscript{4}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 112.
In summary, therefore, one can say that the articles are on the whole descriptive, historical ones, and the few prescriptive articles, i.e., articles that advocate any kind of change to ameliorate conditions, are on the whole superficial, optimistic, and not grounded in reality.

Much of what can be said about Phylon can be applied to the Journal of Negro History. There is an equal disregard for the then-current events happening in the world, especially in Africa and the Third World, although half an excuse could be proferred for the JNH based on its very name. The ASNLH was established in 1915 by Carter Woodson, and given the prevailing view about Africa and African studies at the time, the ASNLH and its major publication, the JNH was the first stimulus and outlet for scholars interested in Africa. The word "history" was broadly defined by the ASNLH as the "collection of sociological and historical documents and the promotion of articles bearing on the Negro", and this policy was maintained over the years. Articles in the early years of the JNH, before World War II, were concerned with laying a foundation for Afro-Americans to be proud of their race.

From 1935–1959, 32 percent of the articles appearing in the JNH came from black colleges and universities. Between 1955–1957, 26 out the 37 contributors were not white, and out of the forty-two volumes of the JNH, 27 percent of the articles deal with blacks outside the United States.


2Ibid., p. 404, and The Journal of Negro History, II (1917), 446.

3Ibid., p. 406.
Fifty-eight of these were on Latin America, and the West Indies, fifty-three on Africa (mainly West Africa), three hundred and thirteen on Europe, fourteen on the history of blacks in Canada, and an insignificant number on Mauritius and Hawaii. Four hundred and forty-four articles dealt with American history. 'From the trend of these topics, it seems valid to conclude that present-day historians of the Negro remain very much pre-occupied with the period of sectional crises, but that there is a growing interest in the history of the Negro outside the U.S., with West Africa, the West Indies and Brazil attracting the largest numbers of papers.' Articles written on Africa from 1945 to 1965 number eleven, on international relations none, and lastly on Afro-Americans and Africa, three. From the years 1956 to 1964 there are no articles on Africa at all.

Articles dealing with the then-current events are few, dealing with South Africa, Nigeria, Brazil, the Congo and Mozambique. The articles do not number more than twelve, and have a liberal, traditional political science pro-establishment point of view. For example, A. Cook discusses self-government in Nigeria. He states that British imperialism is changing, and states: "Political freedom means little unless there is some real assurance of economic stability. Here again we find that the men who made Nigeria [i.e., the British] built on solid ground." This entailed giving the Nigerian peasantry small plots of land so that "As a result

---


3 Ibid., p. 105.
the native in Nigeria has become a small producer, who sells his produce on the open market, and enjoys a large measure of economic self-determination". The author here does not seem to realize that the "open market" is so structured as to work against the benefit of the small producer. The conclusion is a gem "... in the judgment of this writer it has proved far sounder policy to give the native administrative responsibilities, to train him in the art of government ... and thus by easy stages to bring him to a state where he can stand alone." Patronizing superiority is very obvious here, for the native "stood alone" before he was colonized.

Other articles found in the JNH deal with history in order to elucidate recent events. One example is Martin Kilson's article which starts out by saying that African people and their social structures depend on land, for both sustenance and as a necessary factor in their social and economic systems. Any threat to their land meant a threat to their livelihood, and the European colonizers constituted such a threat. Kilson's theory is that the Kikuyu, a tribe in Kenya, organized political movements to secure their land in the face of European threats. The author then gives a historical background about the Kikuyu's land tenure system; British land policy in Kenya, and how it affected Kikuyu society; their relation to such a policy; and lastly, he talks about the major political movements initiated by the Kikuyu in response to the land issue.

---

1Ibid.
2Ibid., p. 106.
He comes to the conclusion that the political movements were a response to the land grievance, which, in the final analysis, is due to the British land policy in Kenya. Thus, he concludes, if the British do not do anything to ameliorate the land situation in Kenya, the Mau Mau movement and others should be the expected consequence.

In summary, we find that articles concerned with international relations are few, mostly historical in nature, often not dealing with any topic remotely related to black experience either in the U.S. or anywhere else. Their outlook is again, like in Phylon, segmented, and historical articles which do deal with black experiences are rarely used to elucidate current happenings and are also segmented in that they do not view, express, or analyze the similarities and/or differences of oppressed peoples throughout the world. Articles on colonialism are not anti-colonial.

I began to read through the Journal of Negro Education (JNE) expecting to find very few articles dealing with topics outside black education, or lack thereof, in the U.S., especially since the three main aims of the JNE were: "first, to stimulate the collection, and facilitate the dissemination, of facts about the education of Negroes; second, to present discussion involving critical appraisals of the proposals and practices relating to the education of Negroes; and third, to stimulate and sponsor investigations of problems incident to the education of Negroes."¹ However, I found that the reverse was true, and that the JNE deals much more than the other two journals with current events in the world, specifically with the Third World. Two complete issues of the JNE were devoted to

education and development in Dependent Territories (XV, Summer, 1946), and education in sub-Saharan countries (XXX, Summer, 1961). However, the topics discussed in these issues cover much more than education per se, as will be noted later.

Articles in the JNE on Africa, number thirty-five from 1945 to 1956, on international relations, fifteen, and on Afro-Americans and Africa, five. For this journal I found that the first and second category were not mutually exclusive. That is to say, that many of the articles written about African dependent territories also discussed colonialism and imperialism, issues that are more of a subject pertaining to international relations. So, since the categories are, to a large extent, interchangeable, I will discuss the two categories simultaneously.

