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<td>Union de Travailleurs Nègres</td>
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<td>West African National Secretariat</td>
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<td>West African Students’ Confederation</td>
</tr>
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<td>WASU</td>
<td>West African Students’ Union</td>
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<td>WAYL</td>
<td>West African Youth League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFTU</td>
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<td>Women’s International Democratic Federation</td>
</tr>
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<td>YMCA</td>
<td>Young Men’s Christian Association</td>
</tr>
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<td>ZANU</td>
<td>Zimbabwe African National Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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Introduction

In May 2013, the African Union (AU), the organization of all African states, held its twentieth summit fifty years after the founding of its predecessor the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) in May 1963. The AU, which was barely ten years old, adopted the theme of Pan-Africanism and African Renaissance for the anniversary summit. A special AU publication explained that

Pan-Africanism is an ideology and movement that encouraged the solidarity of Africans worldwide. It is based on the belief that unity is vital to economic, social and political progress and aims to ‘unify and uplift’ people of African descent. The ideology asserts that the fates of all African peoples and countries are intertwined. At its core, Pan-Africanism is ‘a belief that African peoples both on the continent and in the diaspora, share not merely a common history, but a common destiny.’

Nothing could exemplify this belief better than the AU itself, an organization with a membership that not only includes fifty-three out of the fifty-four African states but also the entire African diaspora. The diaspora is designated the ‘sixth region’ of the AU and consists of ‘people of African origin living outside the continent, irrespective of their citizenship and nationality … who are willing to contribute to the development of the continent and the building of the African Union’.

The AU Echo expressed the view that Pan-Africanism could be considered both ‘a governmental and grassroots objective’, and suggested that it encompassed the thinking of such significant figures as Kwame Nkrumah and Muammar Gaddafi on the one hand and Malcolm X, W. E. B. Du Bois and Marcus Garvey on the other. It suggested that the ‘foundations of contemporary Pan-Africanism were laid by the Fifth Pan-African Congress held in Manchester in 1945’. This congress, it stated, ‘drew up the general outline of a practical programme for the political liberation of Africa’.
Definition

In fact, there has never been one universally accepted definition of exactly what constitutes Pan-Africanism. Some writers on the subject are even reluctant to provide a definition, or suggest that one cannot be found, acknowledging that the vagueness of the term reflects the fact that Pan-Africanism has taken different forms at different historical moments and geographical locations. Nevertheless, most writers would agree that the phenomenon has emerged in the modern period and is concerned with the social, economic, cultural and political emancipation of African peoples, including those of the African diaspora. What underlies the manifold visions and approaches of Pan-Africanism and Pan-Africanists is a belief in the unity, common history and common purpose of the peoples of Africa and the African diaspora and the notion that their destinies are interconnected. In addition, many would highlight the importance of the liberation and advancement of the African continent itself, not just for its inhabitants, but also as the homeland of the entire African diaspora. Such perspectives might be traced back to ancient times but Pan-Africanist thought and action is principally connected with, and provoked by, the modern dispersal of Africans resulting from the trafficking of captives across the Atlantic to the Americas, as well as elsewhere, from the end of the fifteenth century to the close of the nineteenth century. This ‘slave trade’, the largest forced migration in history, and the creation of the African diaspora was accompanied by the emergence of global capitalism, European colonial rule and anti-African racism.

Central to the development of Pan-African thinking and action was the creation of the modern African diaspora, resulting from the trafficking of enslaved Africans. At least 12 million Africans were transported to the American continent, millions more died in the perpetration of this great crime, and new nations came to be established in the Caribbean, Brazil, the United States and elsewhere in which those of African descent were either the majority or a significant minority. Nevertheless, as a consequence of enslavement and the anti-African racism that accompanied it, Africans were generally denied the same rights as Europeans and, in many instances, were not even considered human. Special laws were enacted to maintain such inequalities, even when Africans were legally free, or when the status of slavery no longer existed. The best-known examples are perhaps to be found in the United States where, even in the late twentieth century, African Americans were prevented from voting, forced to accept inferior segregated facilities, including education, and were routinely attacked and intimidated by terrorist organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan and even by the police. Underpinning racist laws and practices and anti-African racism in general has been the idea that Africans are naturally inferior to other humans, especially those of European origin.
Historically racist ideas concerning alleged African inferiority have been connected to the obvious economic and political motives of those who have benefited most from slavery, colonialism and capital-centred societies. Such ideas have been widely promoted and have appeared in various forms. As Muhammad Ali, the famous African American sportsman, expressed it in a speech at Howard University in 1963:

Everything good and of authority was made white. We look at Jesus, we see a white with blond hair and blue eyes. We look at all the angels, we see white with blond hair and blue eyes ... We look at Miss America, we see white. We look at Miss World, we see white. We look at Miss Universe, we see white. Even Tarzan, the king of the jungle in black Africa, he’s white!

Such Eurocentric ideas of white (European) superiority and black (African) inferiority have endured and in varying forms have had a significant influence on attitudes to Africa and Africans. As late as 2007, for example, the president of France, Nicholas Sarkozy, in a speech that quickly became infamous, arrogantly asserted ‘The tragedy of Africa is that the African has not fully entered into history.’ He added that for thousands of years there was no ‘idea of progress’ in Africa. His views were widely condemned and not only in Africa. However, they were strongly reminiscent of those contained in a speech made over forty years earlier by an apparently eminent English historian, Hugh Trevor-Roper. In a public lecture at the University of Sussex in October 1963 Trevor-Roper, Regius Professor of History at Oxford University, stated: ‘Perhaps, in the future, there will be some African history to teach. But at present there is none, or very little: there is only the history of the Europeans in Africa. The rest is largely darkness, like the history of pre-European, pre-Columbian America. And darkness is not a subject for history.’ But Trevor-Roper was only repeating something that was a long-established Eurocentric view. In 1830, the well-known German philosopher Friedrich Hegel stated ‘At this point we leave Africa, not to mention it again. For it is no historical part of the World; it has no movement or development to exhibit.’

Pan-Africanism therefore evolved as a variety of ideas, activities, organizations and movements that, sometimes in concert, resisted the exploitation and oppression of all those of African heritage, opposed and refuted the ideologies of anti-African racism and celebrated African achievement, history and the very notion of being African. Pan-Africanism looks forward to a genuinely united and independent Africa as the basis for the liberation of all Africans, both those on the continent and in the diaspora. However, it should be made clear that historically there have been two main strands of Pan-Africanism. The earlier form emerging during the period of trans-Atlantic enslavement originated from the African diaspora, stressed the unity of all Africans and looked towards their liberation and that
of the African continent. The more recent form emerged in the context of the anti-colonial struggle on the African continent in the period after 1945. This form of Pan-Africanism stressed the unity, liberation and advancement of the states of the African continent, although often recognizing the importance of the diaspora and its inclusion. The continental focus of this form of Pan-Africanism can be seen in the orientation and activities of such organizations as the OAU and the AU. The more recent continental form of Pan-Africanism is likely to include the peoples and states of North Africa, the earlier form sometimes does not. I use one single term ‘Pan-Africanism’ to include all ideologies and movements that have at their centre the notion of the unity and advancement of Africa and its diaspora. I see no reason to adopt the proposal made by George Shepperson, many years ago, that Pan-Africanism with a capital letter should only be used to refer to the major congresses mainly organized by W. E. B. Du Bois (1868–1963) from 1919 onwards, as well as other events such as the 1958 All-African People’s Conference; whereas it should be presented without a capital letter when referring, for example, to Négritude and Garveyism, as well as ‘for all those All-African movements and trends which have no organic relationship with the capital “P” variety’. To my mind, on the contrary, Pan-Africanism might be more usefully viewed as one river with many streams and currents.

Black internationalism

In more recent times it has become fashionable mainly in some academic circles in the United States to use the term ‘black internationalism’ as an alternative to Pan-Africanism. The editors of one key text on the ‘Black International’, for example, define black internationalism as chiefly referring to those struggles which ‘although situated mainly in specific localities’, were ‘connected in some conscious way to an overarching notion of black liberation’. At the ‘core of black internationalism’, they assert, is ‘the ideal of universal emancipation’. However, as they present Garveyism and Black Power amongst other examples of such struggles, it is difficult to see how black internationalism can usefully be distinguished from Pan-Africanism.

In another influential text, Brent Hayes Edwards traces the rise of what he refers to as black internationalism to the period following the First World War and suggests that France, and particularly Paris, was an important locale for the emergence of ‘the stirrings of the cultures of black internationalism’. However, even in this case there is a recognition that these post-war stirrings which include the Harlem Renaissance and Négritude had important antecedents in an earlier period. Indeed, Edwards specifically mentions the consciousness already existing at the time of the London Pan-African Conference in 1900, which recognized that the struggles waged by African Americans, for instance, were part of a wider Pan-African struggle to address what W. E. B. Du Bois referred to as ‘the problem of the twentieth century’.
Edwards seems to have borrowed the phrase ‘black internationalism’ from Jane Nardal (c.1900–1993), an influential and important Martinican writer in Paris in the 1920s, who used the term *internationalisme noir* to refer to the growing links between ‘Negroes of all origins and nationalities’. Nardal particularly highlighted such developments as ‘a certain pride in being black’, and ‘in turning back towards Africa, cradle of the blacks, in recalling a common origin’. However, there is no doubt that she also used the phrase to refer to the growing Pan-Africanism as described by Du Bois in his essay ‘Worlds of Colour’.

Moreover, there seems to be no evidence that the term black internationalism has ever been widely used by other writers nor by activists. Pan-Africanism has been and remains the preferred term and therefore will be used throughout this historical survey.
Before the concepts of Pan-African and Pan-Africanism fully emerged at the end of the nineteenth century there were various organized efforts by Africans in the diaspora during the eighteenth century to unite to combat racism, to campaign for an end to the kidnapping and trafficking of Africans, or to organize to repatriate to the African continent. In Britain, for example, there appear to have been several informal efforts before African abolitionists, led by Olaudah Equiano (c.1745–1797) and Ottobah Cugoano (c.1757–?), formed the Sons of Africa organization in the 1780s to campaign for an end to Britain’s participation in the trans-Atlantic trafficking of enslaved Africans. The Sons of Africa appears to have been one of the first Pan-African organizations. Its members came from different parts of West Africa but as a consequence of enslavement and forced migration, found themselves in England where they organized collectively to find solutions to the common problems they faced. The Sons of Africa wrote letters to the press, lobbied Parliament, jointly addressed the Quakers and co-operated with other abolitionists and radicals as part of the wider campaign against the trafficking of Africans and for the rights of all.¹

Across the Atlantic in Boston in 1784 the abolitionist Prince Hall (c.1738–1807) and others organized the first African Masonic lodge in North America as a means of combatting racism and for mutual support and with a clear orientation towards Africa. Hall subsequently organized lodges in Philadelphia and Rhode Island and identified himself with efforts being made by some African Americans to return to Africa, while other Africans in Rhode Island also organized various types of fraternal organization.² Three years later an African Church movement developed in Philadelphia and Baltimore out of the Free Africa Society founded in Philadelphia by Richard Allen (1760–1831) and Absalom Jones (1746–1818), which itself emerged from opposition to racism within the Methodist Church. The African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church became the most notable outcome of this movement, which also emerged in other North American cities and, through the activities of Daniel Coker (1780–1846) and others, soon

¹ The forerunners
²
also extended to Sierra Leone in West Africa. An earlier African Baptist movement had begun in Savannah in the 1770s and some of its disciples had subsequently founded similar churches in Canada and the Caribbean colonies. A notable example was George Liele (1750–1820), sometimes known as the first Baptist missionary, who established the Ethiopian Baptist Church in Jamaica in 1793.

What is noticeable about such early initiatives is that they identified positively with Africa and were often accompanied by efforts to refute the dominant racist ideology of the day, which argued that Africans were inferior to Europeans, or even sub-human and only fit for enslavement. Absalom Jones specifically referred to the links between those in Africa and the diaspora in one of his most famous sermons in which he not only refers to ‘our brethren in Africa’ but also to all Africans’ shared history. The African American activist and missionary Daniel Coker wrote his own refutation of pro-slavery arguments in *A Dialogue between a Virginian and an African Minister* published in 1810. David Margrett, or Margate, another African missionary preached a message of revolutionary African liberation on both sides of the Atlantic in the 1770s, in London as well as in South Carolina and Georgia. It was said of him ‘that he can’t bear to think of any of his own colour being slaves’, and he said of himself ‘that he had been called to deliver his people from slavery’.

The best-selling writings of Equiano and Cugoano also aimed to undermine the racism that justified slavery, as well as attacking the slave trade and slavery itself. Such writing was sometimes a collective endeavour undertaken in the interests of all Africans and had a wide influence. Indeed Equiano, who was more usually known by his slave name, Gustavus Vassa, specifically reclaimed his African name, Olaudah Equiano, and re-styled himself ‘The African’ in his *Interesting Narrative*. As others have pointed out, the self-designation ‘African’ was one of the first elements of a new Pan-Africanist thinking that emerged in the eighteenth century amongst those in the diaspora. What became important was not a narrow national identity, as Fante, Igbo or Yoruba, but the new common Pan-African identity – African. This is clearly the case for African Masons, Christians and activists such as the Sons of Africa, as well as individual writers. Moreover, despite the prevailing anti-African racism, Africa was often presented in a positive light in the writings of Equiano, Phyllis Wheatley (1753–1784), James Gronniosaw (1705–1775) and others. A new African form of Christianity often linked communities, and therefore contributed to a growing Pan-African consciousness, throughout the Anglophone world in Britain, North America, the Caribbean and West Africa.

However, perhaps the most important event to undermine both racism and the slave system during this period was the revolution that broke out in the French Caribbean colony of St Domingue in August 1791. That revolutionary struggle eventually led in 1804 to the creation of Haiti, the first modern ‘black’ republic anywhere in the world and only the second
independent country in the entire American continent. The revolution disproved any racist notion of African inferiority, since the African revolutionaries had defeated the armies of Britain, France and Spain, the most powerful in Europe. Victory elevated Haiti to iconic status amongst all those of African descent and produced new heroes and heroines such as Toussaint L’Ouverture (1743–1803), Jean-Jacques Dessalines (1758–1806), Sanité Bélair (1781–1802), Cécile Fatiman (fl. 1791), Henri Christophe (1767–1820) and Alexandre Pétion (1770–1818). Haiti’s constitution established the principle of equal human rights and established the country as a safe-haven for all Africans. Indeed, in the early nineteenth century several thousand African Americans migrated to Haiti from Philadelphia and other cities in the United States. Haiti also acted as a base for future assaults on the ideology of racism by some of the country’s leading intellectuals and statesmen such as Anténor Firmin (1850–1911) and Benito Sylvain (1868–1915).

The Haitian Revolution might also be considered an early form of Pan-Africanism, of African unity, alongside other acts of liberation carried out by the enslaved during this period, such as the Revolt of the Malês in Brazil in 1835. One historian has presented such resistance in the Caribbean as a ‘200 years war’, or ‘one protracted struggle launched by Africans and their Afro-West Indian progeny against slave owners’. The Haitian Revolution united Africans from different parts of the African continent, as well as those born in the Caribbean. They established their own common language of communication, religious practices and worldviews in pursuit of liberation, and they managed to maintain a struggle and vision of freedom for over a decade. The various Maroon communities, or settlements of liberated former African slaves, that existed throughout the American and African continents in the modern period can be thought of as other early forms of Pan-African unity. Of these the most celebrated was Palmares in Brazil, an African kingdom where thousands of liberated Africans from different backgrounds found refuge for nearly a century until it was destroyed by invasion in 1694. However, Palmares was not an isolated example and South America was the location for many such African settlements, variously called quilombos, cumbes and palenques, which may also be considered early forms of Pan-Africanism.

The Haitian revolution was clearly an inspiration to many. Prince Hall, for example, referred positively to the revolutionary events in St Dominque and the struggles of those he referred to as our ‘African brethren’. Nanny Grigg, one of the leaders of the 1816 Bussa rebellion of enslaved Africans in Barbados, reportedly exhorted her comrades to act ‘in the way they did in San Domingo’. The Revolution also appears to have had a direct influence on José Antonio Aponte (d.1812) and his comrades who organized a large-scale rebellion in Cuba in 1812, and on Denmark Vesey (1760–1822), who had been a slave in Saint Domingue before his self-liberation and preparations to lead the enslaved to rebellion in South Carolina in 1822. Indeed, references to the inspirational Haitian Revolution can be found amongst
many in the diaspora in this period, from the revolutionary demands of Robert Wedderburn (1762–1835) in London to Bostonian David Walker’s *Appeal to the Coloured Citizens of the World* (1819). Walker’s *Appeal* is a significant early Pan-African text. Within it Walker (c.1785–1830) refers to ‘the sons and daughters of Africa’, condemns racism, extols Africa’s glorious historical past, claims an African origin of civilization, demands enlightenment and calls on his ‘afflicted and slumbering brethren’ to follow Haiti’s example and liberate themselves.

**Repatriation**

There were several early efforts by Africans in the diaspora to return to the African continent. In 1792 Thomas Peters (1738–1792), born in Africa, enslaved and then self-liberated during the American War of Independence, led over 1,000 ‘Black Loyalists’ from Nova Scotia in Canada to the new British colony of Sierra Leone, where they continued to agitate for their rights and even self-government. The Nova Scotians also began to speak of themselves as Africans and it might be said that they also began to develop a Pan-African consciousness. In part this was based on their common experience of enslavement and of the slave system, but, it was also based on knowledge of the world around them. They lived in a period where there were many large-scale rebellions of Africans culminating in the Haitian Revolution. In the early 1770s, for example, there were three major rebellions of Africans against the slave system in Suriname, Jamaica and St Vincent. The rebellion in Suriname involved tens of thousands of Africans and Amerindians and all three were widely reported in the North American press. There is therefore evidence of the development of an embryonic Pan-African consciousness based not only on common experience but also a common demand for liberty. Evidence of this thinking can, for example, be found in the petitions sent to the last governors of the British colonies in North America on behalf of enslaved Africans demanding freedom and the right to work so that money could be saved to send ‘Africans home to their native country’. These Africans demanded the same rights as other humans and declared ‘we are a freeborn pepel and have never forfeited that natural liberty [*sic*]’.

Other African Americans organized repatriation to Sierra Leone in the nineteenth century, including the Bostonian Quaker merchant Paul Cuffee (1759–1817), who began his efforts in 1815. Cuffee used his own ships and part-financed the first African American settlers to Sierra Leone and he also contemplated aiding migration from the United States to Haiti. Efforts to repatriate to West Africa were also made by Africans and their descendants who had been kidnapped, enslaved and transported to Brazil, Cuba and other parts of the Caribbean. After 1835, significant numbers of Africans from Brazil and Cuba returned to Lagos, Porto Novo and other West African
cities. It is estimated that around 8,000 made the Atlantic crossing in the nineteenth century, often with no certainty that they would reach Africa alive or still at liberty. Another notable advocate of repatriation was the Barbadian J. Albert Thorne, who established his African Colonial Enterprise and envisaged emigration to the British colonies in central or east Africa. There are therefore many remarkable stories of Africans from the diaspora who made the return journey to Africa in this period.

It must also be remembered that after 1807 tens of thousands of African ‘recaptives’, those enslaved and then freed on the high seas by the actions of the British navy also returned to Africa. Initially most were taken to the British colony of Sierra Leone from where many travelled to other parts of West Africa, often returning to their original homelands, but also further afield, as an influential, Western-educated population. The African American AME Church established itself in Sierra Leone from the 1820s and from 1876 onwards Freetown’s Fourah Bay College provided university degrees for students throughout Anglophone West Africa. Sierra Leone and its population therefore became very significant in the emergence of Pan-Africanism in the nineteenth century, as the activities of James Africanus Horton, Edward Blyden and their circles demonstrate.

The modern country of Liberia in West Africa, which was founded and developed by the American Colonization Society (ACS) in the early nineteenth century, also became a haven for repatriated African Americans. The AMS had been founded in 1817 as an unholy alliance of humanitarians and slave owners with differing motives, including racism and fear of the growth of a free African population in the United States, for encouraging the migration of African Americans. Nevertheless, after its declaration of independence in 1847, Liberia was viewed by many as another symbol of African achievement, alongside Haiti. African American colonization of Liberia was seen by some as providing another opportunity to prove the capabilities of those of African descent; a means to establish a base in Africa to elevate the position of all Africans.