On African countries (or Dependent Territories), articles were written from the educational point of view—i.e., the educational systems within these countries, the difficulties which these face due to lack of resources (and depending upon the viewpoint of the author, the existence of a colonial power which was either a negative or positive factor in the development of an educational system in the colonies). All the authors agreed upon one point: that education was essential for development, democracy and the fight against communism, and that independence depended upon having the masses educated, otherwise independence could not take place.¹

Many of the articles suggested that the colonial experience benefitted the colonies in different ways. For example, J. Davis predicted that in the British colonies there was to be a rapid development in education because the British were grateful for the loyalty shown by her colonies during the war. This is obvious because Britain provided a fund of £120 million in ten years to be given as a grant to the colonies, some of it to be spent on education. He concludes that the hope of the colonies "lies in extending the remarkable cooperation that is being built up between Africans and Europeans. . . . British colonies in Africa look forward to increasing autonomy and ultimate self-government. In the meantime, they have protection, stability, and the sympathetic assistance of the British people in the complicated tasks of economic development, education, and adjustment from a feudal, primitive society to commercial and cultural relationships with the modern world." 1 G. S. Parker, after considering different aspects of British colonial rule in Kenya and Uganda, says that although some bad side-affects have resulted, yet the good effects outweigh the bad ones. "In conclusion, it must be admitted that the lofty ideals embodied in the various policy declarations of the British government have been commendable and have been conducive to a higher standard in dealing with dependent peoples. . . . Despite friction over land, labour, and race. . . . and inspite of the communists around Nairobi, few Natives or other persons in East Africa would willingly exchange British rule for that of any imperial power. Nor would but few suggest that the Natives were better off in their primitive state, . . .

1Jackson Davis, p. 368.
A little more than half a century of British rule has enabled over eight million Natives to advance from a primitive and near barbaric state to the point where they may begin to assume an important share in the direction of their own affairs.\(^1\)

The above articles show that all the authors firmly believe in democracy, in liberalism and in education as a means of achieving development and progress. Also, they tend to call for mass education, be it either primary or secondary school education in dependent countries without looking at reality, namely, the colonial situation and the limitations such a political system poses to the accomplishment of such a goal. These articles are therefore naive, shallow in their analytic depth, and do not deal with the main question: that in order to achieve mass education, one has to change the political and economic reality of the dependent peoples.

However, there is another series of articles which try to deal with the root questions involved,\(^2\) and which unfortunately are not followed up in later issues. One of the best articles is an early one, dated 1946 by Ralph Turner, who begins by saying that imperialism is the control of one people by another for the benefit of the latter, the imperialist culture usually being an urban one. "Thus, development, regardless of the advance in social efficiency which it embodied, involved the institutionalization of the exploitation by a few of the great body of the people of a city and its attached territory. . . . Imperialism was the extension of this exploitative regime over foreign peoples,"\(^3\) and the author goes

\(^1\)G. G. Parker, p. 447.
\(^2\)See footnote (2) on page 22.
\(^3\)R. E. Turner, p. 267.
on to give a very explicit description of the development of modern imperialism and its different stages. Imperialism also gave rise to different political philosophies such as the 'state of nature' and the 'natural rights of man'. These two concepts, the author claims, helped free the middle-classes in Europe while justifying the exploitation of the overseas populations. Modern imperialism rests upon paramount power, which is ultimately military power, for the main purpose of draining the wealth of the colonized peoples by economic enterprises. This is reflected in a "colonial economy", and he goes on to describe it and its effect on colonial labour. "Imperialism has always operated in ways that made the labour of controlled peoples available to the imperial people without admitting the former to the so-termed 'superior culture' of the latter. This circumstance prevails today... in the United States, where the Negro population (which should be understood as a precipitate of early modern imperialism) is struggling to obtain release from controls still partly established in law but more generally organized in race prejudice."¹ He concludes by saying that imperialism has no new worlds to conquer, and thus must turn back upon itself and destroy itself, such as the Nazi effort did. This article is the best one which describes the imperial and colonial dynamics of operation.

Another good article is by DuBois² who showed how the wealth of Europe was built upon the exploitation of the coloured peoples of the world, every device being used to justify this—theories of evolution, the rewriting of history and science. He elaborated on this topic in

¹Ibid., p. 281.
²DuBois, p. 311.
Another author critically appraised the trusteeship system established under the United Nations, and came to the conclusion that it has not improved the well-being of the African peoples. This is due to the fact that the colonial powers increasingly need their colonies. Oliver Cox states that it is a misnomer to call the United States and Great Britain "democracies" because this stage has not been reached by them—the most advanced democratic country being the Soviet Union. Only the proletariat can achieve democracy, destroying capitalism in the process. Cox does not discuss what the Dependent Territories, which have a small if not non-existent proletarian class, will do to achieve democracy.

The last few articles discuss the various problems of dependent territories and independent countries, having in common the idea that their development depends on Western aid and largesse. For example, Ralph Bunche sees that the role of the United Nations is to insure peace in the world and settle disputes among Third World nations, such as the Palestine Question, which it solved successfully. W. Benson is also naive when he discusses the United Nations and its positive role in developing the Third World.

In appraising the articles found in the JNE we find that although most of the articles show a lack of analytic depth, and usually discuss non-U. S. countries from the educational angle (as was to be expected) the articles here are far more numerous than in the other two journals, and cover a wider spectrum of views on development and related issues to the Third World. However, as is obvious from the above sample of articles, very few mention any relationship between blacks in the United States and the darker peoples of the world, and the proportion of coherent, analytic articles are in the minority, and are not followed up or discussed in any way in later issues.

After having given a synopsis of the main trends in the three journals, the question naturally arises: why do the majority of the articles deal (or do not deal) with the issues involved in the way they did? Why do the articles in the journals largely ignore the important issues of, for example, self-determination of oppressed peoples, a condition, which it could be argued, blacks in the United States also share?

Two answers may be given. In the mid '40's and '50's, Africa and African societies were generally regarded as heathen and not worthy of study. Thus, it has been suggested that Afro-Americans were reluctant to identify in any way with anything African. This, one author posits, has begun to change for "Africa itself has begun to change. . . to stand in a new light, to assume. . . a new role in current history." Thus, the effect on the Afro-American Negro is that he "now moves in and

---

between parts of two worlds,\(^1\) and is forced into having a dual nature. Negro scholars, the author maintains, \(^2\) and writers of the last two or three generations have had their energies quite fully engaged in the enormous task of lifting the Negro's place in American life and history out of the mire of ignorance, prejudice, and obliquity in which so much white writing and scholarship confined it in the past. They have been concerned with the Negro (and with themselves) not as Africans or ex-Africans, but as American.\(^2\) He then divides black literature in the following way:

A group of titles represents that school of Negro writing marked at an earlier stage which were chiefly intent upon re-establishing the African heritage as something for Negroes to take a pride in. They were trying to offset the common Negro attitudes about Africa by proving that historically it was not the cipher in the darkness that the white man say. A third major group of the first one being travellers accounts and articles on Liberia of titles has to do with Africa in world politics, the object of colonial wars, exploitation, Western white rapacity. The scattering of older works on the anthropology, flora... and art of Africa has been swelled in the last few years by the output of younger Negro scholars who have joined the general rush of discovery. They are producing studies on the new politics, the new sociologies, the new economics of changing Africa and they do so as a rule strictly in the manner of their various scholarly disciplines... But scarcely any of this literature bears directly on relations between Negro Americans and Africans in terms of mutual attitudes, except as these appear incidentally, as in the writings of missionaries and travellers, or in the works of those with a hortatory or propagandistic purpose.\(^3\)

However, in the author's analysis as to why different writings did not

---

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 221.

materialize, the reason, I think, goes a little beyond the "aversions" which Afro-Americans developed in their childhoods, and may be attributed to more concrete phenomena, such as lack of funds in the different schools to study Africa (especially during the time when the United States was relatively unembroiled in African affairs, and therefore did not consider it important enough to subsidize certain departments).
CHAPTER V

AFRO-AMERICAN SCHOLARS AND THEIR INTEREST IN AFRICA: 1965-1973

Turning now to articles written on Africa after 1965 to the early seventies, I found that Afro-American scholars evinced a much broader interest in African affairs than before. Articles in black journals cover topics as disparate as the popularity of soul-music in Africa to liberation movements and one-party systems in Africa. To cover these far-ranging articles in any depth or conciseness would be inadvisable as a rigorous, year-by-year analysis of the contents of black journals (as was carried out in the preceding chapter) would yield little of interest or academic significance. Therefore, I have decided to focus on specific trends either in the topics discussed or in intellectual slants which have emerged after 1965 among the writings of black scholars stemming from their interest on Africa as being the more appropriate tactic.

Many articles in the Review of Black Political Economy and Black Scholar are devoted to discussing the colonial question in the United States. Articles of this nature began to appear after the advent of the Black Power movement in the late '60's and the early '70's, when Afro-American activists linked their struggle to liberation struggles occurring in the Third World. A similar analogy had been advanced in the '20's by the C. P. U. S. A. which considered Southern blacks in the United States
as constituting an embryonic black nation. This analysis was not highly
garded among the then-existing black intellectuals. Today, however,
this idea with many different interpretations and ramifications, is much
in vogue with certain activist groups, such as the Republic of New Africa,
and with many individual Afro-American intellectuals.

Afro-American intellectuals have had to undergo mental somersaults
and gyrations to fit the "colonial paradigm" to the situation of black
people in the United States. Generally speaking, colonialism is a system
of domination of a people and their land by another people who are tech-
nologically superior, and usually ethnically different. Domination by the
technologically-superior group is initially economically motivated, to
exploit the land and/or the cheap labour of the subordinate indigenous
people, and is sustained by the armed forces of the ruling group. A set
of institutions are then created to sustain the dominant position of the
ruling group, and concomitant values are inculcated into the indigenous
population to enforce an acceptance of the status quo. At times, members
of the indigenous population are trained and brought within the adminis-
trative structure; thereby providing an illusion that progress is taking
place. Contradictions, however, within and without the colonial situa-
tion encourage nationalism within a certain class of the indigenous
population, usually among the trained (intellectuals and/or the army)
classes, and they lead a revolt against the ruling powers with or without
the support of the masses of the indigenous people, as the case may be,
seize state power, reinstate themselves as the ruling class, and assume
the responsibility for their fate and the destiny of their people.

Countries which had been under the yoke of colonialism may be charac-
terized as being generally underdeveloped with a low percentage of literacy, high infant mortality rates, low growth of the GNP, etc.—all these factors stemming from the fact that the colonized country once achieving constitutional de jure sovereignty, has no real de facto sovereignty, but is tied economically and politically to serve the needs of the former mother country.

The traditional definition of a colony, then, assumes that the colony exists as a separate geographical entity from the mother country, and that exploitation both of the land and labour of the colonized peoples is taking place. Thus, Afro-American intellectuals had to radically alter the definition of a colony for it to fit into the situation which they perceived to be existing in the United States.