By the end of the nineteenth century the African kingdom of Abyssinia had also assumed a similar iconic status partly because of its ancient history and a monarchy that traced its origins to biblical times. Even more importantly Abyssinia, led by its Emperor Menelik II, managed to defeat an Italian Army of invasion, at the historic battle of Adowa in 1896, and so preserve its independence from European colonial rule. It was the only African country to do so, although Liberia, strongly connected to the government of the United States and the Firestone Rubber Company also managed to preserve some measure of independence from the major European powers during their scramble for African colonies at the close of the nineteenth century.

The growth of colonies of Western-educated Africans in Sierra Leone, Liberia and elsewhere in West Africa, many of whom were personally connected with the struggle against enslavement and racism, was certainly a factor contributing to the emergence of emancipatory ideas with a broad
Pan-African rather than just local character throughout the nineteenth century. Certainly Western-educated Africans residing in Africa tended to identify more with each other and with other educated Africans in the diaspora than they did with uneducated Africans in the continent. Indeed, it could be said that an African intelligentsia of clergymen, doctors, lawyers and teachers emerged on all sides of the Atlantic, in Europe, the Americas and in Africa during this period. This intelligentsia influenced and drew inspiration from each other. Several prominent figures emerged such as Martin Delany, from the United States, Edward Blyden from the Caribbean and the Sierra Leonean James Africanus Horton.

Prominent figures

Martin Robinson Delany (1812–1885), was an abolitionist, writer and medical practitioner, who welcomed the ‘common cause’ that was developing between ‘the blacks and colored races’ of the world. He travelled to West Africa and advocated the ‘regeneration of Africa’ by those in the diaspora. He began to argue that despite the enormous contribution that Africans had made to the United States their future lay in emigration. At first, he considered that this must be to other parts of the American continent but gradually became convinced that it was emigration to Africa that was required if the ‘Colored Race’ was to re-establish its ‘native characteristics’, and return to its ‘former national position of self-government and independence’. He presented many of his views in his major work *The Condition, Elevation, Emigration and Destiny of the Colored People of the United States* (1852). In 1859 Delany and his colleague Robert Campbell (1829–1884) travelled to Lagos and other Yoruba kingdoms, in what is today Nigeria, where they were granted land for settlement. Delany’s plans for mass migration to West Africa were interrupted by the American Civil War, in which Delany became the first African American officer in the Union army, as well as by its aftermath. At the end of his life he returned to practising medicine and to writing a refutation of Social Darwinism, *The Principia of Ethnology: The Origin of Race and Colour* (1879). Delany spoke increasingly of the unity of all those in the diaspora and in 1860 clearly stated his policy ‘Africa for the African race and black men to rule them. By black men I mean, men of African descent who claim an identity with the race.’ The phrase ‘Africa for the African’ pre-dated Delany and was in common usage by the mid-nineteenth century. It is likely to have been an adaptation of the demand ‘Ireland for the Irish’.

Edward Wilmot Blyden (1832–1912), a politician, writer, educator and diplomat, has been viewed as one of the key thinkers in the development of Pan-Africanism. He was born in St Thomas in the Caribbean and after unsuccessful attempts to enter colleges in the United States emigrated to Liberia in 1851, with support from the AMS. He was both a teacher and
newspaper editor and became a strong advocate of repatriation to Africa from the diaspora and ‘racial pride’. For Blyden the ‘object of Liberia’ was ‘the redemption of Africa and the disenthralment and elevation of the African race’. He believed that African redemption would be brought about through the ‘Christian civilization’ of African American migrants and he was subsequently given an official government appointment to encourage migration from the diaspora to Liberia. Blyden also began to study history to find evidence to refute charges of African inferiority and to combat the prevailing racist views of the day. He published his own major work on the subject, *A Vindication of the Negro Race* in 1857. Blyden continued to exhort others in the diaspora to return to Africa and establish a ‘home and nationality’ of their own and he believed that Liberia could be the nucleus of what he referred to as ‘a West African state’. His thinking therefore had a great appeal for other educated West Africans, he was also an advocate of establishing a West African university to train West Africans for self-government and to build West African unity, but his entry into Liberian politics and outspoken comments on Liberians of mixed parentage led to his exile in Sierra Leone. From there he urged the British government to expand ‘Christian civilization’ throughout the region. He was equally enthusiastic about the territorial expansion of the United States in West Africa, again believing that ‘African redemption’ might be brought about through colonial rule.

In 1872, he established his newspaper *Negro* designed to ‘serve the race purpose’ and one of the first publications specifically aimed at audiences in Africa, the Caribbean and the United States. Blyden believed that Africans had their own unique contribution to make to the world and an equally unique ‘African personality’. He also believed that Africans must develop an education suited to their own needs, history and culture and he encouraged the study of African languages and Arabic. He was also a defender of Islam and many of his articles on this subject are contained in his most famous book, *Christianity, Islam and the Negro Race* (1887).

During his own lifetime Blyden was a very influential figure who had a significant impact on his contemporaries, especially the younger generation who began to organize on a pan-West African basis, or agitate for political reforms throughout British West Africa, including J. E. Casely-Hayford (1866–1930), John Mensah Sarbah (1864–1910) and Mojola Agbebi (1860–1917). However, he was also a firm supporter of British and other forms of colonialism in Africa, a position that he shared with many other Western-educated Africans in the nineteenth century. He was given official positions by the colonial government in Sierra Leone and he believed that Britain was the colonial power best suited to protect the interests of Africans but also that the partition of the continent by the European powers was in the interests of ‘African regeneration’ and for ‘the ultimate good of the people’. He even welcomed the British invasion of Egypt in 1882 and was reluctant to criticize the atrocities carried out by Belgian and American interests in the Congo. Blyden was one of the first to articulate the notion of
‘African personality’ and the uniqueness of the ‘African race’ and to establish influence in Africa and in the diaspora. For this reason, he is often seen as one of the key figures in the emergence of Pan-Africanism. Blyden’s views, encompassing as they do support for colonial rule, the ‘civilizing mission’ and various ideas of ‘race’ are clearly rooted in the nineteenth century and yet his contradictory ideas influenced later Pan-Africanists such as Marcus Garvey (1870–1940) and even Kwame Nkrumah (1909–1972).27

One of those who worked with Blyden in Liberia was African American Alexander Crummell (1818–1898) a missionary and abolitionist, who studied at the University of Cambridge in England. Crummell too had a strong belief that it would be those Christians from the diaspora who would ‘civilize’ Africa and he therefore became a strong advocate of African American migration and of the development of Liberia. His was a common view, that the regeneration of Liberia and of Africa in general must come from outside. Both Crummell and Blyden were influenced by the theories of German philosophers such as von Herder. They believed that Africa’s destiny was God given and that the African ‘race’ had specific qualities that would turn contemporary inferiority into ‘that superiority and eminence which is our rightful heritage, and which is evidently the promise of our God’. For this purpose, in his later life when he had left Liberia, Crummell founded the American Negro Academy in 1897, to ‘accomplish the civilization of the Negro race in the United States’. Blyden even believed that racism against African Americans was part of the divine plan to drive ‘the oppressed from the house of bondage, as Israel was from Egypt, to do his work in the land of his fathers’.28

Another of Blyden’s co-workers for African American migration was Bishop Henry McNeal Turner (1834–1915), an important African American figure in the nineteenth century, a writer and former politician, who became one of the leaders of the AME Church in the southern United States and one of the main proponents of African American migration to Africa in this period. He reportedly said, ‘the Negro will never be anything here while Africa is shrouded in heathen darkness’, a view that would no doubt have been supported by Blyden, Crummell and others.29 Turner travelled to both Sierra Leone and Liberia on several occasions and established the International Migration Society and two newspapers, the Voice of Missions and the Voice of the People, to encourage migration to Africa. He was also one of the first to preach that the Christian god could be conceived of as an African.

James Africanus Horton (1835–1883), a physician, scientist, historian and writer has been called ‘the father of modern African political thought’ and was also a key figure in the development of Pan-Africanism. Born near Freetown in the British colony of Sierra Leone, Horton was recruited by the War Office and sent to Britain in 1855 where he became one of the first Africans to train as a medical doctor. He was also one of the first African scientists in modern times to research and write on Africa and perhaps the
first scientist to describe the symptoms of sickle cell anaemia. It seems that it was while he was in Britain that Horton became aware both of racism and his African identity and adopted the name ‘Africanus’. After his graduation, he also became one of the first Africans to receive a commission in the British army. He served throughout the British colonies in West Africa but suffered from racism and discrimination throughout his army career.

In 1865 Horton began his political writing with the publication of an address to the London-based African Aid Society entitled *Political Economy of West Africa – The African’s View of the Negro’s Place in Nature*. His first political writing was prompted by the report of Britain’s Parliamentary Select Committee on the West African colonies that recommended ultimate withdrawal from this region by the British government and the creation of conditions that would lead to self-government. Horton wrote in support of African self-government but also took the opportunity to repudiate the dominant anti-African racism of the time. Horton further developed his ideas which in 1868 were republished in his most famous book *West African Countries and People, British and Native with the Requirements Necessary for Establishing that Self-Government recommended by the Committee of the House of Commons, 1865 and a Vindication of the African Race*. Horton, who became a supporter of Blyden, used the book to present a lengthy critique of Victorian racism, including the views of the anatomist Robert Knox who published a book entitled *The Races of Man* (1862) in which he had referred to the dangers of a future ‘United States of Africa’. Horton’s other main aim in the book was a vindication of Africans in which he borrowed freely from the work of others as well as presenting a programme for the self-government of Britain’s West African colonies. Horton too had an important influence on other educated West Africans and declared that his aims were to develop among them ‘a true political science’ and ‘to prove the capacity of the African for possessing a real political Government and national independence’. He thus became the first African to openly campaign for self-government not just in one country but throughout British West Africa and to champion the cause of what he referred to as ‘African nationality’.

Like Blyden, Horton thought in terms of pan-West African as well as diasporic political activity and he also thought that ‘civilization’ would be brought to Africa from outside. However, his ideas probably influenced those who drafted the constitution for the short-lived Fanti Confederation (1868–1874). Horton supported the Confederation, believing that it was working towards the ‘self-government of the Gold Coast’, and he argued that it should be recognized by the British government. Horton was also in communication with the leaders of the Accra National Confederation, formed in 1869 with similar aims, believing that it contained ‘the germ of that form of government’ that he had advocated in his writing. Horton too was a man of many contradictions. One of the wealthiest individuals in West Africa and often closely connected to the colonial authorities, his
own experiences of racism and efforts to combat it, as well as his position in society, drew him to advocate African self-government and forms of African unity and Pan-Africanism, especially throughout British West Africa.

**Ethiopianism**

Occurring at the end of the nineteenth century, during the period of the European ‘scramble’ for African colonies, were several notable struggles of Africans in west, central and southern Africa against what were perceived as racist practices and attitudes within Christian churches. African resistance led to what was commonly referred to as the Ethiopian movement, a movement to establish independent African churches. This movement is generally seen as commencing in what is now Lesotho in 1872, when 158 Africans renounced the control of French missionaries. The Ethiopian, or African Church, movement was often influenced by African American and Caribbean missionaries originating within the AME, AMEZ and Baptist churches. It was also inspired by various biblical texts mentioning Africa, most notably the psalm verse ‘Princes shall come out of Egypt, Ethiopia shall soon stretch forth her hands unto God.’

The term ‘Ethiopia’ came to be used as a synonym for Africa and the biblical verse had inspired many of the forerunners. It was certainly used by Prince Hall in one of his most famous speeches published as *A Charge Delivered to the African Lodge* (1797) but often known as ‘Thus Doth Ethiopia Stretch Forth Her Hand from Slavery, to Freedom and Equality.’ In 1829 African American Robert Alexander Young published *The Ethiopian Manifesto, Issued in Defence of the Blackman’s Rights, in the scale of Universal Freedom*, emphasizing that he spoke of the ‘whole of the Ethiopian people’ since all were without rights. There are numerous other examples including a chapter entitled ‘Ethiopia Stretching Out Her Hands Unto God; or, Africa’s Service to the World’ in Blyden’s *Christianity, Islam and the Negro Race*. Although often expressing itself in religious terms, Ethiopianism also articulated a range of anti-colonial strivings encapsulated in the slogan ‘Africa for the Africans.’ As a broad cultural and political movement, an early form of Pan-Africanism, it was certainly enhanced by Abyssinia’s military victory over Italy at the battle of Adowa in 1896. Ethiopia, as it is now known, was the only African state to decisively defeat a European colonial power in this period and thereby preserve its independence and sovereignty. Emperor Menelik (1844–1913) when affirming his country’s sovereignty, declared, ‘Ethiopia has need of no one, it stretches its hands unto God.’

The name Ethiopian appears to have first been used by the Rev. Mangena Maake Mokone (1851–1931) when he broke away from the Wesleyan Methodist Church in the Transvaal to form the Ethiopian Church of South
Africa in 1892. Mokone used the term Ethiopian influenced by the psalm but also because he hoped that the church would spread throughout Africa. He corresponded with Bishop Henry McNeal Turner and, with Charlotte Maxeke (1874–1939) as an intermediary, his church subsequently affiliated with the AME church in the United States. The latter sent missionaries to South Africa during this period as did another African American church, the National Baptist Convention. Both denominations began to sponsor students from southern Africa to study at African American colleges in the United States. Perhaps the most famous of the Baptist’s recruits was John Chilembwe (1871–1915), from what is today Malawi, although the AME Church appears to have had a much larger impact on South Africans. The AME Church established its own branch in Pretoria in 1896 and Bishop Turner made a five-week visit to South Africa in 1898, strengthening the Ethiopian movement and the influence of the AME Church throughout the region.

The AME Church itself had a long relationship with Africa, having sent the first missionaries to Liberia in 1821. Like other African American churches, it often combined support for missionary work and ‘advancement’ in Africa with its support for various repatriation schemes. In the 1880s Bishop Turner became one of the leading ‘African Emigrationists’, even calling on the United States government to support the repatriation of up to 1 million African Americans. He too was of the view that the creation of the diaspora was part of a divine plan for the ‘redemption of Africa’.

Ethiopianism in South Africa, as well as elsewhere, was also clearly a manifestation of wider social and political unrest and was associated with the slogan ‘Africa for the Africans’. Ethiopianism in South Africa was strengthened by the outbreak of the Second Boer War and subsequently considered a contributory factor to the 1906 Zulu or Bambatha Rebellion in Natal. This rebellion also led to one of the earliest Pan-Africanist texts, A Defence of the Ethiopian Movement (1908), written by Bandele Omoniyi (1884–1913), a young Nigerian student based in Britain who ended his short life engaged in politics in Brazil. By the time Omoniyi’s book was published there were over seventy independent African churches of various denominations in South Africa, which were collectively viewed as a threat to white supremacy and European colonial rule. Although some Ethiopian churches were narrowly based among speakers of one African language, many did not distinguish between speakers of different languages and had a Pan-African orientation. Often this was encouraged by the gaining of Western education, as well as by the emergence of a local African press and papers such as John Tengo Jabavu’s Imvo Zabantsundu (Black Opinion), founded in 1884, which regularly commented on African American matters. A Pan-African orientation was further cemented by contact with those from the diaspora, such as the Fisk Jubilee Singers, or the African American sea captain Harry Dean, and particularly for the few Africans who studied in
the United States. Elsewhere in southern and central Africa, Ethiopianism often took the form of an African Watch Tower movement, which separated from the American parent body and was considered such a threat that its founder was expelled from what is today Malawi in 1914. Nevertheless, the movement and its offshoots continued to spread and played some part in the anti-colonial uprising led by John Chilembwe in 1915.

In British West Africa in 1898 the AMEZ Church supported the establishment of an African Methodist Church in the Gold Coast. Here S. R. B. Attoh-Ahuma (1863–1921) a politician, journalist and writer played a leading role along with other leading African Methodists. Evidently independence from European control drew these Africans to the AMEZ Church. As one pointed out, ‘It is indeed an entirely Negro Church; organised by Negroes for Negroes, governed, controlled, supported by Negro energy, intellect, liberality and contributions.’

In Nigeria, Mojola Agbebi (1860–1917) and others broke away from the American Baptists. Propounding the doctrine that ‘European Christianity is a dangerous thing’ they formed the Native Baptist Church in Lagos in 1888, the first independent African church in Britain’s West African colonies. Agbebi, who was also a prolific journalist and one of the most prominent Nigerian newspaper editors, worked with Blyden and became one of his closest supporters. Born David Brown Vincent Agbebi changed his name and encouraged others of Sierra Leonean origin, whose families had adopted European names, to follow his example. He also encouraged the wearing of traditional dress and pride in traditional culture and music within and outside the church. Agbebi saw these new African churches as places, ‘governed by Africans, worked by Africans, supported by Africans, minus the trammels, complexion, and dominations of a foreign and alien race’. He subsequently travelled to Britain and the United States and met with Du Bois, John E. Bruce and other early Pan-Africanists.

John E. Bruce (1856–1924) who had started his life enslaved, was a mainly self-taught historian, journalist and writer. An active member of the AMEZ Church he played an important role in the development of Pan-Africanism, linking like-minded figures in West and South Africa, Britain, the Caribbean and the United States. In addition to Agbebi, his contacts included Blyden, Dusé Mohamed Ali (1866–1945), founder of the African Times and Orient Review; two of the founders of the South African National Congress John L. Dube (1871–1946) and Solomon Plaatje (1876–1932); J. E. Casely-Hayford, one of the founders of the National Congress of British West Africa. Bruce was also connected with African American intellectuals and later became an important figure in Marcus Garvey’s Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA), writing for and editing the UNIA’s Negro World. The connections between Agbebi, Blyden, Bruce and others demonstrate that Pan-African networks were becoming well established by the dawn of the twentieth century.
The Chicago Congress on Africa

The first gathering to be described as ‘pan-African’ was the Congress on Africa held in Chicago in August 1893 at the same time as the World’s Columbian Exposition, and attended by Frederick Douglass (c.1818–1895), Henry McNeal Turner, Alexander Crummell, Alexander Walters (1858–1917) of the AMEZ Church, Hallie Q. Brown (1849–1949) former principal of Tuskegee Institute and T. Thomas Fortune (1856–1928) the African American editor of The New York Age, who later claimed to have conceived although not implemented the idea of holding a Pan-African congress. African Americans were well-represented, continental Africans less so, and the overall orientation of the Congress retained the Eurocentric notion of the African as subject, rather than agent, and the need to bring ‘civilization’ and commerce to Africa from outside. The Congress therefore included presentations from ‘well-educated blacks as well as elite and middle class whites’. Even here, however, resistance to such Eurocentric thinking was evident and Bishop Turner declared that Africans were the original humans from whom both civilization and Europeans were descended. The Congress also discussed the controversial question of African American emigration to Africa.

A similar congress was held two years later in Atlanta, organized by the Stewart Missionary Foundation for Africa. It was notable for a message of greeting from Blyden, who did not attend, praising the British invasion of the kingdom of Asante, as well as the contribution of Etna Holderness, a Liberian and perhaps the first continental African woman to speak at such an event, who had come to the United States as a nursemaid and wished to return to Africa as a missionary. There were also contributions from Crummell, Bishop Turner and Fortune. Other African Americans, most associated with missionary endeavours, also participated but most of the contributions were concerned with missionary activity and ‘saving’ and ‘civilizing’ Africa, including those from a representative of the AMS.