Robert Allen, in one of the important books published in the late '60's, Black Awakening in Capitalist America, tried to fit the reality of Afro-American into such a paradigm and the paradigm into reality to make the two coincide. He argues that "Black America is an oppressed, a semicolon of the United States, and the black revolt is emerging as a form of national liberation struggle." Thus, the first alteration to the colonial paradigm is a geographical one, which states that black America is a semicolon, or a domestic colony within the United States, and a shift in emphasis takes place from that of a colonized people colonized by a foreign people to an emphasis on the institutions created by coloni-
zation which serve to sustain it.\(^1\) Once that shift is made and the difficult question of land is neatly circumvented, many striking and impressionistic similarities can be pointed out between colonized peoples in the Third World and Afro-Americans in the United States. Such similarities, Robert Allen points out, include political and legal provisions whereby blacks in the United States were systematically excluded and manipulated by whites.\(^2\) In both cases, armed force was used to subjugate the exploited peoples. The class consideration as well, offers striking similarities, where certain classes of the subordinate group collaborate with the dominant one with the aim of perpetuating the status quo.\(^3\)

Culturally as well, there are similarities, such as the role of the church as pacifier and the destruction of the traditional forms of culture.\(^4\)

Neocolonialism in the Third World also finds its counterpart in a neocolonial black nation in the United States, where formal independence is granted to a colonial nation, and where Afro-Americans are granted certain superficial aspects of political freedom, but where in both cases economic exploitation still remains the crucial factor.\(^5\) Thus, black people in the United States form a domestic neo-colony where the Establishment is co-opting any potential for revolution by equating Black Power

\(^1\) Ibid., pp. 7-8.
\(^2\) Ibid., pp. 8-9.
\(^3\) Ibid., pp. 10-11.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 13.
\(^5\) Ibid., pp. 13-14.
with Black Capitalism via organizations of great financial wealth such as the Ford Foundation, and by forging ties with the black middle class, whose job is to ensure that the masses of black people remain quiescent in their condition of exploitation.¹

The colonial paradigm is certainly a persuasive and an attractive one with which to work. However, certain fundamental questions could be raised about its applicability. Besides the fact that the paradigm needs radical alteration to fit the situation, the paradigm raises more questions than it answers, and offers no viable solution or solutions to the Black struggle in the United States.² Certainly, the question of land cannot be brushed aside lightly by saying that the colonial question in the United States has unique characteristics and that it is necessary to concentrate on colonial "processes" or "institutional mechanisms".³ After all, the colonial paradigm, both the classic and the altered version, is based on the premise that the colonized are able to overthrow their masters to assume control over their destinies. And it is at this point that the colonial paradigm, when applied to the United States, shows a fundamental weakness: how can black people gain control so that they can determine their own fate—and over what will they exercise their sovereignty? Some intellectuals have answered by stating that specific regions

¹Ibid., pp. 17-19.


in the south constitute the basis for a black nation, others argue that
the ghettos and cities in general constitute colonies, and therefore the
control over the basic institutions there, such as police, business,
schools, etc., should be seized. Since basic changes in American society
enabling black people to either establish a separate state or to exercise
viable self-determination over cities and ghettos, cannot take place
within the existing political and economic structures; a general upheaval
and a radicalizing of the society in general is called for. And since
the black population in the United States forms a sizeable minority, but
constitute a minority nonetheless, to carry through such an upheaval
would logically need the cooperation and radicalization of other ethnic
groups and classes in American society. The colonial paradigm however,
as is usually applied to the United States, makes no provision for any
white participation, taking for granted the fact that the black struggle
by itself and on its own will enable black people to achieve self-deter-
mination. To say the least, the paradigm's prescriptive usefulness is
limited.

Some black intellectuals have used the colonial paradigm as a con-
ceptual framework to characterize the ghetto as an underdeveloped colony
with an underdeveloped economy, similar to many of the underdeveloped
nations in the Third World; and like many Third World countries, they
condemn imperialism but not capitalism. Thus, like many underdeveloped
nations, some Afro-American intellectuals view with disfavour the excesses
of capitalism, but believe that it is a sound basis for development, if
tempered with a little socialism. Henry C. Wallich and William J. Dodson,¹

¹Henry C. Wallich and William J. Dodson, "Economic Models and Black
(Fall, 1972), 74.
for example, state that the solution to black people's economic problems in the United States may be multi-faceted,¹ and they conclude by seeing the black population achieving power within the institutional framework already existing, and not confronting the institutions on any fundamental premises. Thus, they parallel some Third World governments which view the only way for development to take place is through the aegis of foreign, capitalistic, investment.

A slightly more leftist view which some black authors prescribe to is the dependency theory, which, again, many Third World intellectuals ascribe to. Generally, this model views the Third World as mere appendages to the capitalist countries, with the result that little development takes place which benefits the masses in the appendages. Ron Bailey, among others, could be characterized as a dependency theorist of black America.² He starts out with the analogy that the black community, like overseas colonies, is not only a source of cheap labour, but also a market for highly-priced manufactured goods.³ He points out the fact that nominal independence granted to the Third World countries, like the Emancipation Proclamation and the Civil Rights legislation, has not significantly changed the plight of the Third World peoples and Afro-Americans,⁴ and he concludes by stating that the dependency theory offers

¹Ibid., pp. 75 and 86.
³Ron Bailey, p. 47.
⁴Ibid., p. 63.
... a more effective framework for the analysis of the historical and contemporary situation of black people in the U.S. We have seen how the concept we are calling internal colonialism fits what we know to be the concrete historical experiences of black people and the relationship of these experiences to Third World underdevelopment European (including Euro-American) development.

The Dependency theory, when applied to the black struggle in the United States, has the same flaws as the colonial paradigm, since it in effect is nothing but an extension and refinement of that same paradigm.

Stokely Carmichael, claiming to be "scientific", offers yet another interesting conglomerate of ideas designed to end exploitation of black people, not only in the United States, but wherever they exist.

In his strategy of liberation, Stokely Carmichael addresses himself to what he considers the three crucial problems which any ideology in Black America must encompass:

... we must speak to the problem of class, against capitalism; we must speak to the problem of race, against racism; and we must speak to the problem of land.