The first Pan-African Conference

The first Pan-African Conference was held in London in July 1900, convened by Henry Sylvester Williams (1869–1911), a Trinidadian lawyer, and the organization he and others founded in London in October 1897, the African Association. The circumstances that led to the convening of the conference are far from clear. T. Thomas Fortune claimed that around 1896 he had initiated the idea of such a gathering ‘out of which might be evolved an association of the Africans and the descendants of Africa, from all parts of the world’, and that Williams who was in New York at the time took up his suggestion. However, there is no other evidence to substantiate this claim.
The African Association was mainly concerned with various injustices in Britain’s African colonies, as well as the Caribbean. It aimed to present accurate information, to influence British public opinion so that ‘Members of Parliament could be instructed that the better treatment of Native Races should command greater attention in Parliament.’ It declared that it wished to encourage unity amongst Africans and be a representative body on ‘matters affecting the destiny of the African Race’.51

The Association was evidently concerned with the treatment of Africans throughout the continent, although it seems likely that it was particularly concerned with events in South Africa. It was opposed to the violence and racism of the European colonial powers in Africa, as well as economic conditions in the Caribbean, although not necessarily opposed to colonial rule itself, nor the ‘civilizing’ mission. It was particularly concerned that educated Africans were not consulted and had no say regarding the fate of their compatriots and the African continent, and it is important to note that in its name and activities it used the term Africans to include both those from the continent and from the diaspora. It certainly lobbied the British Parliament about conditions in the Caribbean and southern Africa, as well as the promotion of racism in Britain, and submitted proposals for reforms. It concerned itself with the colonies of the other European powers in Africa too. But although it received some support from enlightened opinion in Britain, it was viewed with contempt by the British government.

However, its aims soon received favourable reports in the press in Britain’s West African colonies. Although membership was only open to ‘Black Men’, its joint-founder was an African woman, Anne Victoria Kinloch (c.1863–?) from South Africa, who came to Britain in 1896 and had been lecturing and writing on the oppression of Africans in her homeland throughout the country. Little is known of Kinloch’s motives for travelling to Britain but her important role was made clear by Williams who wrote that ‘the Association is the result of Mrs Kinloch’s work in England and the feeling that as British Subjects we ought to be heard in our own affairs’. Kinloch herself explained that ‘with some men of my race in this country, I have formed a society for the benefit of our people in Africa’.52 Although the Association claimed that ‘no one not of African descent’ could be a member, it also appears that the treasurer of the Association was Frank Colenso, the son of the Anglican Bishop of Natal, who was of European not African descent, but who like his father was a strong campaigner for the rights of the Zulu and other Africans in South Africa.53 The other officers and committee members were mainly law students or lawyers from the Caribbean and West Africa. The Association’s supporters included MPs and members of the Anti-Slavery Society and Aborigines’ Protection Society. It most notable supporter was perhaps Dadabhai Naoroji who had been Britain’s first Indian parliamentarian.

Within a short time, the Association’s patrons included Mojola Adegbe and Booker T. Washington, and it soon referred to itself as the Pan African
Conference Committee. It also consulted other leading African Americans including Bishops Alexander Walters and James Holly about its intention to hold a conference. This would be timed to coincide with the Paris Exhibition, to assemble ‘men and women of African blood, to deliberate solemnly upon the present situation and the outlook for the darker races of mankind’. Plans for the conference, which was still mainly aimed at influencing enlightened public opinion in Britain, were also widely reported in the African American press, as well as in Anglophone Africa and the Caribbean.

It seems that after Williams met with the Haitian writer and Pan-Africanist Benito Sylvain in Paris, the scope of the conference was broadened to include ‘the treatment of native races under European and American rule’; consequently lynching in the United States would also be discussed. One important aim of the conference was to demonstrate that those of African descent could speak for themselves against all the injustices they faced and contemporary reports stressed that this was the first occasion on which Africans had united for ‘the attainment of equality and freedom’. Williams also insisted that women deserved a ‘prominent position’ at the conference.

Benito Sylvain (1868–1915), a Haitian diplomat, philosopher and writer, was his country’s envoy to Emperor Menelik of Abyssinia and then the latter’s aide-de-camp. He learned of the African Association from Booker T. Washington on his return from Ethiopia in 1897, and it seem likely that he was in contact with Williams for some time before 1900. Sylvain had been educated in Haiti and France and spent several years based in Paris. There he had become a leading campaigner against racism and a prolific defender of Africans in many published articles. Between 1890 and 1897 he published a newspaper, *La Fraternité* (‘in defence of the interests of Haiti and the Black Race’) in collaboration with his brother and two politicians from Guadeloupe. In 1898, he founded l’Association de la Jeunesse Noire, an association for young Africans in Paris, where Sylvain worked with Anténor Firmin, another notable Haitian. They had discussed convening an international conference to consider issues relating to anti-African racism and inequality but then decided to work with Williams and the African Association. Sylvain subsequently published his major work and PhD dissertation entitled *Du Sort des Indigenes dans les Colonies d’Exploitation* in 1901.

Anténor Firmin (1850–1911), a Haitian politician, diplomat writer and anthropologist is best known for his book *De l’égalité des races humaines* (1885). This was written as a counter to the publication of the now infamous *Essai sur l’inégalité des races humaines* by Count de Gobineau, which attempted to prove European superiority and African inferiority. Firmin, in opposition, stated that ‘all men are endowed with the same qualities and the same faults, without distinction of colour or anatomical form’, and refuted de Gobineau’s racist arguments. In 1900, Firmin was appointed to head the Haitian legation in Paris and the Pan-African Conference elected him vice-president for an envisaged Haitian branch of the newly-created Pan-African Association.
The Pan-African Conference was held at Westminster Town Hall, not far from the British Parliament, from 22 to 24 July 1900. The discussion focused on slavery, colonialism, racism – all forms of oppression against Africa and Africans and how they might be removed. In addition, there was also a focus on possible forms of reparation for Africa and Africans. The Conference was chaired by Bishop Alexander Waters and included speakers from the United States, the Caribbean and Africa, in addition to those based in Britain.54

Key participants included John Archer (1863–1932), Samuel Coleridge-Taylor (1875–1912), Rev. Attoh-Ahuma (1863–1921) and Frederick J. Loundin (1836–1902), as well as Catherine Impey and Jane Cobden Unwin. Two African American women spoke at the conference. Anna J. Cooper (1858–1964), formerly enslaved, was a member of the American Negro Academy, a leading educator and human right activist, the author of the influential *Voice from the South by a Black Woman from the South*, who would later influence Jane Nardal.55 At the London conference, she spoke on ‘The Negro Problem in America’. Anna H. Jones (1855–1932), a Canadian-born suffragist, was also a key speaker who delivered a presentation entitled ‘A Plea for Race Individuality’. Other women including African American sisters Ella D. Barrier (1852–1945) and Fanny Barrier Williams (1855–1944) also attended. Sylvain, delivered one of the main speeches as the representative of Emperor Menelik of Ethiopia. Capt Harry Dean (1864–1935) and W. E. B. Du Bois (1868–1963) were amongst the distinguished participants of this international gathering, which concerned itself with many of the key issues and problems facing ‘African humanity’.

The conference’s ‘Address to the Nations of the World’, which condemned racial oppression in the United States as well as throughout Africa and demanded self-government for colonies, was drafted under the chairmanship of Du Bois and included the famous phrase ‘the problem of the 20th century is the problem of the colour-line’.56 Du Bois had already coined the phrase ‘Pan-Negroism’ in his lecture ‘The Conservation of Races’ in 1897. It was perhaps an understandable term but one that was not destined to become popular.57

The conference recognized the importance of the ‘three sovereign states’ Haiti, Liberia and Ethiopia, sent a ‘memorial’ to Queen Victoria calling her attention to the conditions imposed on her ‘native subjects’, and intended to establish branches in Africa, the Caribbean and North America of a new Pan-African Association (PAA). The PAA was presided over by Bishop Walters, with an executive committee that included Sylvain, Williams, Archer, Coleridge-Taylor, Loundin and Anna J. Cooper. It appears that Du Bois was not elected a member and within a short time Dr Robert Love, Tengo Jabavu and others were added to the executive.58

Plans for a second conference in the United States in 1902 and a third in Haiti in 1904 were announced and Williams launched the first few issues of a magazine, the *Pan-African*, which it seems only focused on Africans within
the British Empire. There were also plans for a ‘bureau in London with the object of watching the interests of the African races all over the world’.  

However, despite his strenuous efforts and extensive travel to the Caribbean, the United States and South Africa, both the Pan-African Association and the Pan-African soon collapsed and therefore no further conferences were organized. There is some evidence that the demise of the PAA was the result of differences within its executive committee but the precise cause remains unknown.  

Although the Pan-African Association and its publication were short-lived and Williams was unable to organize further Pan-African conferences, his activities and those of the African Association should not be considered a failure. He established the words Pan-African and Pan-Africanism and initiated the modern Pan-African movement by convening the London conference. Moreover, he had consolidated the Pan-African networks linking all those working for the advancement of Africa and Africans in the continent as well as in Europe, North America and the Caribbean. Only Blyden appears to have been outside Williams’ orbit, largely it appears because he chose to be. The London Pan-African Conference recognized the rights of women, the need for self-government and began to discuss the question of reparations too. What it lacked was the ability to sustain itself and any programme to bring about the desired and necessary change.
Pan-Africanism and Garveyism

The Pan-African network

Following the London conference several years passed before such a major event was again organized. Nevertheless, several of the key figures remained active and further developed various aspects of Pan-Africanism. In a series of lectures and articles Edward Blyden elaborated his notion of the uniqueness of the ‘African Personality’, as well as his defence of African traditions and political and economic institutions, most notably in *African Life and Customs* (1908). Amongst other things, Blyden claimed that traditional African institutions were not unlike the socialism desired by so many in Europe. Mojola Agbebi likewise continued to oppose Eurocentrism and to defend African forms of Christianity, championing the inclusion and promotion of African music, culture and languages. Blyden’s and Agbebi’s writing was followed avidly not only by those with a Western education in Africa, but also by Africans in the diaspora in Europe and the United States.

Pan-Africanist ideas were central to J. E. Casely-Hayford’s novel *Ethiopia Unbound: Studies in Race Emancipation* (1911), which he dedicated to ‘the sons of Ethiopia the world over’. Joseph Ephraim Casely-Hayford was a lawyer, journalist, writer and politician, born into a prosperous elite family in the British colony of the Gold Coast. His reputation was made first as an anti-colonial journalist then as a lawyer defending indigenous land rights. He worked with the Aborigines’ Rights Protection Society and was later a founder member of the National Congress of British West Africa and a major sponsor of the British-based Pan-Africanist Dusé Mohammed Ali’s *African Times and Orient Review*. *Ethiopia Unbound*, can be seen as another example of the Ethiopianism that influenced Marcus Garvey. Considered by some to be the first Pan-African novel, it was also partly autobiographical, its literary form was simply a means to allow a discussion of many of the main political concerns of the Pan-Africanists of the day. Through Kwamankra, the novel’s main character, Casely-Hayford praises the work of Horton and especially Blyden as designed ‘to re-veal everywhere the African
unto himself ... to lead him back into self-respect’, and to restore ‘his true place in creation on natural and national lines’. The novel is concerned with developing the ‘African nationality’, encouraging ‘race emancipation’, and proudly claims that Africa was the ‘cradle of civilization’. It looks forward to the prospect of those of African descent around the world modernizing African society whilst retaining its best African features in the manner of Japanese modernization. Casely-Hayford therefore also advocated the creation of a university in West Africa that might combat the Eurocentrism that accompanied colonial rule.4

Both Casely-Hayford and Blyden sent messages of greeting to Booker T. Washington’s ‘International Conference on the Negro’ held at Tuskegee in 1912. It is possible that both Washington and Thomas T. Fortune had planned to hold such a gathering even earlier but it was not designed to develop the overtly political concerns established by the Pan-African Conference held in London in 1900 and is not to be considered a Pan-African gathering, despite the later view of Du Bois that it constituted one.5 Indeed, it was mainly directed at missionaries, including those of the AME and AMEZ churches, as well as colonial governments, with the aim of discussing to what extent the vocational education methods developed at Tuskegee Institute might be employed in the African and Caribbean colonies. Both Bishops Walters and Turner attended and Casely-Hayford’s message did strike a Pan-African chord, as he called for unity between those in West Africa and the United States and the development of an ‘African nationality’.6

A more representative event was the founding of the Negro Society for Historical Research, launched in 1912 in the United States by John E. Bruce and the bibliophile of Puerto Rican origin, Arthur Schomburg. Both were associated with the American Negro Academy founded by Alexander Crummell in 1897. The new Society aimed to study ‘Negro History’ but also to collect rare books, documents and photos relating to the subject. Amongst its honorary and corresponding members were several African rulers, as well as Du Bois, Blyden, Casely-Hayford, Agbebi and Alain Locke (1885–1954), later a prominent figure of the Harlem Renaissance. Members in Britain included the Jamaican Pan-Africanist writer T. E. S. Scholes (c.1858–1940), Dusé Mohammed Ali and the Nigerian Moses Da Rocha (1875–1942).7 Both Da Rocha and another member, F. Z. S. Peregrino (1851–1919) a Gold Coaster active in South African politics (sometimes as a government informer), had attended the 1900 Pan-African Conference.8 There were several representatives from the British West Indies, as well as from Panama, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Costa Rica and Brazil. The member from Panama was Marie Du Chattelier, later an organizer with Garvey’s Universal Negro Improvement Association.9

Bruce had joined Thomas T. Fortune’s Afro-American League, one of the first black civil rights organizations in the United States, in 1890 and subsequently became its president. He was also involved with the Niagara Movement, as well as other African American organizations, and became a
strong supporter of armed self-defence against lynching and other forms of terrorism aimed at African Americans. In 1913, he formed the secret Loyal Order of the Sons of Africa, convinced that there was a need for a Pan-African organization with its headquarters in Africa and members on the continent, as well as in the United States and the Caribbean. Bruce had originally envisaged an organization that would fight for the rights of all Africans, both by employing lawyers and through organized self-defence. The officers of the Loyal Order included James Aggrey (1875–1927) from the Gold Coast and Schomburg, as well as others from the Caribbean and West Africa. The organization probably had some Masonic connections and it is possible that Bruce considered that its members should arm themselves and seek some support from Japan and India.10

Bruce and Casely-Hayford both had a strong connection with another early Pan-Africanist, Dusé Mohammed Ali, who claimed to be of Egyptian and Sudanese origin. He had worked as both an actor and seafarer before establishing himself in Britain as a journalist who wrote critically about British imperialism and who defended the rights of Africans in the continent and diaspora. In 1911, he published the partly plagiarized *In the Land of the Pharaohs*, a vigorous condemnation of British colonial rule in Egypt. Ali was strongly influenced by the Universal Races Congress, held the same year in London, which he attended alongside Du Bois, Scholes, Aggrey, who represented Blyden, the South African activist and journalist Tengo Jabavu (1851–1921), Anténor Firmin, and the former president of Haiti, François Legitime. Ali began publishing his *African Times and Orient Review (ATOR)*, a ‘Pan-Oriental Pan-African’ journal in 1912. The paper was financially supported by Casely-Hayford and a consortium of three other West Africans and was distributed in the British West Indies, North America, West and East Africa, as well as in India, China, Japan and Europe. In its pages, Ali called for Afro-Asian solidarity, attacked racism and imperialism and supported global anti-colonial and Pan-African struggles. During 1912 and 1913 Marcus Garvey was employed as a journalist and it is generally agreed that Ali and the politics he espoused had a significant influence on Garvey.11 The *ATOR* attracted other significant international contributors and distributors including Bruce, Aggrey, Peregrino, Attoh-Ahuma, Aggrey, the Trinidadian Felix Hercules (1888–c.1930), African American, writer and activist William Ferris (1874–1941) and Kobina Sekyi (1892–1956) the anti-colonial writer and activist from the Gold Coast who was subsequently one of the leaders of the National Congress of British West Africa.12

What is evident is that by the eve of the First World War a Pan-African network incorporating new and older figures existed and spanned three continents. There were also clear attempts to organize across Africa and the diaspora and to develop publications that could speak to the problems facing millions of Africans around the world: colonial rule, various forms of economic, social and political oppression and the ubiquitous anti-African racism. In the United States, for instance, over 1,100 African American men,
women and children were murdered by racist mobs between 1900 and 1914 and many more attacked and wounded. It was reported that there were two racist murders of this type every week. This was in addition to the legal segregation and discrimination that occurred throughout the country and particularly in the southern states during this period. In Africa, the violent colonial conquest and division of the continent by the major European powers continued but was almost complete by 1914. Segregation along racist lines was also common within Africa as were atrocities, the most infamous being the genocide that occurred in what was then the Belgian Congo. Half the population, an estimated 10 million people, had been wiped out in the thirty years before 1908. In the Caribbean and South America, the legacy of slavery continued in the form of colonial exploitation and impoverishment. Anti-African racism during this period was globally ubiquitous, even in European countries such as Britain and France, where a colour bar and other forms of racism were widespread and legal.

Garvey and Garveyism

The man who would become the most significant figure during the period of the First World War and after was the Jamaican journalist, writer, trade unionist and activist Marcus Garvey (1887–1940) who first established his Universal Negro Improvement Association and African Communities League (UNIA) in Jamaica in 1914. It seems likely that Amy Ashwood, Garvey’s first wife, may have been the UNIA’s first member and secretary but as the organization was launched before she met Garvey, claims for joint founding may not be appropriate. The early Jamaican UNIA was concerned with social and economic ‘upliftment’, and it soon adopted the famous motto ‘One God! One Aim! One Destiny!’ Nevertheless, it declared itself to be non-political and claimed it wished to emulate Booker T. Washington and ‘establish a Tuskegee in Jamaica’. However, the UNIA Manifesto included amongst its aims establishing ‘a universal confederacy amongst the race’, as well as promoting ‘racial pride and love’, developing education, commercial enterprises and ‘conscientious Christian worship’, as well as assisting in ‘the civilizing of backward tribes in Africa’. It was formed ‘in view of the universal disunity existing among the people of the Negro or African race, and the apparent danger which must follow the continuance of such a spirit.’ Garvey explained that wherever he had travelled ‘I saw the injustice done to my race because it was black.’ He had then been inspired by Booker T. Washington’s autobiography *Up from Slavery*, and whilst he was in London, immediately before returning to Jamaica in 1914, ‘his doom … of being a race leader’ dawned on him. According to his own account: ‘I asked “Where is the black man’s government? Where is his king and his kingdom? Where is his president, his country, and his ambassador, his army, his navy, his men of big affairs?” I could not find them, and then I declared, “I will help to make them.”’
Garvey’s approach was influenced not only by his initial admiration for Booker T. Washington, and his sojourn in Britain and central America, but also by his upbringing in Jamaica, where the 1865 Morant Bay rebellion, and demands for self-government, were still a living memory. Garvey was also influenced by J. Robert Love (1839–1914), publisher of the *Advocate*, a Jamaican newspaper, which like others in the Caribbean and African colonies, as well as elsewhere, championed a Pan-African approach and was concerned about the ‘destiny of the Negro Race’, and ‘Africa for the Africans’. Love publicized the 1900 Pan-African Conference and worked with Sylvester Williams when he visited Jamaica to organize a branch of the Pan-African Association.\(^{17}\) By the time he had reached London in 1913, Garvey was adamant that those from the Caribbean, rather than those from the United States, would ‘be the instruments of uniting a scattered race who, before the close of many centuries will found an empire on which the sun shall shine as ceaselessly as it shines on the Empire of the North today’.\(^{18}\) However, as has been pointed out, Pan-African influences on Garvey would have been manifold and certainly included Blyden, Horton and Casely-Hayford, as well as many others.\(^{19}\)

It cannot be proven that Garvey was influenced by Chief Sam’s African movement but certainly Sam established an important precedent for Garvey’s Black Star Line and plans for African repatriation, as was remarked by the media and authorities at the time.\(^{20}\) Chief Alfred Sam (c.1880–c.1930) was a trader from the Gold Coast, with a company registered in New York who was concerned to develop trade links between West Africa and the United States. In 1913 Sam secured rights to land in West Africa and bought a ship with the aim of encouraging the emigration ‘of the best Negro farmers and mechanics from the United States to different sections in West Africa’. Sam’s trade and emigrations schemes were referred to as an ‘African movement’ concerned with ‘men and women of African blood’, and he also proposed to create an Ethiopian Steamship Line.\(^{21}\) Sam’s repatriation plans were enthusiastically received by prominent African Americans in Oklahoma and soon several hundred had been persuaded to financially commit to the scheme, much to the concern of the government of the United States and British colonial authorities. Eventually about sixty African Americans made the trip to West Africa and the venture faced many difficulties and official opposition. What it does show is that some African Americans were willing to face the uncertainty of life in Africa rather than continue to live in the United States, that dreams of ‘repatriation’ endured and that Sam, as well as Garvey, managed to tap into these Pan-African dreams. Chief Sam’s plans had a vociferous champion, the Rev. Orishatukeh Faduma (c.1855–1946), a Sierra Leonean member of the American Negro Academy and the AME Church, who joined the voyage and wrote a series of articles defending the African movement. Although, Dusé Mohammed Ali was a strong critic, it is quite possible that Marcus Garvey learned from the African movement and was inspired by it.\(^{22}\)
Garvey re-established the UNIA in New York in 1916 where it soon attracted thousands of adherents, first throughout the United States and soon after internationally. By 1919 he had travelled widely and established about thirty branches in different American cities. At its height, the UNIA's worldwide membership has been estimated at over 2 million but no precise figures exist. Undoubtedly it was the largest political movement of Africans during the twentieth century, embracing not just a few intellectuals but the masses both on the African continent and throughout the diaspora. The organization’s newspaper *Negro World*, launched in 1918, preached an anti-colonial message, ‘Africa for the Africans at home and abroad,’ challenged notions of white supremacy and extolled the greatness of Africans and of Africa’s history. Like his nineteenth-century predecessors Garvey spoke of the greatness of Egypt and an African origin of civilization. The *Negro World* circulated, often illegally, throughout colonial Africa and the Caribbean, indeed throughout the diaspora. The UNIA established women’s and children’s organizations and promoted commercial ventures of many kinds, the most well-known being the ill-fated Black Star shipping line which aimed to aid commercial ties between West Africa, the Caribbean and the United States, which was first established in 1919. There was also a Universal Millinery Store and a Universal Steam Laundry, as well as several grocery stores and restaurants.