Land, Stokely states, is crucial in any revolution. Rhodesia, South Africa and the United States are all settler colonies, and for any settler colony to be successful, it has to commit genocide against the indigenous population. Americans are European settlers who committed genocide against the native Americans; Afro-Americans on the other hand, are not Afro-"Americans", but Africans. Thus, an ideology for the

---

1 Ibid., p. 68.
3 Ibid., pp. 199-200.
4 Ibid., pp. 200-201.
liberation of black people must logically lead to Pan-Africanism, and thus "The highest political expression of Black Power is Pan-Africanism".¹

Using Pan-Africanism as the foundation for his ideology, Stokely Carmichael then states that the land question cannot be resolved here in the United States—but in Africa.

It seems to me any clear black ideology that talks about revolution, understanding the necessity of a land base, must be pointed toward Africa, especially since we've decided that we're an African people and Africa belongs to all African peoples. It is our homeland!²

One problem however, arises—Africa has no power to give protection to all its African brothers and sisters scattered in the universe. Africa, then, must unite to be able to do so—"It could then give protection to all its descendents, wherever they may be,"³ and thus black people in the United States must make Africa and African unity their top priority and support movements that are trying to build a revolutionary Africa.⁴

The logical corollary to this hypothesis is that black people in the United States, since their land base is in Africa, will move to Africa to develop their relationship with their land. Stokely Carmichael, however, is exceedingly ambivalent on the question of emigration:

What should we do? Should we all go back to Africa? 'Are you saying we should all go back to Africa?' No, I am not saying we should all go back to Africa at this point. We all have to go back there sooner or later though.⁵

¹Ibid., pp. 201-202.
²Ibid., p. 203.
³Ibid., p. 205.
⁴Ibid., p. 206.
⁵Ibid.
And yet in another speech he states:

It is usual procedure for advocates of Pan-Africanism to assure Africans of the diaspora that Pan Africanism does not mean returning to Africa. I refuse to do so... We are Africans. Africa is our home. Even if a man cannot return home it is his dying wish... Mother Africa is ours, we are proud of her and to her glorious reconstruction we pledge our lives.¹

Meanwhile, however, black people in the United States, during the interim period before they either emigrate to Africa and reunite with their land-base, or wait till Africa unites and is able to protect them, must do three things. Firstly, the black community must unite,² secondly, it must seize control over the political institutions within the black community,³ and thirdly, the black community must try to develop independent economic bases⁴ even though "we do not own or control the means of production in the larger society. But we must nonetheless attempt to establish independent economic bases wherever possible."⁵

It is difficult to see why Stokely Carmichael puts forward his three-point program for the black community, since his ideology does not state the direction in which the community should travel. He does state however, that genocide will be practiced against black people in the United States ⁶ and that black people must therefore be prepared to fight. The

¹Ibid., p. 225.
²Ibid., pp. 206-207.
³Ibid., pp. 207-208.
⁴Ibid., p. 208.
⁵Ibid., p. 209.
⁶Ibid., pp. 218-219.
capitalist system is also heading for an inevitable upheaval, and this is the second contingency black people must be prepared to face. Other than these two events however, Stokely Carmichael's analysis and program for the liberation of black people leave much to be desired.

In the first place, Stokely Carmichael does not address himself to the class question which he himself saw as an essential ingredient in any proposed ideology for the liberation of black people in the United States. He alludes to the fact that there are black people who are Uncle Toms, but goes no further. Secondly, he ignores a period of roughly two hundred years and the effect of a vastly different environment on black people's culture in the United States when he characterizes them as simply "African". Thirdly, the land question is dealt with in a manner that can only be described as ludicrous. He himself states that land is the supreme question in any revolution, but black people in America should struggle for land that they can neither see, touch, develop or receive sustenance from. Nonetheless, black people must set up independent black organizations in the United States without land. For a self-proclaimed Marxist, Stokely Carmichael has obviously not the slightest familiarity with basic Marxian economics. In trying to make Pan-Africanism the ideology of Black Nationalism

.. Black Nationalism is African Nationalism. Because the Blackman is the African and the African is the Blackman.. African Nationalism finds its highest aspiration in Pan-Africanism. So too Black Power really means African Power.

---

1 Ibid., p. 208.
2 Ibid., p. 224.
Stokely Carmichael commits the mistake of trying to base his ideology for liberation on an historical relationship and an identification with what is basically, a very tenuous tie of colour. By so doing, he neglects the particular and unique conditions of black people in America.

Another trend, exemplified by Tilden LeMelle, is one which uses "race" as an explanatory device in studying international relations. Tilden LeMelle, who was Associate Director of the Center on International Race Relations, Graduate School of International Studies at the University of Denver and editor of Africa Today, has constructed with the help of George W. Shepherd, Jr., (Director of the Center on International Race Relations, Graduate School of International Studies at the University of Denver), a conceptual framework of international relations using race as a central factor, having explanatory powers that he considers to have been widely underrated in the past. He is one of the few Afro-American authors to rate the factor of race as of supreme importance in analyzing international events.

The gist of LeMelle's conceptual framework is fairly simple—that there exists racially stratified societies where a dominant racial group will discriminate against a subordinate one. Class stratification in such societies is merely a function of racial stratification.¹ Racial stratification, however not only exists in societies, but also dominates international relations.² Today international relations are dominated by technologically superior white nations, bound together by bonds of

¹Tilden LeMelle and George W. Shepherd, Jr., "Race in the Future of International Relations," International Affairs, XXXV, No. 2 (1971), 302-03.

whiteness in an effort to perpetuate their domination over the coloured peoples of the world. Relatively recently, however, peoples of colour have also joined in efforts to combat white intrusion into their sovereignty, and have formed Pan-African and Non-Pan-Africanist movements, movements which are dedicated to liberating all peoples of colour from white domination.¹

Much of what occurs in the international arena, according to LeMelle, can be explained by the above argument. Thus, the Sino-Soviet conflict is primarily a conflict between a yellow and a white nation and not an ideological one; and Japan, a non-white nation which has achieved technological parity with white nations, and which in turn exploits non-white peoples such as the black people of South Africa, is summarily and satisfactorily dismissed by LeMelle as a nation having achieved an "honorary white" status.

The function of race in individual societies and in the international arena is an important one—it is the basis for regulating and perpetuating dominant-subordinate relationships by either outright physical force or by nominal assimilationist policies.² In such situations, race is a centripetal force, a force that legitimizes the superiority of the superordinate races. When, however, physical force and the nominally assimilationist policies fail to keep the subordinate race acquiescent, race will become a centrifugal force, acting as a catalyst for violence and the disintegration of society.³ Tilden LeMelle does not satisfactorily explain

¹Ibid., pp. 98-99.
²LeMelle and Shepherd, Jr., p. 303.
³Ibid., pp. 303-304.
how change in a society comes about, (converting race into a centripetal from a centrifugal force), but simply states that the breakdown in centripetal systems occurs when the propagated norms and values are no longer accepted by the subordinate race as satisfactory for explaining their (usually) abject condition.¹

Increasing transnational racial ties could be contributing factors leading to major wars. The panacea for avoiding such tensions, according to LeMelle, is racial pluralism. This would entail the removal of discriminatory practices in domestic as well as in international politics. In pluralist societies, race would no longer be considered a significant stratification device, and new societies would emerge due to an equalitarian revolution, which may establish uniracial states, or which may simply remove race as a significant factor in domestic and foreign affairs.² This would strengthen humanistic considerations for non-white peoples, and protect them from corporate interests which today dominate foreign affairs.³ Racially pluralist societies, Tilden LeMelle admits, are idealistic, but unless some efforts are made to move in that direction, racial conflict will increase. Obstacles towards achieving that goal are many, and the dominant white groups may have to be pushed into redistribution and reform by revolutionary racial conflict.⁴

This is LeMelle's theory of international relations in an abbreviated form. There are gaping holes in his conceptual schemata. The

¹Ibid., pp. 304–305.
²Ibid., p. 312.
³Ibid.
⁴Ibid.
first and most basic criticism that could be levelled against him is that his concept of race does not satisfactorily explain how white nations gained their technological ability to dominate non-white nations. In other words, he fails to distinguish between the economic basis and rationale for racism, concentrating on the effect of race, and he characterizes some of the ideologies of subordinate races as "counter-racist," neglecting to mention that subordinate groups cannot be counter-racist since they do not have the power to enforce and implement their "racist" ideologies. Imperialism too, is characterized as being strongly influenced by racial patterns, even though "obviously, additional factors such as economic exploitation may produce imperialism".

The factor of change is another concept that LeMelle does not deal with systematically or adequately, and given his paradigm, it is easy to understand why. LeMelle characterizes the pattern of change as one of changing race relations—from a centripetal to a centrifugal form of society. However, what forces are at work in causing the breakdown of centripetal forces (i.e., the rejection of accepted norms by the subjugated), remains shrouded in mystery. Subjugated peoples do not try to overthrow their masters simply because they are exploited—history is replete with examples of peoples dominated for centuries with no appreciable improvement in their standards of living. LeMelle does not mention factors which might induce the breakdown of centripetal forces—factors such as urbanization, and economic growth or decline of the societies in question. In short, LeMelle takes for granted that change

---

1 Ibid., p. 34.

2 Ibid., p. 307.
and change in a certain direction, will take place—neglecting to men-
tion factors which will induce, define and maybe redirect (his projection of) change.

LeMelle's suggested panacea also leaves much to be desired. Not only does he not specify what might lead to racially plural societies, but he neglects to mention what form the economic institutions in such societies will take—and whether some economic institutions, such as the corporation, will continue to exist. He talks vaguely of a "redistribution of power" and "real redistribution and reform" which can "come about only with the growth of revolutionary racial conflict", and then posits the conclusion that growing racial conflict can only be avoided by radical change in the dominant societies.

Many other criticisms can be levelled against LeMelle's theories of international relations, however, the above comments are sufficient to show that the concept of race, as LeMelle uses it, is an incoherent one with little explanatory utility. A far more sophisticated usage of a similar concept is used by Richard Gibson in his book, African Liberation Movements, where he posits the thesis that in Africa, the Sino-Soviet split has created similar ideological schisms in African liberation movements, the Chinese usually backing liberation movements that are racially unified, especially in their exclusion of white participation, such as

---

1 Ibid., p. 314.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
the Pan-Africanist Congress, which has proved to be far more effective in the short time it was operative above-ground than the Soviet-backed African National Congress which has followed the more conventional Marxist line of allowing progressive whites to participate in their movement. The concept of race therefore, can be utilized to explain certain aspects of international relations, such as the reluctance of Great Britain to use military force against a rebellious white-dominated Rhodesia, but it should be utilized in dialectical conjunction with other concepts that have equal, if not superior explanatory powers, especially when used in trying to understand the dynamics of the black struggle within the United States, a situation far more complex than many situations in Africa and the Third World.

Other manifestations of Afro-American scholars' interest in Africa are the various organizations they established to promote interest in and research on, Africa. These manifestations can be divided into two sub-categories: black studies departments established on university campuses; and academic organizations initiated by and for scholars or individuals related to the world of academia.