The UNIA’s *Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World*, launched at the First International Convention of the Negro Peoples of the World held in New York in 1920, demanded self-determination for those of African descent ‘wherever they form a community among themselves’. The Declaration condemned anti-African racism and defended ‘the inherent right of the Negro to possess himself of Africa’, and the necessity of Negro nationalism, political power and control. The UNIA at first even refused to recognize the League of Nations because it ‘seeks to deprive Negroes of their liberty’. It also envisaged a ‘Negro independent nation on the continent of Africa’ to which those in the diaspora could return.23 The UNIA increasingly became identified, certainly by its detractors, with the notion of a return to Africa, which had been such a controversial part of African American Pan-Africanist thinking in the nineteenth century. In his *Philosophy and Opinions*, first published in 1923, Garvey concluded: ‘the future of the Negro … outside of Africa spells ruin and disaster’. In his view the solution for those in the diaspora would be brought about ‘by redeeming our Motherland Africa from the hands of alien exploiters’, and by establishing there ‘a government, a nation of our own, strong enough to lend protection to the members of our race scattered all over the world, and to compel the respect of the nations and races of the earth’.24

Garvey and the UNIA were, for a time, feared by the major colonial powers and by the government of the United States, especially when Garvey attempted to forge links with the government of Liberia and declared himself provisional president of a future independent African republic. Garvey’s
plans to establish ‘American and West Indian Colonists’ in Liberia were unsuccessful and rebuffed by the Liberian government following the latter’s commercial agreement with the Firestone Rubber Company and, in 1924, the Liberian government banned all UNIA members from entering Liberia. Garvey not only faced rejection from Liberia; within a few years his Black Star Shipping Line was close to bankruptcy and in 1922 he was arrested and subsequently convicted of what appears to have been a false charge of ‘mail-fraud’. In the wake of these and other problems, Garvey announced that he was abandoning his previous opposition to colonial governments, and other radical demands, which he argued were only fit for the period of World War and major upheaval. In 1925 he was imprisoned as a result of the fraud conviction and sentenced to five years in the Atlanta Penitentiary. In 1927 Garvey’s prison sentence was commuted by order of the president of the United States. and he was immediately deported to Jamaica where he re-established the headquarters of the UNIA. Garvey was exonerated from this conviction only in 1987, nearly half a century after his death.

The New Negro movement

Nevertheless, the achievements of Garvey and the UNIA were impressive. He had arrived in the United States unknown and almost penniless and within a few years had created the largest African American organization and largest Pan-African organization in history. The circumstances produced by the First World War certainly raised expectations amongst African Americans, both those who joined the armed forces and those who stayed at home. But the impact of the war led to Pan-African demands for various forms of liberation that were widely felt in Africa and throughout the diaspora too. In the United States, the rise of Garvey and the UNIA certainly coincided with the ‘New Negro’ movement and what is more commonly referred to as the Harlem Renaissance. Both reflected a new assertiveness and confidence amongst African Americans that found its expression not only in political demands and organizations but also in literature, art and the music of the ‘jazz age’. The ‘New Negro’ was a term that had been utilized even at the end of the nineteenth century but it gained greater currency through the activities of Hubert Harrison, especially the publication in 1917 of New Negro magazine, which was associated with a faction of Harrison’s Liberty League, and later with the publication of Alain Locke’s The New Negro (1925).

The New Negro movement was stimulated by the First World War in which 380,000 African American soldiers participated, some of them serving in Europe. In the same period around 500,000 African Americans migrated to the northern cities. In the first quarter of the twentieth century well over 100,000 migrants entered the United States from the Caribbean many of them arriving in New York. Many of the leading political figures
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of the ‘New Negro’ movement were Caribbean migrants: Garvey, Hubert Harrison from St Croix; activitists and writers such as Wilfred Domingo (1889–1968) and Claude McKay (1889–1948) from Jamaica; journalist and communist Cyril Briggs (1888–1966) from Nevis; writer Eric Walrond (1898–1966) from Guyana. The experiences of migration and international travel had a radicalizing impact, as did the international events such as the Easter Rising in Ireland in 1916 and the Russian Revolution in 1917. These created the conditions for great expectations by the end of the war. Booker T. Washington and Henry McNeal Turner had both died in 1915 and Garvey’s most significant rival, W. E. B. Du Bois, had advocated compromise and accommodation during the war. The scene was set for new politics and leadership to emerge that spoke to the aspirations of the ‘New Negro’, which were especially important following the renewed racist attacks and riots at the termination of the war.

Hubert Harrison (1883–1927) was a writer, journalist and popular orator of Caribbean origin, who was referred to by his contemporary, A Phillip Randolph, as ‘the father of Harlem radicalism’. He established the Liberty League of Negro Americans and edited The Voice, ‘the first newspaper of the “New Negro Movement”’ in Harlem, New York in 1917. It was Harrison who first developed the concept of ‘Race First’, and later the concept of ‘race consciousness’, before Garvey, even though Harrison considered himself a socialist and internationalist. According to Harrison the ‘New Negroes’ wanted equality before the law, were opposed to lynching, disenfranchisement and the First World War. Harrison argued for armed self-defence and for the rights of Africans, as well as Asians, throughout the world. Garvey had initially and unsuccessfully tried to follow the path of Booker T. Washington when he arrived in New York, but he certainly spoke at Liberty League meetings and it is likely he was a member. The UNIA was also at first non-political and it seems that in many respects Harrison paved the way for Garvey and introduced him to radical Harlem politics, while many members of the Liberty League, such as it secretary (and police informer) Edgar Grey, as well as W. A. Domingo, Irena Moorman-Blackston and John E. Bruce, later joined the UNIA. In 1920 Harrison himself became the principal editor of the UNIA’s Negro World. Harrison would even claim that the idea of a Black Star shipping line originated with a former Liberty League member, Charles Seifert, and he clearly saw himself and the League as preparing the ground for Garvey and the UNIA.28

As well as the political movement that centred on Harlem and was evident in such newspapers as The Liberator, The Emancipator, The Voice, New Negro and Negro World, the period immediately following the First World War was also characterized by a literary and cultural movement, perhaps announced by the publication of Claude McKay’s sonnet ‘If We Must Die’ in 1918, although evident in earlier work such as Meta Warwick Fuller’s sculpture Ethiopia Awakening (1914). However, Harrison later claimed that there was no specific ‘Harlem Renaissance’ but rather a continual flowering of African American
culture stretching back even to the 1850s. Nevertheless, it could be argued that not only was there a cultural renaissance following the First World War but also that this coincided with the ‘New Negro’ movement, which itself had wider Pan-African concerns and a renewed interest in Africa. It is not by coincidence that such a movement was almost contemporary with similar Pan-African assertiveness elsewhere, for example the Francophone Négritude movement which it strongly influenced. Not only in America, but also in Africa, the Caribbean and Europe there were similar strivings for more Africa-centred political and cultural developments that arose in opposition to Eurocentrism, colonialism and anti-African racism. It was this Pan-African striving that gave United States-based political and cultural developments such as Garveyism and the Harlem Renaissance such wide appeal, and made identification with Africa central to both. Many who would become influential Pan-Africanists were attracted to the movement and many notable writers contributed to the UNIA’s *Negro World* including Zora Neale Hurston, Claude McKay, Eric Walrond, Arturo Schomburg, J. A. Rogers and Amy Jacques Garvey, Marcus’s second wife, who wrote a regular women’s page.

Women and the UNIA

It could be argued that women were central to the development of the UNIA and formed its ‘backbone’ from the time of the movement’s founding. Amy Ashwood, Garvey’s first wife, claimed to have been the UNIA’s first member and played a leading role when the UNIA was based in Jamaica. Amy Jacques, Garvey’s second wife also played a significant leadership role, not just in relation to *Negro World* but more particularly during the time of her husband’s imprisonment. Women dominated auxiliary organizations of the UNIA such as the Black Cross Nurses, the Universal African Motor Corps and many other such groups formed within the UNIA. Every local branch of the UNIA had a ‘lady president’ and women may have formed the majority in many local branches. Key organizers included Louise Little, the mother of Malcolm X, who joined the UNIA in Montreal and then was the secretary of a UNIA branch in Omaha and probably fulfilled similar roles in Milwaukee. It is even reported that she worked directly with Garvey. Other important women within the UNIA include Mamie De Mena and Henrietta Vinton Davis. Davis became the first international organizer for the UNIA, chaired major meetings and conventions and was the only female member of the delegation that met with Liberian President King in 1924. She was also part of the UNIA commission that drafted the petition to the president of the United States demanding Garvey’s release from prison. Garvey once described her as ‘the greatest woman of the Negro Race today’. De Mena became assistant international organizer, a major speaker, responsible for all the UNIA’s North American chapters, worked as editor of *Negro World* and acted as Garvey’s representative.
The African Blood Brotherhood

Another organization that emerged in Harlem in the immediate post-war period was the African Blood Brotherhood for African Liberation and Redemption (ABB) founded in 1919 by another immigrant to New York from the Caribbean, Cyril Briggs. The ABB also further developed some of the ideas of Hubert Harrison. It stood for both ‘Race Radicalism’ and ‘Class Radicalism’ and amongst its aims were ‘A Liberated Race’, and ‘Absolute Race Equality – Political, Economic, Social’. Other aims included ‘immediate protection and ultimate liberation of Negroes everywhere’, and it also envisaged the organization of a ‘worldwide Negro Federation’, and a ‘Pan-African army’.32

Briggs described himself as ‘pro-Negro’, while at the same time asserting ‘the Negro’s place is with labour’. The ABB established branches within the United States, as well as in parts of the Caribbean, and included an illustrious membership that included Wilfred Domingo, Claude McKay, and future communists Grace Campbell (1883–1943), Richard B. Moore (1893–1978), Otto Huiswoud (1893–1961) and Harry Haywood (1898–1985). Briggs and the other members combined elements of a Marxist analysis of the world with a ‘Race First’ and Pan-Africanist orientation. There were some initial attempts of the ABB to work with Garvey and the UNIA but Briggs later wrote that he established the organization with the aim of ‘combating several aspects of the Garvey movement and particularly its “Back to Africa” philosophy’. The ABB’s attitude to communism was based on ‘its belief that all such forces as menace white capitalist control of the world ... and the imperial regimes of Europe should be encouraged by the darker peoples who stand to benefit most by the undermining and destruction of European imperialism and white world domination’.33 Briggs and other ABB members were therefore greatly inspired by the Russian Revolution and the founding of the Communist International 1919.

The UNIA and Africa

Whatever the exact numbers of its members, it is evident that UNIA branches were established in many parts of Africa, the Caribbean and North America, as well as in such European countries as Britain and France. Garvey and the UNIA certainly established their influence and made a significant impact throughout the African continent. Some of this influence was generated by Africans who were in contact with the UNIA, such as Dusé Mohammed Ali who worked on the Negro World, or those from South Africa, such as Sol Plaatje, who spoke at UNIA meetings while he was visiting the United States and James Thaele, a leader of the African National Congress who strongly supported the UNIA when he began publishing the paper African World in 1925. Many Africans were also radicalized by their experiences of the First
World War, when communication between Africans from many different national backgrounds occurred and the expectation that their enlistment would lead to significant change had been generated. A British army officer even suggested that the global conflict necessitated ‘encouraging strong and isolated tribal nationalism’ amongst Africans, so as to combat what was referred to as the danger of ‘a violent Pan-African upheaval’ brought about by the conditions of the war. Partly as a consequence of the war, there was a more general awareness of anti-African racism, coupled with opposition to it, and a rising consciousness of the right of Africans to govern themselves, or at least be consulted about how they were governed. Various forms of African nationalism, as well as Pan-Africanism, were on the rise and were manifest in the founding and early life of such organizations as the South African National Congress and National Congress of British West Africa.

**The UNIA in West Africa**

‘Race consciousness’ was evidently an important factor in the successful spread of Garveyism throughout West Africa. One contemporary report noted that there was support for the Black Star Line all along coastal West Africa and explained, ‘Any all black proposal, well-financed cannot fail to succeed in Africa. Race consciousness is just that strong.’ It seems that such consciousness stemmed from the experience of the First World War. As the *Times of Nigeria* explained in 1920 ‘One lesson above all others that the results of the late world upheaval have taught the African races is the necessity for organising an African brotherhood.’ Garvey and the UNIA echoed many of the ideas elaborated by Blyden but added an important economic dimension and the notion of self-help that particularly appealed to the ascendant merchant and professional classes in West Africa.

A UNIA branch was established in Freetown, Sierra Leone in 1920, with a female division initially headed by Adelaide Casely-Hayford, the wife of J. E. Casely-Hayford. UNIA members from Sierra Leone also attempted to establish branches in Senegal but these attempts were thwarted by the French colonial authorities, which were also concerned about UNIA activities in Dahomey and Cameroon. It is to be noted that in Sierra Leone support for Garvey and the UNIA was often strongest amongst those who were Western educated. The Freetown branch sent the only delegate from British West Africa, George O. Marke, to the UNIA’s International Convention of the Negro Peoples of the World held in August 1920. Marke was subsequently appointed supreme deputy potentate of the UNIA and was part of the ‘technical commission’ despatched to Liberia in 1921.

Garvey’s most significant initiative in West African began with his overtures to the Liberian government in 1920. Although the UNIA’s mission to Liberia was initially welcomed by the government of that country, the head of the mission was critical of the government of Liberia, while the
latter came to suspect that the UNIA would be a subversive influence in the country, especially after it came to an agreement with the Firestone Rubber Company. Marke also headed the UNIA delegation to the League of Nations that unsuccessfully petitioned for confiscated German colonies in Africa to be established as self-governing territories. The UNIA made repeated unsuccessful attempts to petition the League in 1922 and 1928. Then in 1929 and 1931 Garvey travelled to Geneva to try and convince the League of his case but he was again unsuccessful.

In Nigeria one of the key figures was Akinbami, the son of Mojola Agbebi, who headed the Black Star Corporation in Lagos until it was dissolved in 1922. A UNIA branch was established in Lagos in 1920 under the presidency of Amos Shackleton, the Jamaican ‘Bread King’ of Lagos. Several other members of the branch were of Caribbean origin but most of the officers were Nigerians, including the secretary, Ernest Ikoli, the well-known journalist and editor, who was later one of the founders of the Nigerian Youth Movement. As in Sierra Leone many of the leading members were Western-educated lawyers and clergymen and several were also members of the National Congress of British West Africa. UNIA branches were reportedly also established in Ibadan and Kano but it seems likely that organized support for the UNIA waned after the collapse of the Black Star Line, while local politics and the activities of the NCBWA were a constant distraction. The illegal *Negro World* was evidently widely circulated throughout West Africa, both in the British and French colonies. Its significance is evident from the fact that it and the activities of the UNIA were widely reported in the local press. Censorship did not curtail readership as is clear from the testimony of Nnamdi Azikiwe, subsequently Nigeria’s first president, who ignored the warnings of his father concerning the dangers of reading such a seditious publication.

The UNIA in Southern Africa

In South Africa, it was reported that there were five UNIA branches in Cape Town alone during the 1920s, in addition to others situated throughout the country in other towns and cities including Johannesburg and Pretoria. It seems that sailors from North America, and particularly the Caribbean, were important couriers of news about the UNIA and the *Negro World* and some of the first members of the UNIA in South Africa also originated from the Caribbean. There were branches of the UNIA in Basutoland and South West Africa, while its influence also spread to Mozambique. Tengo Jabavu described how political repression in South Africa had created the conditions for support for Garvey and the UNIA:

> Whose Black Republic propaganda promises great things. It promises among other things: the expulsion of the white man and his yoke of
misrule from their midst; Negro autonomy (‘I Afrika mayi buye’ = Let Africa be restored to us) with Garvey himself as Lord High Potentate; a black star fleet with powerful black armies bringing salvation, and bags of grain to relieve Africans from the economic pinch.44

The Cape Argus appeared concerned about the ‘increasing influence of Garveyism in Africa’, which the newspaper feared ‘is capturing the imagination of the black people of Africa.’45 The South African and other colonial governments concurred and therefore did everything possible to prevent the circulation of the Negro World. When Garvey announced a worldwide speaking tour in 1923 measures were immediately taken to prevent his appearance in Africa, and consequently Garvey never stepped foot on the African continent. Nevertheless, in southern Africa and more widely there were strong rumours that Garvey would soon arrive ‘with a large force of black soldiers to drive the white man out of the country’.46 As in the United States, the myth of a black liberator was attractive to those who were not only hostile to the government but also critical of existing leaders. One African supporter of the UNIA declared that as an uneducated person all that he could do was promote the ideas of the UNIA and ‘to spread the spirit of the new Negro’.47

Many of the supporters of Garvey and the UNIA in southern Africa identified with the slogan ‘Africa for the Africans’, linking it with their own ‘I Africa mayi buye’ (Let Africa be restored to us), as well as drawing on earlier forms of Ethiopianism that expected African liberation to be brought by African Americans. Garvey’s speeches, his elevation as provisional president of Africa and other aspects of the UNIA’s programme were reinterpreted in various inspirational ways. A worldview which asserted that Africans not Europeans were the rightful masters in Africa was strengthened as well as a sense of unity between those on the continent and in the diaspora. A key transmission role was often played by seafarers of Caribbean origin who distributed Negro World and often played a key role leading UNIA branches in South Africa.48 The UNIA’s African Orthodox Church also established a presence in South Africa, as well as in Rhodesia, Uganda and Kenya. The UNIA’s influence in South Africa may be judged from the many correspondents that contributed to the Negro World. In Nyasaland those who had been associated with the rising of 1915 were also connected with the UNIA, while the founder of the Industrial and Commercial Workers Union (ICU) in South Africa, Clements Kadalie, wrote of his support for Garvey and there were several prominent Garveyites within the ICU, as well as within the ANC. Some historians have seen the impact of Garveyism as a significant influence on the later emergence of both the ANC Youth League, as well as the Pan-Africanist Congress.49

Support for Garvey in Africa was dented by the Liberian government’s deportation of the UNIA delegation in 1924, the subsequent banning of US-based UNIA members from Liberian territory and Garvey’s conviction
for fraud. The actions of the Liberian government were criticized by some sections of the press in British West Africa but although the National Congress of British West Africa and sections of the Western-educated elite had welcomed many of the economic aspects of Garvey’s programme, they had often been more cautious about embracing what for some was viewed as subversive politics. Several West Africans first contacted the UNIA whilst in the United States and were intrigued by the commercial possibilities it offered.