It is the latter forms of organization that will be briefly re-searched here, since the movement to establish black studies departments was initiated by students and not by established black intellectuals, the group I am specifically interested in. One contradiction however, should be noted here in regard to black studies departments:

They demand all the trappings of 'self-determination', except the ability to pay for themselves. Yet the more deeply they penetrate into white academic territory, the more profoundly they withdraw into themselves. They want sovereignty, but a subsidized sovereignty. They seek to develop the rudiments of
a new black nation. . . (but) they cannot break the umbilical cord with the white world, and they cannot live harmoniously within that world.¹

Turning now to the different organizations established by black scholars, we find that the Council on African Affairs (CAA), founded in the 1930's by the joint efforts of Paul Robeson and Dr. Max Yergan, to have been one which consistently took an anti-colonialist, and later on, an anti-imperialist stance (which is not necessarily an anti-capitalist position), and which did try to persuade both the black public and the government to support the liberation of Africa and the entire colonized world, until its dismantlement under vicious McCarthyite attack in 1955.² The CAA disseminated information by servicing the press with information regarding Africa, organized programs and petitions, and circulated pamphlets and reports. It had an extensive African library and research facilities, and organized rallies, demonstrations and conferences in order to arouse and enlist support for its programs. And, although it was never structured as a mass organization, in 1948, it was listed as a "subversive organization" and placed on the Attorney-General's list. The high point of the Council's activities was in 1947, the Council having an interracial body of members, although its organizational and political functions was apparently run by the black members. In its heyday, the Council included among its members H. Aptheker, Rabbi Max Felshin, E. Franklin Frazier, Alain Locke, Rayford Logan, DuBois, and Rep. Acam Clayton Powell.³

³Ibid., pp. 207-208; 233-234.
The position the Council took on international relations shifted during the years it existed. In the 1930's, the CAA welcomed the emergence of the Soviet Union as a world power, seeing it as generating new power relationships in the world, and believing that the combined efforts of the Soviet Union and the United States would enable the colonized peoples to emerge from colonial domination. In 1944 for example, a conference sponsored by the CAA adopted a resolution which urged the United States government to promote international agreements "establishing effective machinery for securing the social, economic and political advancement of the African and other colonial peoples." In the same year, a petition was presented to President Roosevelt and the Secretary of State, urging the United States government to promote industrialization in Africa for the benefit of the African peoples. The petition was signed by Mary McLeod Bethune, Horace Mann Bond, and Theodore Dreiser, among others. The government responded evasively, endorsing independence for the colonized people if they were "prepared" for it.

Faith in the ability of the United States to follow a foreign policy conducive to the interests of the African and colonized peoples on the part of the members of the CAA was shaken by the onslaught of the Cold War, the United States foreign policy of "containment" with the concomitant militarization of the world, the American failure to forcefully support effective trusteeships and the massive aid directed for the rehabilita-
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1 Ibid., p. 208.
3 Ibid., p. 211.
4 Ibid., pp. 214-216.
tation of European countries to the neglect of the colonies and black people in the United States.\textsuperscript{1} International events, such as the Greek crisis of 1947, the Atlantic Pact, the Korean War, the Marshall Plan and the Point IV Assistance Programs, the United States economic involvement in South Africa, and the location of American military bases in North Africa helped to promote that disillusionment. It still remains to be pointed out that however great the disillusionment on the part of black scholars with regard to the imperialistic actions of the United States, they were unable to mobilize people to effectively make an impact on American foreign policy, nor were they able to convince government officials over to their viewpoints.

The First World Conference of Negro Writers and Artists gave birth to the Societe Africaine de Culture (SAC), which led in turn to the establishment in 1957 of the American Society of African Culture (AMSAC) by black scholars, with white scholars joining in as associates.\textsuperscript{1} AMSAC's aim was to educate Americans about the contributions of African peoples to the arts. More particularly,

Its purpose has also been to bring to the American Negro . . . an understanding of the continuing value of our gifts and a pride in our origins, so that we may join other Americans who feel secure in the traditions of their past and their contributions to America.\textsuperscript{2}

AMSAC and the American Negro Leadership Conference (ANLAC), an organization set up by Afro-American Civil Rights, religious and fraternal organizations, had overlapping memberships. ANLAC was an organization


set up by President John F. Kennedy, and "Some suspected it of being a white approved palliative for those Black Americans who were beginning to be stirred by the persistence of white domination in southern Africa."\(^1\)

The organization held two national meetings in 1962 and 1964, before petering out. "It's ultimate failure was grounded in an assumption on the part of its members that they could wield influence upon foreign policy by virtue of their own national prestige. But they had no real power on (sic) American society: they were only the brokers of their own powerlessness."\(^2\)

Indeed, AMSAC itself has been accused of being C.I.A.—controlled, exploiting Afro-American intellectuals, and holding arts festivals in the most reactionary regimes in Africa.\(^3\)

Another group was the African Studies Association (ASA), a non-profit organization formed by thirty-five scholars in 1957 with the aim to

- . . . foster, encourage and conduct scientific research and study about Africa, to publish, disseminate—or make available—the results of such research and study and otherwise to foster, encourage and improve knowledge and education in such field.\(^4\)

By October 1969 there were approximately two thousand members affiliated to the organization in various ways. It was (and presumably still is)

---

\(^1\) Tilden LeMelle, "Black Americans and Foreign Policy," pp. 20-21.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 21.


financed by membership dues and grants from the Carnegie Corporation
and the Ford Foundation.¹

One of the failings of the ASA, pointed out by Tilden LeMelle,² is that although it purports to be a non-political, professional organization, therefore eliminating the possibility of the organization taking sides on political issues; yet leading members of the ASA were and are doing classified research—work for U. S. governmental agencies, which enables the United States to base its foreign policy decisions. This, Tilden LeMelle correctly points out, is political activity, and refutes the argument put forth by the ASA that it is a non-political, professional organization.³