The Negro World was widely read in West Africa, despite or perhaps because it was illegal. Several correspondents from West Africa appear in the pages of Negro World while others, such as Kobina Sekyi in the Gold Coast, where there were reported to be two branches, were critical of the attempts of Garvey and others in the diaspora to ‘redeem’ Africa but wrote in support of Garvey following his conviction.50 The influence of the Negro World should not be overestimated, however, since Africans eagerly read or listened to reports from any publications from abroad that provided ‘race consciousness’ and a Pan-African perspective. The Negro World clearly had to compete with other publications with a Pan-African orientation from Europe and North America.51

The Negro World was clearly influential in East Africa too, as Jomo Kenyatta reported. According to his account even illiterate Africans would gather around a reader to listen to articles and then by memorizing them spread the words of ‘upliftment’ to others.52 Such words spread far and wide. The king of Swaziland famously told Amy Ashwood Garvey that he only knew the name of two black men outside Africa. One was the boxer Jack Johnson, the other Marcus Garvey.53 However, penalties for possession and distribution of the Negro World were severe. An agent in Nyasaland, for example, was sentenced to three years of hard labour. Nevertheless, there is ample evidence that the Negro World, Garvey and the UNIA were widely known in Africa even in the Portuguese colonies. Attempts at censorship only added to the grievances of literate Africans and widespread hatred of colonial rule. In some parts of Africa, such as South Africa and Kenya support for Garvey and the UNIA continued well into the later 1930s and even after Garvey’s death. There is some truth in Garvey’s claim that the UNIA had ‘stirred Africa from centre to circumference’, and that the continent had been ‘awakened through our propaganda of “Africa for the Africans, at home and abroad”’.54

The UNIA and the diaspora

Marcus Garvey and the UNIA also exerted a significant influence on Africans in the diaspora. According to one historian, in addition to those in the United States, UNIA branches were established in Cuba, Panama, Costa Rica, Canada, Columbia, Mexico, Australia, Brazil, Ecuador, Venezuela, as well
as throughout the Caribbean. Cuba contained the largest number with over fifty branches, followed by Panama with forty-seven. In Britain, there were four branches during the 1920s and two of these were in Wales. Garvey was also in contact with Ladipo Solanke, the founder of the Nigerian Progress Union and West African Students’ Union (WASU) in London, where his ideas appear to have coincided with the students’ own views about self-reliance and race consciousness. At one stage Solanke seems to have wished to head a UNIA branch in London but although unsuccessful in that regard he and the WASU were granted the use of a house Garvey owned in West London as their first headquarters. In France, the Dahomean Kojo Tovai Houenou, founder of the Ligue Universelle pour la Défense de la Race Noire and editor of Les Continents met and corresponded with Garvey, spoke at the 1924 UNIA convention and is reported to have sent copies of the Negro World to Dahomey. Later, Garan Kouyaté, the secretary-general of the communist-linked Ligue de Défense de la Race Nègre also attempted to correspond with Garvey but was ignored when the latter visited Paris in 1928. On that visit, Garvey appeared to prefer the company of those concerned with the more reformist La Dépêche Africaine. The UNIA also had some links with Africans based in Lisbon, Portugal who in the early 1930s published A Mocidade Africana and frequently referred to Garvey and the UNIA.

In the United States, Noble Drew Ali, leader of the Moorish Holy Temple of Science based in Chicago, a predecessor of the Nation of Islam, proclaimed Garvey the forerunner to his own coming, and therefore as a prophet of Drew Ali’s unorthodox version of Islam. While in Jamaica, the early followers of the creed of Ras Tafari also acknowledged Garvey as a prophet and a forerunner of their divinity, the emperor of Ethiopia, Haile Selassie. Marcus Garvey is reported to have prophesied ‘Look to Africa where a black king will be crowned, the day of deliverance is near,’ although there appears to be little evidence of Garvey uttering this phrase. A few days after Haile Selassie’s coronation in 1930 Garvey wrote in his paper The Blackman:

We have no doubt that the time has now come. Ethiopia is now really stretching forth her hands. This great kingdom of the East has been hidden for many centuries, but gradually she is rising to take a leading place in the world and it is for us of the Negro race to assist in every way to hold up the hand of the Emperor Ras Tafari.

Garvey in this way emphasized a modern form of Ethiopianism, one that was taken up and elaborated by Garveyites in Jamaica, such as Robert Hinds and Leonard Howell. Howell was one of the first to establish a Rastafari community and doctrine, as well as a known Garveyite, as were many of the early supporters of the Rastafari movement. However, Garvey’s reported views on the movement were at best ambivalent and there is some evidence that he disagreed with the notion of the divinity of Haile Selassie.
Nevertheless, the Rastafari movement was to become significant, first in Jamaica, then throughout the Caribbean and eventually globally. Garvey’s teaching, however misinterpreted, or reinterpreted, remained central and therefore in time took on a new global significance.

Indeed, during the 1930s Garvey openly criticized Selassie for neglecting Ethiopia’s modernization and defences, while at the same time denouncing the invasion of Ethiopia by fascist Italy. Subsequently he became ever more critical of Haile Selassie, alleging that he ‘allowed himself to be conquered by playing white’, an approach that led to further divisions within the UNIA and in turn criticism of Garvey by some of his followers. Garvey refused to issue a call to UNIA members and other Africans to go the immediate defence of Ethiopia, which reportedly led to many members of the UNIA deserting the organization. The national representative of the UNIA in the United States commented: ‘the UNIA which has cried aloud about “redeeming Africa” for 17 years is dying because it has not lived up to its high-sounding principles of Negro nationalism. Disgrace stares us in the face.’

Garvey seems to have completely misjudged the global Pan-African support for Ethiopia and the significance of the Italian invasion. He even claimed that ‘Mussolini copied our Fascism,’ and ‘Mussolini and Hitler copied the programme of the UNIA – aggressive nationalism for the black man in Africa ... We hadn’t the character to stand behind it but they adopted it.’ But such comments only discredited him further. His position was adversely commented on by many significant commentators, including Adam Clayton Powell Jr. in the United States and George Padmore, who wrote that in Britain Garvey’s stand ‘made him very unpopular amongst the African students, who attempted to break up his meetings’. However, Haile Selassie had also gained some unpopularity amongst Africans in Britain for his statements denying he was a ‘Negro’. The mood of the times maybe best summed up by Isaac Wallace-Johnson one of the leading Pan-Africanists from the African continent who wrote in 1937 of how he had admired the UNIA as an important ‘stepping stone’, when it was ‘in full swing’, but that in recent years Garvey had ‘fallen a thousand degrees below what he was at the period of the inception of the UNIA’ and that his philosophy was now ‘quite contradictory to that of the progressive elements of civilization and culture’. He concluded, ‘Let no one be misled by Mr Garvey or his big talks about African Redemption and the rest of it ... He might have been a great leader in the past. But ... Marcus Garvey like the rest of past leaders has obviously outlived his usefulness in so far as leading the African peoples may be concerned.’

Garvey’s politics, meeting with the leadership of the racist Ku Klux Klan in 1922 and links with the masses put him at odds with Du Bois and other African American leaders, as did the UNIA’s support for the racist legislation of United States Senator Bilbo in the 1930s. Following his deportation and relocation to Jamaica, Garvey entered into local politics as well as remaining active in Pan-African matters. However, he became increasingly
isolated and in some ways marginalized from the movement he had created, despite new UNIA publications and two UNIA conventions held in Jamaica in 1928 and 1931. Garvey also toured throughout Europe and in 1928 and 1931 petitioned the League of Nations to create an independent black state in Africa, a similar demand to that made by Du Bois and his Pan-African Congress movement some years earlier. Garvey’s finances also suffered during this period, as well as his political popularity and in 1935 he left Jamaica almost bankrupt and settled in London. He remained active in Pan-African politics and made some particularly significant speeches in Canada in the late 1930s, where he vowed: ‘We are going to emancipate ourselves from mental slavery because whilst others might free the body, none but ourselves can free the mind,’ an exaltation that was later paraphrased and made famous by the Jamaican singer Bob Marley.66

By the time of Garvey’s death in 1940, the UNIA had become divided and Garvey himself had sometimes become associated with a political orientation that was rejected as too moderate by other more radical Pan-Africanists, such as George Padmore and Isaac Wallace-Johnson.67 Nevertheless, his legacy was immense, particularly in Jamaica where following his death his ideas exerted a major influence on the Rastafarians and where he was subsequently declared the country’s first national hero. His influence was acknowledged by other Pan-Africanists, most notably by Kwame Nkrumah who stated that during his student days in the United States, ‘Of all the literature that I studied, the book that did more than any other to fire my enthusiasm was Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey.’ Garveyism too has remained an influential trend of Pan-Africanism especially in the African diaspora. Garvey made this supremely self-confident judgement of himself and the UNIA: ‘Despite what the world may say in criticism of me, we have rendered more service as an organisation than all the other Negro organisations put together have done in the last 100 years. We have given a national consciousness to the Negro.’68
W. E. B. Du Bois had emerged as a leading Pan-Africanist during the London conference in 1900. However, three years earlier, he had written of the need for what he referred to as a ‘Pan-Negroism’, led by African Americans, in his well-known essay *The Conservation of Races*. At the time he had written, ‘if the Negro is ever to be a factor in the world’s history’ it would be because of the efforts of ‘black hands, fashioned by black heads and hallowed by the travail of 200,000,000 black hearts beating in one glad song of jubilee’. In his essay he stated, ‘we, as American Negroes, are resolved to strive in every honourable way for the realization of the best and highest aims, for the development of strong manhood and pure womanhood, and for the rearing of a race ideal in America and Africa, to the glory of God and the uplifting of the Negro people’.¹

Certainly, Du Bois had become one of the key African American political figures, known for the publication of seminal work such as *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903), the creation of the Niagara Movement in 1907 and the founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in 1911. Du Bois also became the influential editor of the NAACP’s publication *The Crisis*. For African American advancement, he initially envisaged a leadership of those referred to as the ‘Talented Tenth’, those who had received the benefit of ‘Higher Education’. As he expressed it in 1903, ‘The Negro race, like all races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men.’ Responding to criticism he later sought to change this aristocratic view. In 1915, for example, he expressed the view that, ‘The Pan-African movement when it comes will not, however, be merely a narrow racial propaganda. Already the more far-seeing Negroes sense the coming unities: a unity of the working classes everywhere, a unity of coloured races, a new unity of men.’² Although undoubtedly still a very male-centred approach this was a significant change. Such change and development continued throughout Du Bois’ long life.

Du Bois and the Pan-African congresses
Du Bois’ position as a leading African American political figure was somewhat dented by his support for the government of the United States during the First World War, despite the focus of his 1915 essay ‘The African Roots of the War’, and his policy of urging African Americans to ‘forget our special grievances’ and ‘close ranks’ for the war effort. He was certainly criticized by other key figures in the United States, including A. Philip Randolph and Marcus Garvey, for what appeared to be the moderation of his views. However, he and others argued that Africans, especially in the diaspora, would best undermine racial oppression through their participation in the war and, he considered, that in this respect they were fighting for their own freedom. In the post-war period, he reconsidered this position and his call for returning African American soldiers to meet racist violence by fighting back was viewed with alarm by the United States government. It was in these circumstances, that Du Bois began to claim that a ‘debt of blood’ had been given by many during the First World War and that Africans required reparation for hundreds of years of enslavement. He argued that the future of Africa was key to the future of the entire ‘Negro race’ and sought to continue the tradition of major international Pan-African gatherings by organizing the First Pan-African Congress in Paris in 1919. As he said at the time:

We black people, in addition to our rights of ordinary consideration, have proven ourselves worthy of extra consideration. And so, we are holding a Pan-African Congress. The whole black world is virtually represented. We shall never rest, we shall never cease to agitate, until we have received from the world what we have in such yeomanly fashion rendered – fair play.

The initiative of Du Bois has sometimes led him to be considered the ‘father of Pan-Africanism’ and therefore, to some disregard for the efforts of Henry Sylvester Williams, the convenor of the London conference in 1900. Du Bois certainly revived the phrase ‘Pan-African’, and re-established a central Pan-African movement linked to his name. He was clearly aware that Africa’s fate would be discussed and decided in France and accordingly he argued: ‘The African movement means to us what the Zionist movement means to the Jews … the centralization of the race effort and the recognition of a racial fount … Amelioration of the lot of Africa tends to ameliorate the condition of colored peoples throughout the world.’ This Pan-African initiative of Du Bois was supported by the NAACP on the basis that an event focusing on global African matters might well be good publicity for the Association and the domestic issues it championed. In addition, Du Bois may well have been prompted by the criticism he had faced within the United States, as one of the principal recruiters of African American troops who had faced carnage and racism during the war. There was also a need to re-establish his leadership credentials, not least because of the growing popularity of the UNIA and Garvey, who Du Bois described as ‘the most dangerous enemy of the Negro race in America and in the world’. 
In addition to other considerations, the New Negro movement, as well as Garvey’s agitation, heralded a renewed interest in Africa and Pan-Africanism. As Du Bois expressed it: ‘Then came the First World War, and among American Negroes at is close there was determined agitation for the rights of Negroes throughout the world, particularly in Africa.’ At the same time as the Congress, therefore, Du Bois planned to address the leaders of the victorious powers gathering at Versailles in France and to press that the principle of self-determination, which was much trumpeted by President Wilson of the United States, should also be applied to Africa and Africans. Du Bois proposed that a new ‘internationalized’ African state might be established from Germany’s confiscated African colonies. In his view, such a creation should consider the views of ‘intelligent Negroes’ both in Africa and the diaspora, but he envisaged it would be administered on a ‘trusteeship’ basis by the great powers themselves. Du Bois even hoped that Belgium and Portugal would voluntarily forfeit their colonies for this new ‘international Africa’, which would also constitute the realization of the slogan ‘Africa for the Africans’. He later claimed that from this proposal emerged the ‘mandated territories’, former colonies nominally governed under the auspices of the League of Nations, but largely indistinguishable from other colonies and generally governed by the victors of the First World War, Britain and France. However, his argument for a new African state was ignored. Perhaps what was most significant was that Du Bois’ plan was very similar to that announced by Garvey and the UNIA, that also demanded that Germany’s colonies should be confiscated and administered by Africans.

Du Bois initially hoped to discuss his plans with the United States government and that he would be appointed an official delegate to the post-war peace conferences to speak on behalf of ‘two hundred million of black people’. However, he received no government support and no such position. He then considered a small Pan-African gathering but managed to gain the confidence of Blaise Diagne, the Senegalese deputy to the French National Assembly. Diagne (1872–1934) who had distinguished himself by acting in a similar manner to Du Bois, and recruiting hundreds of thousands of Africans for the French war effort, was acting as an aide to the French president, Clemenceau. Du Bois therefore had some limited official support from the French government for the Congress, although he was apparently told ‘don’t advertise it’, but faced opposition from the governments of the United States, Britain and the other colonial powers. He also had the support of Ida Alexander Gibbs Hunt (1862–1957), an African American suffragist and NAACP member based in France, who acted as assistant secretary to the congress, as well as a Guyanese barrister, Edmund Fredericks (1875–1935), who was a representative of the London-based African Progress Union (APU). These three, Du Bois, Hunt and Fredericks, together with Diagne, constituted the organizing committee of the Paris congress and, under Diagne’s presidency and with the addition of Rayford W. Logan (1897–1982), formed an executive committee to implement its decisions.
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Eventually fifty-seven participants from Africa, the Caribbean and the United States made their way to Paris, although most were already residing in France and both the British and French colonies in Africa were represented by a single delegate. Twelve delegates represented nine African countries, Liberia had three delegates, including a future president, and constituted the largest African delegation. Twenty-one delegates represented the Caribbean, including thirteen from the French Antilles, and sixteen delegates came from the United States. The president of the London-based APU, John Archer, also attended and spoke at the Paris congress. Archer had first met Du Bois at the 1900 Pan-African Conference in London and would play a significant role in the next two congresses. The African Progress Union can be considered an important British-based Pan-African organization. It was formed in December 1918 for ‘voicing African sentiments’ and ‘furthering African interests’ following a series of meetings of Africans and ‘descendants of African blood’ in London. It described itself as ‘an Association of Africans from various parts of Africa, the West Indies, British Guiana, Honduras and America representing advanced African ideas’. Amongst other things, it demanded self-determination for Africa and Africans as well as reparations for ‘the black race’. Its initial membership was largely dominated by mainly male professionals, although some students were also involved and one of its first major concerns was to combat the growing racism and ‘race riots’ that exploded in Britain’s towns and cities in 1919. Another speaker who would in future play a significant role was Addie Waites Hunton (1866–1943) who had been in France with African American troops, was one of the authors of Two Colored Women with American Expeditionary Forces and the following year became one of the founders of the International Council of Women of the Darker Races of the World (ICWDRW). She reminded the predominantly male congress of the important role of women and urged the participants to consider ‘the necessity of seeking their co-operation and counsel’.

The ICWDRW was initiated by some of the leading African American women activists such as Margaret Murray Washington, wife of Booker T. Washington, Mary Church Terrell, Mary McLeod Bethune, Addie Hunton and Addie Dickerson in 1922. All its eighteen founder members were prominent in African American organizations such as the National Association of Negro Women, and it remained an elite and exclusive organization which required its members to pay an annual fee. Its main purpose was:

the dissemination of knowledge of peoples of color the world over in order that there may be a larger appreciation of their history and accomplishments and that they themselves may have a greater degree of respect for their own accomplishments and a greater pride in themselves.
Although particularly interested in women from Africa and the African diaspora, the Council also concerned itself with women in Asia. However, its Pan-African sympathies were often at the forefront and although most of its focus was the United States, it had close relations with women in Haiti, Liberia and Sierra Leone where it had strong links to Adelaide Casely-Hayford, whose activities were becoming well-known amongst such African American women. The members of the Council saw themselves as representing African women at various international gatherings since, as Mary Terrell explained: ‘It was my privilege to represent, not only the colored women of the United States, but the whole continent of Africa, since I was the only one present at that meeting who had a drop of African blood in her veins.’ It is also significant that leading members of the Council also participated in the wider Pan-African movement, specifically the congresses organized by Du Bois.

The First Pan-African Congress issued three major resolutions:

a) That the Allied and Associated Powers establish a code of law for the international protection of the natives of Africa, similar to the proposed international code for labour.

b) That the League of Nations establish a permanent bureau charged with the special duty of overseeing the application of these laws to the political, social, and economic welfare of the natives.

c) The Negroes of the world demand that hereafter the natives of Africa and the peoples of African descent be governed according to the following principles:

These principles covered the use of land, labour and capital in the colonies, as an attempt to prevent the exploitation of the ‘natives’. The right to education and health care was also demanded, as was the right to freedom of conscience and to be involved in, or consulted, about the form of colonial government. The League of Nations was envisaged as the guardian of these rights. Such demands were made in the expectant spirit produced by the conclusion of the ‘war to end all wars’, as well as United States President Wilson’s fourteen points. These included the aspiration for ‘An absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based on the principle that the interest of the population must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government.’ Sections of the American press and even representatives of the colonial powers found nothing unreasonable in the demands of the Pan-African Congress. A representative of French colonialism even pointed out that some of the demands had already been implemented.

The deliberations of the Pan-African Congress were covered in the American and French press, as well as by the news media in Africa, but largely ignored by the Allied governments meeting in Paris. The proceedings appear to have given Du Bois and other African Americans the opportunity to criticize racism and government inactivity within the United States, although even this was done in muted tones. The occasion also gave Diagne
as well as Gratien Candace (1873–1953), Joseph Lagrosillière (1872–1950) and Achille René-Boisneuf (1873–1927), the representative of Guadeloupe and Martinique in the French National Assembly, the opportunity to deplore racism in the United States and extol the virtues of France and French colonialism. Representatives of French, Belgian and Portuguese colonialism even spoke at the congress and presented colonial rule in glowing terms. Even John Archer appears to have compared Britain’s treatment of its ‘citizens of colour’ unfavourably with the French situation and indeed this may have been exactly what the French government had intended. However, the participation of Diagne, Candace and other representatives of the French colonies was viewed with alarm by the French colonial authorities.

The First Pan-African Congress had little lasting influence, was criticized for its proximity to the French government and for ignoring Marcus Garvey, the other major Pan-African figure of the day. It did, however, re-establish a formal Pan-African movement, even if this was one assisted by Europeans, as had also been the case in 1900. Du Bois had hoped that a more permanent ‘central headquarters’ might be established in Europe but this did not occur, although it is evident that he considered that a permanent organization had been created with Diagne as president and himself as secretary. He even envisaged the creation of an ‘international quarterly Black Review issued in English and French and possibly Spanish and Portuguese’. The congress did, however, facilitate the development of a Europe-based network with strong support in France, Belgium and Britain. The delegates therefore resolved to hold a second congress in Paris in 1921.

The National Congress of British West Africa

The period following the First Pan-African Congress witnessed several important developments. African aspirations for political change were stirring on the continent as well as amongst those in the diaspora. One of the most significant developments was the founding in March 1920 of the National Congress of British West Africa (NCBWA) by forty-five delegates meeting in Accra, in the British colony of the Gold Coast. The NCBWA revived the notion of ‘West African nationality’, the view that all peoples in West Africa, especially the four British colonies, were inter-related and had a common destiny. It was an idea that both Horton and Blyden had contributed to and emerged out of the common economic, social and political aspirations of Anglophone and Western-educated Africans, many of whom were the offspring of related elite families that dominated politics and the press in British West Africa. J. E. Casely-Hayford became the main ideologist of West African nationalism and it was he and Dr Akiwande Savage (1874–1935), an attendee at the 1900 Pan-African Conference, who initiated plans for the NCBWA in the Gold Coast, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Gambia as early as 1914. The NCBWA managed to combine the dream of
a future self-governing West African ‘nation’ with a strong commitment to the existing British Empire. In the meantime, the politicians of the NCBWA sought reforms that would largely be of benefit to themselves and attempted to strive for a ‘united West Africa’. In future, there would even be a demand for ‘dominion status’, as enjoyed by Canada and Australia. Despite its contradictions, West African nationalism, or Pan-West Africanism, endured and was revived again by Kwame Nkrumah in the 1940s and 1950s. The notion of a ‘united West Africa’ also had a significant influence on younger West Africans studying in Britain. The founding of the NCBWA certainly influenced the founding of the West African Students’ Union in 1925 and led to its founder, Ladipo Solanke, publishing his own approach to the subject entitled *United West Africa (or Africa) at the Bar of the Family of Nations*.25

One of the key features of the NCBWA was that although unelected it claimed to speak for the people of the four British colonies, a prospect that alarmed the colonial authorities, and it began to make moderate demands on that basis. It demanded an end to racism in employment, some participation in government and limited elections, compulsory primary and secondary education and the creation of a West African University, along the lines proposed by Blyden. The founding conference opposed the further partitioning of parts of West Africa, occasioned by the confiscation of Germany’s colonies and condemned any alienation of land. The conference also discussed various economic questions and welcomed the launch of the UNIA’s ‘Black Star Line’. The NCBWA saw itself as composed of the ‘natural leaders’ of West Africa, who wished for moderate reforms to prevent ‘political unrest’. The NCBWA was also in contact with other sections of the existing Anglophone Pan-African network including the African Progress Union in Britain and organizations in Trinidad and British Guiana. The founding conference was also welcomed by Dusé Mohammed Ali’s *Africa Times and Orient Review*, which commented, ‘It behoves the coloured people of the world to show a united front’, and ‘unity amongst West Africans is an essential to commercial and political prosperity’. In fact, the NCBWA was one of the earliest examples of African unity within the continent.26


Du Bois’s Second Pan-African Congress was eventually held in three European cities, London, Paris and Brussels in August and September 1921. It was considerably larger than the first congress with over 113 delegates, the majority, over forty, from the African continent and only seven from the Caribbean. Over twenty represented those based in Europe, however, participants did not in the main represent organizations, so the gathering could not be said to be truly representative. Du Bois later blamed the lack of
participation from the Caribbean on the influence of Garvey and the UNIA, although it might just as easily be explained by other factors including a lack of support from the leading figures in the French Antilles. Before the first session held in London, Du Bois and other key figures had also met with members of the International Department of the British Labour Party, the party that would soon form a government in Britain.27

Dr John Alcindor (1873–1924), the new president of the APU, opened the London session, which was held in Westminster Hall. The APU, and particularly its secretary, Robert Broadhurst (c.1859–1948), played a major part in organizing the congress, although the latter did not always see eye to eye with Du Bois.28 Broadhurst originated from Sierra Leone, but spent much of his life in Britain where he was a member of the several Pan-African organizations including the UNIA. He was also in personal contact with many key figures in Africa, including the members of the NCBWA.29 The NCBWA was also in contact with Du Bois, who commented with some approval on its founding and the deputation which it sent to England to present various grievances to the king. In The Crisis, Du Bois also noted that demands for political independence were evident in Egypt and Sudan, while from South Africa two delegates from the African National Congress and the African Political Organisation had been sent to London to lobby for political reforms. Elsewhere, in the Caribbean, Du Bois observed growing efforts and movements for unity, but he managed to ignore the UNIA in his global survey. Nevertheless, he proudly announced that many of these movements would be represented in the Second Pan-African Congress, out of which he suggested ‘will undoubtedly grow a larger and larger unity of thought among Negroes and through this concerted action’.30

The second congress had many of the features of the first. It was almost entirely the creation of Du Bois, who had significant disagreements not only with Broadhurst, who objected to the Brussels venue, but also with Diagne, who was concerned about the political demands of the congress and the ability of Du Bois to speak for African Americans. Du Bois also found that colonial authorities in Europe were greatly troubled by the activities of the UNIA and on several occasions he had to explain how his Pan-Africanism differed from that of Garvey. His great achievement was to persuade the participants that Pan-Africanism mattered and that such a gathering could make a difference by discussing the solutions to common problems. He was aware that he and a few others were speaking on behalf of those who had no idea they were being represented. But he argued that there was a world problem, a ‘certain common denominator’, and ‘they had got to talk about it’. He again hoped that after the Brussels session it would be possible to create ‘an international and permanent organisation’.

Du Bois was assisted in Europe by Walter White (1893–1955), of the NAACP, and by Jessie Fauset (1882–1961), the novelist and literary editor of The Crisis. Fauset also spoke at the London session on African women, mentioning the educational work of Adelaide Casely-Hayford (1868–1960)
and Kathleen Easmon (1891–1924), who were establishing a vocational school for girls in Sierra Leone, as well as the role of African American women in the struggle for emancipation. At least a dozen other women attended the congress in London, Paris or Brussels. Among the other participants in London were Albert Marryshaw (1887–1958), a trade unionist from Grenada, Hastings Banda (1898–1987), the future president of Malawi and John L. Dube (1871–1946), the founding president of the South African Native National Congress, later the ANC. There were also several prominent African Americans including tenor Roland Hayes (1887–1987), and Ida Gibbs Hunt, as well as those from the Caribbean and West Africa who were residing in London. John Archer, the former president of the APU chaired part of the London session and introduced Shapurji Saklatvala, an Indian communist who would later be elected to the British Parliament. During the entirety of the second congress there were also representatives from Haiti, Madagascar, Abyssinia, Martinique, French Congo and many other countries.

The London Manifesto

One of the main issues discussed in the London session was the ‘colour bar’, the discrimination and segregation that existed in relation to Africans throughout the world. It was an opportunity for speakers to give their heartfelt personal experiences and views. Other participants, such as Alcindor, were keener to present a moderate image and therefore the main result of the London session was the rather ambivalent ‘London Manifesto’, which seemed to bear all the hallmarks of Du Bois’ thinking and contained both moderate and more radical aspirations and demands. It commenced by again contrasting conditions facing those of African descent in the United States with those allegedly less severe facing those living under French rule. It condemned the United States intervention in Haiti and the encouragement given to Italy to act in a similar way in Abyssinia. It ended with six demands that were similar to those presented in 1919; racial equality, limited self-government, the right to education and freedom of conscience, common ownership of land and global cooperation ‘on the basis of Justice, Freedom and Peace’.

According to the manifesto the world faced

Two eventualities; either the complete assimilation of Africa with two or three of the great world states, with political, civil and social power and privileges absolutely equal for its black and white citizens, or the rise of a great black African state, founded in Peace and Good Will, based on popular education, natural art and industry and freedom of trade, autonomous and sovereign in its internal policy, but from its beginning a part of a great society of peoples in which it takes its place with others as co-rulers of the world.
Here was a plea for Justice and ‘noblesse oblige’, an indication that Du Bois and those who gathered in London, strong advocates of ‘racial equality’, held views that were not so very different from those of Garvey and the UNIA. The main difference was that Du Bois was not seeking to establish a mass movement to establish the ‘great black African state’, but rather to gather together like-minded ‘thinking leaders’ who could present a coherent and compelling argument to the big powers. Here too Du Bois was convinced that an intelligentsia, ‘the talented tenth’, should be recognized as the ‘natural leaders’ of the ‘Backward and Suppressed Groups of mankind’. He was also of the view that Haiti and Liberia showed that Africans were capable of self-government and that those peoples and countries that were less developed than the big powers could, and should, be helped to advance along the road to development and self-determination. However, there was criticism too of the failure of the colonial powers, ‘for deliberate transgression of our just demands and their own better conscience’. In short, according to Du Bois, Britain, Portugal and Belgium were exploiting, even enslaving the land and labour of the colonies, failing to provide adequate education and making no or few efforts to train the inhabitants for future self-government.

The Brussels session

The London session received some coverage in the press in Britain before most of the delegates moved on to Brussels for the second session that was presided over by Blaise Diagne and conducted in French. The session in Brussels, held in the Palais Mondiale, was attended by more Europeans than Africans including some colonial officials, and facilitated by two well-known Belgian visionaries Paul Otlet and Henri La Fontaine. The Brussels-based Union Congolaise, formed in 1919, sent eighteen participants, including its charismatic leader Paul Panda Farnana who had also helped organize the gathering. Nicola de Santos-Pinto, a planter from Sao Tomé and Dr José de Magalhaes, represented the Liga Africana, based in Lisbon, an important connection since the next congress would be held in that city. A representative of the International Confederation of Students also addressed the Brussels session.

The most significant feature of the Brussels session was that it came under attack by the Belgian government and the press for its alleged Garveyite politics and links with the UNIA. The Belgian Colonial Ministry had discovered some UNIA activity in the Congo, although this seems to have been limited to a few copies of Negro World and information claiming that the Black Star Line would free Africans. The Belgian government also expressed concern about the spread of Simon Kimbangu’s African Church movement in that region and believed that it too was inspired by the UNIA. Simon Kimbangu (1887–1951) was a Congolese religious leader who developed his own African version of the Baptist faith. He was said to have
performed miracles and attracted a large following not just in the Belgian Congo but also in French Congo and Angola. His ministry was therefore viewed with alarm by the Belgian colonial authorities since it was considered to contain Pan-African and anti-colonial tendencies. Kimbangu was arrested for sedition in 1921 just before the Second Pan-African Congress and initially sentenced to death, although this sentence was later commuted to life imprisonment. The Belgian government was also concerned about the activities of the Union Congolaise and its leader, Paul Panda Farnana (1888–1930), the most highly Western-educated African in Belgium, who had trained as an agronomist. Panda had already demanded that Africans should be educated and involved in the government of the Congo and predicted dire consequences should this not occur. He also appears to have had strong contacts within the Congo, including with those close to Kimbangu. Panda was attacked in the Belgian and colonial press as a subversive Garveyite but he also presented his own views, defending Garvey and the right of African Americans to return to Africa and at the same time championing the Second Pan-African Congress where: ‘United as at a battle front, the intellectuals of the black race will collaborate for the moral and intellectual development of indigenous Africans.’

The fear of subversive activity linking Garvey, Kimbangu and Panda therefore also had an impact on Du Bois and the Brussels session. Du Bois too was criticized by the press, one publication even announced that the NAACP was funded from Moscow and was meddling in the Belgian Congo. An atmosphere had been created that condemned all Pan-Africanism as interconnected, subversive, anti-colonial and a threat to Belgian interests in the Congo and created common cause between the governments of Belgium, France and the United States.

The pressure was such that it led to what one participant called three days of ‘pleasant generalities without a word of criticism of colonial governments’. Then the Brussels session ended in uproar when Diagne, technically a servant of the French government as well as the president of the Pan-African Congress, strongly objected to the content of the ‘London Manifesto’, which was being presented to the gathering by Du Bois, the secretary of the congress. Diagne took particular objection to the description of Belgium’s colonial policy as ‘still mainly dominated by the banks and great corporations who are determined to exploit Congo rather than to civilise it’. It was perhaps a prudent precaution that the manifesto had been complimentary about French colonial policy, but it had been similarly critical of Portugal, while Britain was mainly criticized for its failure to adequately educate the ‘natives’ and prepare them for self-government. According to Diagne, Du Bois was promoting ‘radicalism’ and ‘separatism’, and other dangerous ideas. Diagne was particularly opposed to the sixth resolution of the London session that demanded ‘The ancient common ownership of the Land and its natural fruits and defence against the unrestrained greed of invested capital.’ He refused to put the ‘London Manifesto’ to the vote.
because it contained such ‘communist’ theories, while instead allowing all present to vote on a more moderate proposal submitted by the Belgian Otlet. The Brussels session therefore concluded in some disharmony.

The Paris session

The Paris session began with more eulogies to French colonial rule and denunciations of Garvey and communism from Diagne and Gratien Candace but also contained anti-colonial criticism too. Du Bois made it clear that African Americans had no desire to solve the colonial problems of France but he also repeated his view that ‘no Negro in any part of the world can be safe as long as a man can be exploited in Africa, disfranchised in the West Indies, or lynched in the United States because he is a coloured man’. Eventually nearly all the resolutions in the London Manifesto were adopted, although Resolution six was re-drafted to a more acceptable demand: ‘The return to Negroes of the land and its natural fruits.’ However, if the aim was to re-establish unity and develop a permanent Pan-African movement, Du Bois was unsuccessful. There appeared to be some differences between the African Americans on the one hand and some of their more moderate brothers based in Europe. No permanent organization was established, although a ‘secretariat’ was for a time established in Paris under the direction of Candace and Isaac Beton. In Paris too, Du Bois was questioned as to whether he was an advocate of ‘Africa for the Africans’ and in any way linked with Garvey. He concluded that assimilated Africans such as Candace and Diagne might be strong advocates of racial equality but were ‘curiously timid’ when the exploitation of Africa by ‘predatory capital’ was being discussed. Behind such differences Du Bois detected a more serious question; to what extent could the Pan-African congresses be said to speak for those in Africa and the diaspora, to what extent could Du Bois and even thirty of his intellectual colleagues claim to speak for African Americans? Du Bois concluded that the Pan-African Congress might not speak for all but that it did three things: it brought into face-to-face contact a group of ‘educated Negroes of the calibre that might lead black men in the modern world’; it discovered amongst them more points of agreement than difference and it expressed the need for further meetings.

Du Bois did hold some meetings with representatives of the League of Nations. He also submitted a petition from the Second Pan-African Congress to the League, through the Haitian diplomat Dantès Bellegarde (1877–1966), who became famous for his opposition in the League of Nations to the occupation of Haiti by the United States and for exposing the so-called Bondelswarz Massacre by the South African government in what is today Namibia. Bellegarde had also attended the congress and Du Bois was later to call him ‘international spokesman of the Negroes of the world’. The congress petition, however, made few demands. Regarding the demand for
eventual African self-government, it suggested that an African might become a member of the League’s Mandates Commission. It drew attention to the racism directed at ‘civilised persons of Negro descent throughout the world’. It concluded by acknowledging that the League has very little power to do anything but considered that it should ‘take a firm stand on the equality of races, and that it suggests to the colonial powers … to form an International Institute for the study of the Negro problem, and for the evolution and protection of the Negro race’.43

Third Pan-African Congress, London, Lisbon 1923

Despite the differences exhibited in 1921, Du Bois took the initiative to organize a third congress that was held in London and Lisbon in 1923. He later wrote that the ‘Paris office’, that is the French Pan-African Association led by Candace and Beton, nearly ruined the organization of this gathering and the members of the Pan-African Association were criticized for behaving as ‘Frenchmen first and as Negroes second’.44 In fact, Du Bois had been considering holding the congress in the Caribbean, mainly it seems for financial reasons, and at the last minute had to reconvene it in Europe. London seems to have been added as an afterthought, with very little preparation, but evidently with the support of the future Labour prime minister, Ramsey MacDonald and the Fabian Society the congress was convened in London in November 1923.45 The congress later took special measures to try to deal with the disorganization and indebtedness of the ‘Paris office’ and to make sure that it was only one of several regional offices, not an organizing centre. It was envisaged that regional offices in England, Portugal, West Africa, the British West Indies, the United States, Brazil, South Africa, Haiti and Liberia would take responsibility for organizing the next congress, to be held in 1925.

It is worth noting that Du Bois later wrote that the Pan-African movement had been ‘losing ground’ since 1921 and the organizing committee of the third congress only comprised Du Bois, Ida Gibbs Hunt and Rayford Logan. Hunt played a particularly important role, personally donating funds to finance the congress, while the National Association of Colored Women paid Du Bois’s travel costs to Europe.46 The London session was evidently small and included amongst its main speakers notable Europeans such as Professor Harold Laski, H. G. Wells, R. H. Tawney and Sir Sidney Olivier, a former governor of Jamaica. Other speakers included Du Bois, Ida Gibbs Hunt, who spoke on the ‘The Coloured Races and the League of Nations’, Rayford Logan and Dr John Alcindor. Two Africans Kamba Simango from Mozambique and Chief Amoah III from the Gold Coast also spoke and appear to be the only continental Africans present.47 The London session was perhaps most significant for a series of demands and requests
to the colonial and other powers. The most notable of these was directed at Brazil and Central America and urged ‘that peoples of African descent be no longer satisfied with a solution of the Negro problem which involves their absorption into another race without allowing Negroes as such full recognition of their manhood and right to be’.48

Columbus Kamba Simango (1890–1966) is now an almost forgotten figure but Du Bois stayed with him whilst in London. He was a missionary who was initially self-taught as well as educated in South Africa and at Hampton Institute in the United States. He collaborated with Franz Boas and Melville Herskovits and became one of the first African anthropologists. He subsequently married Kathleen Easmon, who was visiting the United States with her aunt, Adelaide Casely-Hayford. In the 1920s he travelled to London where his new wife died in 1924. The following year he married another West African, Christine Coussey, who originated from the Gold Coast. Both worked as missionaries in Angola and Mozambique before Simango was charged with the rape of a white missionary in 1932. He then went with his wife to the Gold Coast in the 1930s and after independence became an important point of contact between Nkrumah’s government and FRELIMO, and head of the Portuguese radio service in Ghana.49 Simango also attended the Lisbon session, organized by José do Magalhaes and the Liga Africana, which was reportedly larger than the London session.