Another tenet held by the ASA is that the ASA is concerned with finding out universal and objective truths—and therefore the Association cannot advance the subjective (and partisan) concerns of any group. Tilden LeMelle again points out that the social sciences are not value-free and non-subjective, and that "if an Afro-centric point of view is unscholarly, then there is no scholarship in studies that deal with man, there never has been and there never will be, and the ASA has no 'scholarly' justification for its existence. . . . To separate the study of man from the condition of man is as irrelevant a pursuit as was the attempt to determine how many angels could rest on the head of a pin."⁴

¹Ibid.
³Ibid., pp. 19-20.
⁴Ibid., p. 19.
At an ASA meeting in Los Angeles in October, 1968, the Black Caucus began to form the African Heritage Studies Association (AHSA) which intends to examine every aspect and approach to the history and culture of African people in this country and throughout the world. Further, its members intend to project their influence into every organization that relates to Africa and the people of African descent. . . . We deplore the fact that so many people, mainly white, are gaining quick reputations as authorities on African people. We regard this as academic colonialism . . . not unrelated to the neocolonialism that is attempting to re-enslave Africa by controlling the minds of the African people. . . .

The movement had originally begun in the Los Angeles meeting of the ASA in 1968, but had begun to take shape and content in 1969 when the demands of the Black Caucus had not been met by the ASA and its board members.2 Originally conceived of as a pressure group within the ASA, asking for minimal changes, the Black Caucus, headed by John H. Clarke, evolved into the AHSA in 1969, still being seen by its members as part of the ASA.

It was at the ASA annual meeting at Montreal that the AHSA voted to become a completely separate organization. The "Black Caucus" disrupted the sessions being held, stating that

. . . the ideological framework of the ASA which perpetuates colonialism and neocolonialism through 'educational' institutions and the mass media be changed immediately.

The AHSA saw itself as legitimizing African Studies, changing the standards of what was conceived as "valid" and "valuable" research, and as a forum for "unorthodox" views which otherwise would have been given short shift by the more established scholars on Africa.

2. Interview with Dr. Shelby Smith, Atlanta University, November 4, 1974.
CONCLUSION

Certain topics central to the issues tackled in this thesis have been inadequately dealt with, due to constricts of time and lack of published materials. For example, the issue of corporate funding of Black Studies departments and black organizations was merely touched upon, and the issue of academic control over intellectuals by forces outside the control of individual scholars and even by the intellectuals as a class was taken as given with examples merely quoted to support the argument. This leaves the author of the paper deeply dissatisfied. On the other hand, I am comforted by the fact that the thesis was not intended to be a definitive answer to many of the questions that still remain unanswered by the paper. This thesis was conceived of as a pilot study with the basic hypothesis that there had occurred a qualitative shift and a quantitative increment in articles written by black intellectuals on Africa between the years 1945 to 1973. After conducting the research–work for this thesis, the hypothesis has been confirmed in part. There has occurred an increase in the numbers of articles written on Africa by Afro–American scholars, discussing and evaluating many different topics. It is possible to hazard a guess as to why this has occurred—there are many more universities that offer courses and majors in African studies, Africa itself had assumed a more important role in international relations (which in a sense legitimizes the field as an area which deserves academic scrutiny not only by anthropologists and sociologists), and the funds allocated for the study of Africa have increased.
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Whether or not the quality of research done on Africa has improved is a question that is open for debate. There is no doubt that the motives for writing on Africa have changed to a small degree. Authors who write on Africa today wish not only to reveal that African civilizations existed in order to inculcate pride in Afro-Americans over their heritage, but also because some authors wish to link the struggle they perceive taking place in the United States by Afro-Americans with the world-wide struggle of exploited peoples for self-determination and freedom. Thus, both the subject-matter and sometimes the motives for writing about Africa, have changed.

A question however, may be raised as to whether Afro-American intellectuals have developed new analytical tools to analyze new issues, and whether the concepts and philosophical underpinnings of their writings conform to those of mainstream American intellectuals, who by definition, engage in academic pursuits from the vantage point of apologizing and maintaining the status quo. Logically therefore, if the philosophical underpinnings used by mainstream American social scientists serve to justify the continued oppression and exploitation of large numbers of people, intellectuals who wish to upset the status quo must search for new philosophical concepts and intellectual tools which justify, in turn, the negation of the existing order.

A bias of the author has been stated at the beginning of the thesis, regarding the duties and functions of black intellectuals as being agents of change in American society. I found that the majority of black intellectuals today, (as I have defined them for this thesis) although clearly perceiving the linkages and implications of American imperialism in Africa
and their people's exploitation in the United States, have failed to agitate for fundamental change in the disciplines to which they belong. Their writings in the main do not distinguish themselves as being different from the mainstream of American social science. This does not mean that I advocate for any Third World intellectual the search for a "new" theoretical framework or paradigm, for within Western philosophy there are some currents of thought that have challenged the edifice of Western society, and have been considered subversive since they advocate the elimination of the root causes of exploitation and oppression. These currents of thought could be scrutinized critically and evaluated. Genuine change cannot be achieved (however conceived, either in the distributive or productive functions of the society) if Afro-American intellectuals use the philosophical tools that spring out of and maintain the very exploitation under which they suffer. All-black organizations concentrating on questions that affect black people do not necessarily mean that the theoretical tools used are of a different caliber from those used by one's reactionary counterparts. I will not go so far as to state, however, as one author does

The Negro intellectuals in the United States have never developed a philosophy as to the meaning of human existence or a social philosophy concerning the world. . . . they have failed to develop any new philosophy or meaning of existence. This has been due partly to the inferior education of Negro intellectuals and partly to their mental and social isolation in American life. They are touched only in a superficial way by the philosophical currents in the modern world. . . where the exigencies of daily living absorbs his energies. They [black intellectuals] seem to have scarcely reflected upon the great revolution which is occurring in the modern world except as it may affect their social status in the United States.1

---
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