In Lisbon, some fifty participants represented Angola, Mozambique, Sao Tomé, Cape Verde, Guinea, Nigeria and the United States, fewer countries than the thirteen represented in London. However, both meetings were small and generally unrepresentative of Africa and the African diaspora. Two of the major speakers were colonial ministers, one the current Portuguese Minister of Colonies. Apart from a focus on Sao Tomé most of the session appears to have been devoted to the history and future of the Pan-African movement, as well as the particular problems facing African Americans. It appears to have been viewed by Du Bois as mainly memorable for its culinary delights and harmonious deliberations rather than for any political achievements.50

The third congress agreed on various demands: the right of Africans to a voice in government; the right of access to land and its resources; trial by juries of peers; free education for all and higher education for ‘selected talent’; the abolition of the slave trade and liquor traffic; world disarmament but failing this the right of Africans to bear arms. In other demands too there was some continuity from previous congresses. The plea that Africa should be developed not for profit but for the benefit of Africans was reiterated, as was the demand that capital and labour be organized for the benefit of the many not the few. Both reflected Du Bois’ socialist leanings but they were simply pleas, neither Du Bois nor the congress developed any programme to realize such aims.51
without discrimination as to race and colour’, and that such areas as Northern Nigeria, Uganda and Basutoland needed to be developed ‘with the specific objective of training them in home rule and economic independence, and for eventual participation in the general government of the land’. Such demands now appear rather naïve and there were similar pleas for an end to ‘white minority’ rule in South Africa, Kenya and Rhodesia. However, the third congress did highlight the global oppression of Africans even in the allegedly free republics of Haiti, Liberia and Abyssinia, which were said to be in the ‘grip of economic monopoly and usury at the hands of the money-masters of the world’. As might be expected, the congress was also critical of lynching and other forms of racial oppression in the United States, and England and France for financing ‘the slave trading industrial monopolies in the Portuguese colonies’. But such criticisms and demands were directed at the League of Nations, which although dominated by the major colonial powers was asked to appoint African representatives to the Mandates Commission and the International Labour Organisation. Nevertheless, all the demands of the congress amounted to one plea, ‘that black folk be treated as men’.52

The demands made by this congress were made on behalf of ‘civilised’ Africans and in many ways echo the demands Du Bois made for the ‘talented tenth’ in the United States. There is no overall demand of ‘Africa for the Africans’, or even a reiteration of previous demands for self-government and self-determination. Indeed, there was an acceptance of the view presented by the colonial powers that most Africans needed more preparation and training before such rights were granted. It was not accidental that Du Bois was so close to MacDonald and the Fabian Society in Britain, who would soon show themselves to be such zealous defenders of the British Empire. At this stage Du Bois’s Pan-Africanism was that of gradualism and minor reforms and showed a mistrust of the majority of Africans, something that was not so evident in Garveyism. Even before the congress, Du Bois’s leadership was rewarded when he was named as the United States official envoy for the inauguration of President King of Liberia, who had previously attended the Second Pan-African Congress. Du Bois travelled directly to Liberia from Lisbon to make his first visit to Africa.

Fourth Pan-African Congress, New York 1927

Du Bois originally intended to hold a fourth congress in the Caribbean in 1925. He lamented the fact that ‘the Pan-African idea was still American rather than African’, and had the aim of ‘moving the centre of this agitation nearer other African centres of population’. He explained that his original plan was to charter a ship and hold meetings throughout the Caribbean but he had difficulties finding such a ship and concluded ‘I suspect the colonial powers spiked this plan.’53 The Fourth Pan-African Congress was eventually held in New York in August 1927, financed and largely organized
by Addie Waites Hunton of the ICWDRW, in conjunction with the National Association of Colored Women and the Women’s International Circle for Peace and Foreign Relations (WICPFR), together with the support of Ida Gibbs Hunt and Jessie Fauset. It was therefore almost entirely organized by women and it appears that the ICWDRW also wished to support a fifth congress that it was proposed might be held in the Caribbean.54

There were over 200 delegates in attendance at the congress, and over 5,000 participants overall, although most of these were from the United States. There were African representatives from Nigeria, Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast and Liberia but, as Du Bois admitted, Africa was ‘sparsely represented’. The Caribbean was represented by Haiti, the Bahamas, Barbados and the Virgin Islands. Some of the most notable speakers were non-Africans: Melville Herskovits, John W. Vandercook, author of Black Majesty: The Life of Christophe King of Haiti and other books on Haiti. Other speakers included Chief Amoah III from the Gold Coast and the Haitian Dantès Bellegarde, as well as the NAACP’s William Pickens and the historian William Leo Hansberry.55

The resolutions of the fourth congress reiterated previous demands. Africans everywhere needed: ‘A voice in their own government’, rights to the land and national resources, modern education for all children, the development of Africa for Africans and ‘not merely for the profit of Europeans’. Once again there was a demand for economic reform to develop society for the ‘welfare of the many rather than the enriching of the few’, and a plea for the treatment of all humans as ‘civilized despite difference of birth, race or colour’.56 In addition there were specific resolutions calling for the removal of United States troops from Haiti, for increased educational provision in Liberia, and for ‘continued independence’ for Abyssinia. The independence of Liberia and the removal of US troops from Haiti were important issues taken up by both the ICWDRW and the WICPFR at the time. Hunton had visited and written a report condemning the United States occupation of Haiti and in 1929 she helped establish the Save Haiti League.57

The congress praised some of the political and educational reforms in Britain’s and France’s African colonies, while demanding that Belgium gave Africans some voice in government and restored land ownership to them. Portugal was praised for its ‘liberal and far-sighted colonial legislation’, but at the same time criticized for allowing unbridled ‘financial and industrial power’ to drive it and its colonies into bankruptcy. In the Caribbean, the demand was for ‘the federation of the islands’ an unlikely occurrence since they were in the hands of several colonial powers. There was also a demand for an ‘utter erasing of that colour line between mulattoes and blacks, which sprang from slavery and is still being drawn and encouraged by those who are the enemies of Negro freedom’. Regarding the United States, the congress drew attention to the latent political and economic power of African Americans and encouraged its use both in elections and as consumers. It concluded: ‘Lynching, segregation and mob violence still
Du Bois continued to believe that the ‘colour line’ was a global problem and thus the Congress also desired ‘to see freedom and real national independence’ in Egypt, China and India and demanded an end to the United States interference in Central and South America. Perhaps as a result of Du Bois’ own recent visit to the Soviet Union, as well as the presence of Otto Huiswoud, a leading communist originally from Suriname, special thanks were offered to the Soviet government ‘for its liberal attitude toward the coloured races and for the help it has extended to them from time to time’. There was also a paraphrasing of Marx’s famous dictum in a congress resolution: ‘We urge the white workers of the world to realize that no program of labor uplift can be successfully carried through in Europe or America so long as colored labor is exploited and enslaved and deprived of all political power.’

Despite the apparent link between Pan-African concerns and organized labour, the congress represented a definite decline for Du Bois and his Pan-African movement. Yet again plans were made to hold a fifth congress and to establish a permanent organization and Huiswoud’s name appeared amongst those appointed to a preparatory committee, which included Bellegarde, Logan, Du Bois and Addie Hunton. Du Bois wished to hold such a congress in Algiers or Tunis in North Africa but was denied permission by the French government. Du Bois wrote to Bellegarde that ‘until we black folk developed international interests … I would not undertake to push the Pan-African congress.’ Evidently Rayford Logan did try to persuade him to convene another Pan-African congress but Du Bois would not again be involved in such a gathering until 1945, a congress he took no part in organizing.

The four congresses established the idea of Pan-Africanism, consolidated Pan-African networks and drew activists from the United States, Liberia, Ethiopia and Haiti, as well as those from Africa and the Caribbean resident in Europe. The congresses took a stand against racism and began to raise the demand for self-determination in the colonies. However, few representatives from organizations on the African continent participated, there was little support from African American organizations and no permanent organization, organizing centre or publication was established. The congresses were also criticized for the moderate political views expressed and for the exclusion of Marcus Garvey, perhaps the leading Pan-Africanist of the time.
Pan-Africanism and communism

Both the Pan-Africanism of Garvey and that espoused by Du Bois were criticized by those in Africa and the African diaspora who were drawn to the revolutionary ideas of communism, the prospect of a new world that was ushered in by the Russian Revolution of 1917 and the construction of a new socialist society in what became the Soviet Union. Du Bois’ Pan-African vision seemed to some to be too reliant on the benevolence of the League of Nations and the socialist parties of France, Britain and others connected with the Second International. These parties often supported openly racist policies or, like the British Labour Party, established governments that did nothing to end colonial rule in Africa and the Caribbean. Garvey’s Pan-African approach did claim ‘Africa for the Africans at home and abroad’ and in 1920 the UNIA promulgated a ‘Declaration of the Rights of the Negro People of the World’. However, although the slogan ‘Africa for the Africans’ certainly inspired many, neither Garvey nor the UNIA had a programme to realize such a demand, nor guarantee the rights of Africans on the continent, or in the diaspora.

In 1919, following the Russian Revolution, the new Communist International (Comintern or CI), formed by Lenin, the Russian Bolsheviks and communists throughout the world began to formulate a revolutionary Pan-Africanist approach to the problems facing Africans and the African diaspora. The Comintern openly opposed colonialism and one of the conditions for admission to its ranks was that communist parties ‘must support – in deed, not merely in word – every colonial liberation movement’. However, the connection between socialism and Pan-Africanism was established well before the emergence of the Comintern. Indeed, Du Bois had written about the need for a socialist orientation for the Pan-African movement in his 1915 essay The Negro. There he welcomed ‘the coming unities’, and the need for ‘a unity of the working classes everywhere, a unity of the colored races, a new unity of men’. Other early Pan-Africanists, such as Caribbean-born Hubert Harrison, an activist in New York in the period before the First World War, had also advocated an adherence to
socialist principles. In 1911 he explained, ‘Socialism is here to put an end to the exploitation of one group by another, whether that group be social, economic or racial.’

There is now a voluminous literature on the relationship between the international communist movement and Africa and the African diaspora, especially in the United States and South Africa, some of it written in recent years and based on archival material from the Comintern. There have also been a few studies that have sought to examine the Comintern’s approach to what was termed the ‘Negro Question’, that is how the liberation of Africa and the African diaspora might be brought about. What can be concluded is that during the inter-war period, and partly in response to the activities of Du Bois and Garvey, the Comintern took what can be termed a Pan-Africanist approach to the liberation of Africans and the African diaspora in which the agency of Africans, and those of African descent, played a vital role.

The international communist movement took up for solution the problem of African and black liberation from the time of the founding of the Comintern in 1919. The analysis and actions of the Comintern provided a new impetus to the worldwide struggle for black liberation and Pan-Africanism, and presented and highlighted the experience and inspiration of the Russian Revolution, which advanced the possibility of a new revolutionary road for the emancipation of all those of African descent. In the period between the two world wars many throughout Africa and the diaspora looked towards communism and the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union as the means to a new society free from oppression, colonialism and racism. Many, including some well-known personalities, such as W. E. B. Du Bois, Claude McKay, Paul Robeson (1898–1976), Langston Hughes (1902–1967), Louise Thompson Patterson (1901–1999) and Josiah Gumede (1867–1946), travelled to the Soviet Union and publicly announced how impressed they had been with what they had seen. For many years, the Soviet Union was viewed as a model for the colonial countries of Africa and the Caribbean as well as metropolitan ones, in terms of its economic development, as well as for its approach to the ‘national question’ and racism. Many others throughout Africa and the African diaspora were inspired to join a communist party, or became closely identified with the international communist movement, such as McKay, Jomo Kenyatta (1891–1978), Audley Moore (1898–1997), Claudia Jones (1915–1964), Isaac Wallace-Johnson (1894–1965) and Kwame Nkrumah (1909–1972). The communist movement played a leading role in some of the key political events in relation to Africa and the diaspora during the twentieth century and, in many cases, was the most organized and significant political force.

The oppression and exploitation of Africa and of all those of African descent had been an important issue for the communist movement even before the twentieth century, as is evident from the writings of Karl Marx and other Marxists in the nineteenth century. Both Marx and Engels took a keen interest in the struggle against slavery and the slave trade in the United
States, as their writings on the subject demonstrate. Although Marxism spread to both the American and African continents during the nineteenth century, it was poorly developed in relation to what was later called the ‘Negro Question’, even though it clearly influenced significant figures such as Du Bois and Harrison.9

It was left to V. I. Lenin and the Comintern to establish a general revolutionary political line for the communist movement on the liberation of Africa and the African diaspora. Lenin’s writings certainly contain several references to the status of African Americans, some of his writings also focus on the partition and exploitation of Africa and its significance in the epoch of imperialism.10 But of even more significance are the views he and other Bolsheviks developed on what came to be called the ‘national and colonial question’. Just as in Russia, where Lenin called for a revolutionary alliance between the working class and the largely non-Russian peasantry, he also called for an alliance between the revolutionary movement of the working class in the advanced capitalist countries and the anti-colonial movements and oppressed peoples in the colonies, to undermine and destroy imperialism. Lenin regarded the revolutionary movement in the colonies as vital in this struggle, since it was there that imperialism might well be breached at its weakest link.11

The Manifesto of the Communist International to the Proletariat of the Entire World, launched in 1919, therefore included a call to the ‘Colonial Slaves of Africa and Asia’ to rise up against colonial rule.12 The Comintern’s call immediately struck a chord with black people in both the United States and in Africa. In the United States, the first area in which significant numbers of black communists emerged, the Russian Revolution, the founding of the Comintern and the publication of its Manifesto immediately exerted an influence on several key figures including Harrison. Several others, especially Caribbean migrants to the United States, such as the members of Harlem’s 21st AD Socialist Club, Otto Huiswoud, Richard B. Moore and Grace Campbell, were similarly inspired. Another member, the Jamaican Wilfred Domingo, as early as 1919 wrote:

Will Bolshevism accomplish the full freedom of Africa, colonies in which Negroes are the majority, and promote human tolerance and happiness in the United States by the eradication of the causes of such disgraceful occurrences as the Washington and Chicago race riots? The answer is deducible from the analogy of Soviet Russia, a country in which dozens of racial and lingual types have settled their many differences and found a common meeting ground, a country which no longer oppresses colonies, a country from which the lynch rope is banished and in which racial tolerance and peace now exist.13

Another important figure influenced by revolutionary events in Russia was the Jamaican writer Claude McKay, who publicly wondered if Bolshevism might make the United States ‘safe for the Negro’, and argued: ‘If the Russian idea
should take hold of the white masses of the western world, and they should rise in united strength and overthrow their imperial capitalist government, then the black toilers would automatically be free.’ McKay referred to the Russian Revolution as ‘the greatest event in the history of humanity’. Yet another influential Caribbean migrant was Cyril Briggs, the founder of the African Blood Brotherhood for African Liberation and Redemption (ABB).

The ABB, initially founded in 1919, included amongst its members Wilfred Domingo, Richard B. Moore, Otto Huiswoud, Grace Campbell, Claude McKay and Harry Hayward. Its aims included ‘immediate protection and ultimate liberation of Negroes everywhere’. It combined elements of Marxist analysis with those of Pan-Africanism, and had branches throughout the United States and in parts of the Caribbean. It subsequently became an important means of recruiting African Americans to the American Communist Party and for disseminating communist ideology amongst African Americans. In later years the Pan-Africanist leanings of the ABB would have some influence on the policies of both the Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA) and perhaps even on the Comintern. The revolutionary events in Russia even influenced Garvey and his Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA). Many of the members of the ABB were associated with the UNIA, some were even former UNIA members, while Garvey himself initially welcomed the emergence of Soviet Russia. In 1924, he publicly mourned the death of Lenin in Negro World, calling him ‘probably the world’s greatest man’, and sent a telegram to Moscow ‘expressing the sorrow and condolence of the 400,000,000 Negroes of the world’.

In Africa and amongst Africans overseas, especially those in the armed forces during the First World War, the Russian Revolution and the formation of the Comintern were also significant events. In South Africa the founding of Africa’s first communist party in 1921 was inspired by the emergence of the Comintern, although at the time of its founding it probably had only one black member. However, one of the leaders of the new party, W. H. Andrews, prophetically wrote: ‘The influence of the Russian Revolution is felt far beyond the boundaries of the vast Soviet Republic and probably has even more immediate appeal to the enslaved Coloured races of the earth than to Europeans.’ Indeed, even before the formation of the Communist Party of South Africa (CPSA), revolutionary Marxists in the International Socialist League in South Africa were quoting Marx’s famous dictum ‘Labour cannot emancipate itself in the white skin while in the black it is branded,’ and issuing leaflets in Sesuto and Zulu.

The Comintern

The Comintern’s approach to African liberation was informed not only by the writings of Lenin but also by the practical experience of communists seeking solutions to the problems that faced the revolutionary movement in
various parts of the world, including the United States and Africa. It should be noted that the Comintern was perhaps the only international organization of the day that was openly based on a platform of anti-racism. At its second congress, in 1920, it adopted statutes proclaiming that

The Communist International breaks once and for all with the traditions of the Second International, for whom in fact only white-skinned people existed. The task of the Communist International is to liberate the working people of the entire world. In its ranks the white, the yellow, and the black-skinned peoples – the working people of the entire world – are fraternally united.22

Lenin’s Preliminary Draft Thesis on the National and Colonial Questions submitted at the second congress, specifically demanded that ‘all Communist Parties render direct aid to the revolutionary movements among the dependent and subject nations (for example, in Ireland, among the Negroes of America, etc.) and in the colonies’.23

It was at the fourth congress of the Comintern that what came to be known as the ‘Negro Question’ was discussed in detail. Those attending the congress included Claude McKay, the representative of the ABB. McKay considered that it was time for the Comintern to call a ‘Negro Congress’ and he wrote that ‘the Third International will be amazed at the fine material for Communist work there is in the Negro Race’.24 Another important delegate was Otto Huiswoud, an official representative of the Workers’ Party of America and another leading member of the ABB, who was subsequently made chairman of the Negro Commission established by the congress. The most important consequences of the deliberations at the fourth congress were not just the fact that a Negro Commission was established and a ‘Thesis on the Negro Question’ agreed, but also that a policy was established in relation to all ‘Negroes’ throughout the world, that is for Africa and the African diaspora. The role of the two black delegates at this congress should not be underestimated. Huiswoud and McKay played a key role in drafting the ‘thesis on the Negro Question’ and made a big impact on the Congress, as is clear from the letter of ‘fraternal greetings and best wishes’ sent to the ‘Negro Workers of America’, which was addressed to McKay from the chairman of the Comintern.25 It is also clear that McKay was profoundly influenced by his experiences in the new Soviet Russia which he referred to as ‘one great nation with an arm in Europe that is thinking intelligently on the Negro as it does on all international problems’.26

The ‘Thesis on the Negro Question’, agreed at the fourth Comintern congress argued that, ‘the Negro problem has become a vital question of the world revolution’, and therefore concluded that, ‘the cooperation of our oppressed black fellow-men is essential to the Proletarian Revolution and to the destruction of capitalist power’.27 What was essentially a Pan-Africanist policy for the Comintern, was at least partly a consequence of
the view that those of African descent had been the victims of a particular form of racist oppression. It was also based on what seemed to be the emergence of a new awakening and common struggle epitomized by the rapid development of the Garvey movement, as well as the influence of Du Bois’ Pan-African congresses in the post-war period. The fourth congress of the Comintern implicitly recognized this fact by pledging to organize a ‘general Negro conference or Congress in Moscow’, and by calling for support for ‘every form of Negro movement which tends to undermine or weaken capitalism or imperialism, or to impede its further penetration’.28

One of the consequences of this new approach was the recruitment of black students to the University of the Toilers of the East in Moscow (KUTV), which had been especially established to train communists from colonial countries and oppressed nations.29 Another was that individual communist parties sought to collaborate with the Pan-African movement. In 1924, for example, communists in the United States, at that time organized as the Workers Party of America, wrote to the fourth international convention of the UNIA urging its members to become ‘makers of history’ and defending the right of African Americans to migrate to Africa, or anywhere else in the world. The Workers Party made it clear that it stood for the rights of African Americans, as well as the rights of all, and unequivocally stated ‘We stand for driving all the European imperialists out of Africa and for the right of self-determination of the peoples of Africa’.30

The American Negro Labor Congress and the World Negro Congress

The Comintern’s efforts to address and solve the ‘Negro Question’ were hampered by the weaknesses and often inactivity of individual communist parties. At the fifth Comintern congress in 1924, both the French and British communist parties were criticized for their inactivity, the French for not doing more to organize amongst Africans living in France; and the British for not openly demanding the independence of the colonies in their propaganda.31 In the French case, this criticism also came from African and Caribbean party members. The Communist Party in the United States also came under criticism from its African American members for its approach and the latter called for their own American Negro Labor Congress (ANLC) to be established, a demand supported by the Comintern.32 But despite a resolution at the ANLC’s founding in 1925 calling upon its executive committee to ‘lay the foundation for a world organisation of the workers and farmers of our race and to make this organisation a leader and a fighter in the liberation movements of all darker-skinned peoples in the colonies of imperialism everywhere’,33 the ANLC failed to make the desired breakthrough and was unable to convene the ‘World Negro Congress’, which many of its members desired.34
World Anti-Colonial Conference and League Against Imperialism

In 1927 Brussels, Belgium, was the venue for the famous ‘World Anti-Colonial Conference’, which led to the founding of the League Against Imperialism and for Colonial Independence (LAI). The Brussels conference was convened by the League Against Colonial Oppression, which had been founded by German communists in 1926. Nearly 200 delegates participated in the conference, representatives from throughout the colonial world, and such personalities as Nehru, Madame Sun Yat-sen and Albert Einstein. There were also many representatives from Africa and the African diaspora including Messali Hadj and Hadj-Ali Abdelkader from the Paris-based L’Étoile Nord Africaine; Carlos Martins from Haiti; Max Clainville-Bloncourt and Camille St Jacques, representing the Paris-based Union Intercoloniale; Lamine Senghor (1889–1927), member of the French Communist Party and Narcisse Danaé representing the Comité de Défense de la Race Nègre; J. T. Gumede of the African National Congress; James La Guma of the CPSA; and Richard B. Moore, representing the ANLC. William Pickens of the NAACP, George Weston, president of the UNIA and other African American radicals such as Hubert Harrison had been encouraged to attend the Brussels conference by the ANLC but were unable to do so. However, Pickens did subsequently attend the second congress of the LAI held in Frankfurt in 1929, along with several African American delegates such as Williana Burroughs, as well as future president of Kenya Jomo Kenyatta, then residing in London, and Garan Kouyaté, originally from West Africa but representing the Paris-based Ligue de Défense de la Race Nègre.

The 1927 conference established its own five-member ‘Negro Commission’, including Bloncourt, Martins and Gumede, with Senghor as chairman and Moore as rapporteur, and devoted a whole session to the ‘Negro Question’. Moore played a major part in the conference and introduced and presented the ‘Common Resolution on the Negro Question’, which included references to Africa, the United States and the Caribbean. The resolution demanded:

1. Complete freedom of the peoples of Africa and of African origin;
2. Complete equality between the Negro race and all other races;
3. Control of the land and governments of Africa by the Africans;
4. Immediate abolition of all compulsory labour and unjust taxation;
5. Immediate abolition of all racial restrictions, social, political and economic;
6. Immediate abolition of military conscription and recruiting;
7. Freedom of movement within Africa and elsewhere;
8. Freedom of speech, press and assembly;
9. The right of education in all branches;
10. The right to organize trade unions.

The Resolution concerned itself with ‘the emancipation of the Negro peoples of the world’, and was perhaps the most politically developed statement that had been formulated on this issue.

To accomplish its aims Moore called for ‘the organisation of the economic and political power of the people’, in unions and co-operatives, a struggle against ‘imperialist ideology’, and he stressed the importance of ‘unity with all suppressed peoples and classes for the fight against world imperialism’.

The LAI was first based in Germany, but after the Nazis came to power in 1933, its main centre was in England; it also established branches in India, Latin America, North Africa and even in Japan. It became an important organization assisting the anti-colonial struggle, especially throughout Britain’s colonies in Africa and amongst those of African and Caribbean origin residing in Britain and in France. The Brussels conference undoubtedly created the conditions for leading African activists to learn more about the communist movement and subsequently to become influenced by its ideology. Following the conference, La Guma and Gumede from South Africa, together with E. A. Richards, chairman of the Sierra Leone Railway Workers’ Union, were invited to visit the Soviet Union to see for themselves the gains of the revolution. On his return to South Africa, Gumede proclaimed ‘I have seen the new world to come, where it has already begun. I have been to the new Jerusalem’. This was not an uncommon sentiment. The previous year W. E. B. Du Bois had also spent several months in the Soviet Union. He subsequently wrote: ‘I stand in astonishment at the revelation of Russia that has come to me. I may be partially deceived and half-informed. But if what I have seen with my eyes and heard with my ears in Russia is Bolshevism, I am a Bolshevik.’

La Guma’s visit to Moscow was to prove vital in the development of Comintern policy in relation to South Africa and for the CPSA, in which he was a key member. It allowed him to discuss the political orientation of the CPSA with the leading figures of the Comintern. It was in the course of these discussions that a new policy emerged which built on the demands advanced at Brussels for ‘the right to self-determination through the complete overthrow of the capitalistic and imperialist domination’.

The sixth congress of the Communist International

During the sixth congress of the Comintern, held in 1928, there were important developments in relation to the policy on the Negro Question in general and particularly in relation to the United States and South Africa.
Here too, African, Caribbean and African American communists would play a leading role and many of them expressed criticism of their own and other communist parties. The congress occurred at a time when the Comintern took the view that the world was entering a new period of economic and political crisis in which there was an increasing likelihood of wars and revolutionary struggles breaking out. The Negro Question, affecting as it did large parts of Africa and the Caribbean, became even more important, while in those areas where communist parties existed, such as the United States and South Africa, the need to rid them of any manifestations of ‘white chauvinism’ became even more urgent. The policies adopted during this ‘Third Period’ also called for a less conciliatory approach to rival political ideologies, leaders and organizations that were often condemned as ‘reformist’, that is encouraging faith in the existing political system, such as Du Bois, as well as Garvey and the UNIA. In part, however, such changes had been discussed for some years and had often been urged by black communists themselves. One of these was a much greater emphasis on ‘Negro workers’, which consequently led to the Negro Question becoming a much greater concern for the Red International of Labour Unions (RILU), sometimes referred to as the Profintern, the trade union centre of the Comintern.42

The sixth congress adopted two key resolutions, or ‘theses’ on self-determination for African Americans in the United States and Africans in South Africa. The thesis on the ‘Black Belt’ in the United States, that is those southern states where African Americans formed a majority population, argued that they constituted a nation of a special type, with the right to govern themselves and to demand independence from the rest of the United States if they so wished. The other thesis advocated what was termed a Native or Black Republic in South Africa, that is South Africans should struggle for what was later referred to as majority rule. Although the Comintern, and its highest body the Congress, played a decisive role in the adoption of these theses as policy, black communists also played a leading part in drafting and advocating their adoption. The most significant of these communists were James La Guma, the African American James W. Ford (1893–1957), who later stood as vice-presidential candidate for the CPUSA, and Harry Haywood, then a thirty-year-old African American student at the Lenin School in Moscow. Indeed, for these black communists the theses on self-determination were a means of empowerment as they forced the Negro Question to the centre of Comintern policy. Haywood, like his elder brother, had been a member of the ABB and had only joined the American Communist Party in 1925. It was as a student, three years after joining the Communist Party, that he took part in the discussions regarding the future orientation and work of the communist parties in both the United States and South Africa.43

In South Africa, black self-determination meant increased Africanization of the Communist Party, its membership as well as the leadership. The theses specifically instructed the South African party to ‘orientate itself chiefly upon the toiling masses’, noting that ‘the Party leadership must be developed
in the same sense’. In short, the policy adopted by the Comintern created all the conditions for African ascendancy in the South African communist movement and for a policy that put Africans at the centre of the struggle for liberation in that country. The new theses did, however, meet with some resistance. Some South African communists, black as well as white, rejected the new policy as ‘Garveyism’ and considered that it endorsed what they considered to be the Garveyite slogan of ‘Africa for the Africans’, a notion they had hitherto opposed. However, supporters of the thesis, such as La Guma, enjoyed the support of the Comintern and its president who declared that in relation to South Africa the Comintern ‘must say very clearly that in the struggle between the Negroes and the whites that it is on the side of the Negroes’. Despite this support, the Comintern was not a monolith and its leadership far from omnipotent, accordingly disagreements within the South African party continued for some time.44

The situation in the United States in some ways mirrored that in South Africa and the Black Belt thesis also created controversy. There was considerable opposition to the idea that African Americans were a ‘nation within a nation’, a people for whom racism was a ‘device of national oppression’. Within the Communist Party, Haywood only gradually accepted the thesis but then became its greatest champion. His position, and that of the Comintern, was not entirely new since the notion that African Americans constituted a ‘nation within a nation’ had been advanced since the nineteenth century by writers and activists such as Martin Delany. In 1917 Cyril Briggs, the founder of the ABB had also demanded self-determination and a ‘separate political existence’ within the United States for African Americans, while in 1935 Du Bois would also discuss the issue in his article ‘A Negro Nation Within the Nation’.45

The Black Belt thesis highlighted several key issues: the right of African Americans to choose their own future, and the fact that African Americans’ desire for liberation had a potentially revolutionary character that should not be underestimated. Comintern policy drew not only on Lenin’s analysis that African Americans might constitute a nation, but also on their own experiences of struggle. At the same time it provided a new basis for the struggle against racism and ‘white chauvinism’ in the United States and created the conditions for encouraging a new approach and a re-evaluation of African American history and culture, linking both to Africa and the wider African diaspora.46

The result, according to Robin Kelley, was a new chapter in the history of the Communist Party in the United States; for the first time communist ideas began to circulate amongst African Americans in the southern states, precisely the area where the struggle for Civil Rights later emerged.47

The Native Republic and Black Belt theses were therefore important developments in the Comintern’s Pan-Africanist approach based on the perceived common interests that linked people of African descent around the world. As the Comintern explained:
Whether it is a minority (USA etc.), majority (South Africa) or inhabits a so-called independent state (Liberia, etc.), the Negroes are oppressed by imperialism. Thus, a common tie of interest is established for the revolutionary struggle of race and national liberation from imperialist domination of the Negroes in various parts of the world. A strong Negro revolutionary movement in the USA will be able to influence and direct the revolutionary movement in all parts of the world where the Negroes are oppressed by imperialism.48

After 1928, these questions assumed even greater importance within the communist movement and some black communists such as Haywood and Ford found themselves in influential positions. This approach also had a significant legacy in South Africa, as can be seen in the later demands of the African National Congress. There has also been a significant legacy in the United States, as can be seen from the first and final demands of the Black Panthers’ ten-point programme: ‘we want power to determine the destiny of our black community’ and ‘we want a United Nations-supervised plebiscite to be held throughout the black colony in which only black colonial subjects will be allowed to participate, for the purpose of determining the will of black people as to their national destiny’.49 This legacy can also be seen in the demands of other individuals and organizations during the Black Power era and later that demanded African American self-determination. In this sense, the approach of the communists raised the consciousness and perspectives of the wider Pan-African movement.

The International Trade Union Committee of Negro Workers

In keeping with the resolutions of the sixth congress of the Comintern, in 1928 the Profintern created a new body to organize black workers – the International Trade Union Committee of Negro Workers (ITUCNW). Led by the African American James W. Ford, the ITUCNW initially had members from the United States, South Africa, Guadeloupe, Martinique and Cuba. It eventually hoped to include representatives from Haiti, Portugal’s African colonies, the Belgian Congo, Liberia and French Equatorial Africa, as well as from Brazil, Colombia, Venezuela and other countries in Latin America. Subsequently, however, the ITUCNW did not have any responsibility of organizing in South America, although it retained its connections throughout the Caribbean.50 Evidently the ‘Negro Question’ was an important factor in some Latin American countries, such as Brazil and Cuba, where the demand for black self-determination was similarly promoted by the communists.51 The ITUCNW was assigned ‘the task of drawing Negro workers into the existing trade unions, of further creating new trade unions and of unifying
the wide mass of Negro workers on the basis of the class struggle’. Towards that end, the ITUCNW convened the First International Conference of Negro Workers, the long-desired World Negro Congress, which finally met in Hamburg, Germany in 1930 and marked an important landmark in the Comintern’s Pan-Africanist activity.52

Some of the intended delegates to the conference were prevented from attending by the action of colonial governments, but representatives from the United States, the Gold Coast, South Africa, Sierra Leone, Gambia, Nigeria, Cameroon, Haiti and Jamaica eventually gathered together in Germany for the historic conference.53 At the close of the conference a new executive committee of the ITUCNW was elected ‘to give concrete aid and assistance to all Negro workers and to help them build up class unions in their countries’. It included amongst its membership Ford, George Padmore, African American Helen McClain of the National Needle Workers’ Union, E. Reid from Jamaica, Nigerian Frank Macaulay (1891–1931), E. F. Small (1891–1958) from Gambia, Albert Nzula (1905–1934), one of the leaders of the CPSA and Tiemoko Garan Kouyaté (1902–1942) as African representatives.54 Indeed one of the significant features of the conference was the relatively large proportion of delegates from the African continent, a contrast with the domination of Du Bois’ Pan-African congresses and the UNIA’s convention by diasporic Africans. The other significant feature was a focus on the struggles of workers, especially those in the colonies, as a vital means to bring about the liberation of Africa and the diaspora. This was a focus that would be repeated fifteen years later when Padmore convened the famous Manchester Pan-African Congress. The representation of women was rather less impressive since only two African American women Helen McClain and Williana Burroughs (1882–1945), a teacher and representative of the ANLC, appear to have participated.55

The Negro Worker

The First International Conference of Negro Workers was also a major event in the career of Trinidadian George Padmore (1903–1959), who had joined the Communist Party while a student in the United States, who subsequently became a leading figure in the ITUCNW and the editor of its publication The Negro Worker. This publication had first appeared in both French and English in 1928, edited by Ford, and was distributed, or often smuggled, around the world mainly by black seamen sometimes disguised as a religious tract.56 Padmore was also responsible for many of the articles in The Negro Worker and for writing many other ITUCNW publications, most notably The Life and Struggles of Negro Toilers (1931).57 The publications of the ITUCNW chronicled the struggles of black workers in Africa, the United States, the Caribbean and Europe. They consistently identified the main enemy of the ‘Negro Toilers’ as the great powers, particularly British, French and US imperialism, while presenting the Soviet Union as the ‘Champion of the
Oppressed’. They constantly warned readers of the ‘reformism and national reformism’ promoted by a host of ‘mis-leaders’ – the British Labour Party, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in the United States, the Industrial and Commercial Workers Unions in South Africa, for example. Garveyism was always presented as the most dangerous form of ‘ideological deceit’, guilty of ‘denying the class struggle’ and the ‘possibility of the revolutionary struggle of the Negro masses for self-determination’.58

At the same time, the readers of *The Negro Worker* were encouraged to support not just struggles in Africa and the African diaspora but also the struggles for national liberation in India and China and warned of the dangers of fascism and the prospect of a new world war. *The Negro Worker* was one of the first publications to expose Nazi Germany’s aim to obtain colonies in Africa, at the expense of the other colonial powers. Perhaps most importantly, *The Negro Worker* offered practical advice to those involved in struggles. It presented concrete demands that could be fought for, and was very much a collective organizer, disseminating Marxism and a sense of unity of struggle throughout Africa and the African diaspora, as well as amongst all the oppressed and exploited in the world.59 It is a tribute to its effectiveness that the publication was banned by the authorities in most African and Caribbean colonies.

The Caribbean

The ITUCNW along with *The Negro Worker* took a strong interest in the Caribbean. Indeed, two of the committee’s founders represented Guadeloupe and Cuba, while both Jamaica and Haiti were represented in Hamburg. The ITUCNW took up the responsibility of organizing amongst the workers in the Caribbean, especially in Jamaica, but it also gained organized supporters in St Lucia, British Guiana, Grenada, Haiti, Trinidad, Guadeloupe, Puerto Rico and in the Dutch Antilles.60 The *Negro Worker* regularly carried articles on the Caribbean and made much of the 1932 visit to Moscow made by Vivian Henry, general-secretary of the Trinidad Workingmen’s Association, and Hubert Critchlow (1884–1958), general-secretary of the British Guiana Labour Union.61

Even before the founding of the ITUCNW both Huiswoud and Cyril Briggs had been sent to work in the Caribbean by the American Communist Party, in 1930 it became officially known as the CPUSA, which had been given a responsibility for that region by the Comintern. During the preparations for the Hamburg conference Huiswoud had visited several Caribbean countries and had even held a public debate with Marcus Garvey in Jamaica. During the 1930s the CPUSA established links in Jamaica, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico and strengthened its ties with the Communist Party of Cuba. One of only a few communist parties in the region, the Communist Party of Cuba was founded in 1925. By 1929 the Cuban party began to pay much more
attention to the recruitment of black members, especially amongst the sugar workers. By the time of its second congress in 1934 several black workers had risen to leadership positions. The congress discussed the issue of winning over the ‘Negro Toilers’ to the revolutionary struggle and attacked any ‘discrimination against Negroes’. The congress also discussed the need for ‘greater clarification of the Negro Question as a national rather than a “racial” question typified in the slogan for self-determination of the Negroes in the Black Belt of Oriente Province’. The influence of the Communist Party in Cuba increased and it became known as the party of black workers. Consequently, the influence of the Cuban party also spread outside the island and perhaps especially in Jamaica. One of the most significant organizations in the Caribbean in contact with the ITUCNW was the Negro Welfare Cultural and Social Association (NWCSA), led by Elma Francois (1897–1944) in Trinidad. Originally from the island of St Vincent, Francois and the NWCSA became leading organizers of workers during the rebellions that erupted in Trinidad in the later 1930s, and Francois became the first woman to be charged with sedition for her political activities. She was later named a national heroine of Trinidad and Tobago.

Britain and the Negro Welfare Association

Much of the Comintern’s work on the Negro Question centred on the British Empire, since Britain was the world’s leading imperialist power, with colonies throughout Africa and the Caribbean. However, despite the urging of the Comintern and the ITUCNW, the British party was slow to seriously engage with anti-colonial activity in Africa and the Caribbean, or amongst African and Caribbean residents in Britain. Much of this work was left to the LAI and its affiliate the Negro Welfare Association (NWA), founded in London in 1931. One of the Association’s most important constituencies consisted of African and Caribbean seamen based in Britain’s main ports such as London and Cardiff. Black communists again played a pivotal role in this work, men such as the Barbadian Chris Jones [Braithwaite] (1885–1944), who led a committee of ‘Coloured’ seamen in London, Harry O’Connell, from British Guiana, who organized in Cardiff, and another Barbadian, Arnold Ward (1886–?), who became secretary of the NWA.

Although charged with organizing African and Caribbean people in Britain and in the colonies the NWA was initially led by English communists connected with the LAI. Nevertheless, its aims were unmistakably Pan-Africanist: ‘to work for the complete liberation and independence of all Negroes who are suffering from capitalist exploitation and imperialist domination ... [and] to analyse, expose and combat capitalist exploitation and oppression in Africa, the West Indies, the other Negro colonies as well as in the USA’. Certainly all the leading black communists in Britain were all active members of the NWA. So too were many who played a key role
in the anti-colonial movements in Africa such as Jomo Kenyatta and Isaac Wallace-Johnson.

The secretary of the NWA, Arnold Ward, was constantly in contact with Padmore of the ITUCNW, William L. Patterson (1891–1980) in the United States, Isaac Wallace-Johnson in West Africa, Harry Thuku (1895–1970) in East Africa and others in the Caribbean, so that through the NWA important Pan-African networks were established and developed. It campaigned on a variety of issues: racist legislation in South Africa, land alienation in Kenya and self-determination in the Caribbean. The NWA also called for mass economic and political struggle in the colonies to achieve ‘complete independence’. Together with the LAI it championed the anti-colonial struggle in West Africa and worked closely with the West African Students’ Union, the Gold Coast Aborigines Rights Protection Society and, particularly, the Sierra Leonean activist Isaac Wallace-Johnson, who was closely connected with the ITUCNW. In addition, the NWA also had allies within Britain’s Parliament, who were kept fully briefed on West African and other colonial issues, enabling them to question official policy. The NWA worked closely with all the main Pan-African organizations in Britain, including the League of Coloured People and the International African Service Bureau as well as playing a pivotal role in the important global Pan-African networks that were established during this period.

The French connection

In France, the Communist Party had first organized African and Caribbean workers and students during the early 1920s in the Union Intercoloniale, alongside those from South East Asia. However, by 1926 the black members formed their own Pan-African organization, the Comité de Défense de la Race Nègre (CDRN), led by the famous Senegalese communist and decorated war veteran, Lamine Senghor. The CDRN enjoyed an uneasy relationship with the French Communist Party but many of its leading members were communists. Its publication La Voix des Nègres was widely read not only by African and Caribbean people in France but also in the Caribbean and French West Africa. Only a year after its formation Senghor and Garan Kouyaté, with Communist Party support, formed a similar organization Ligue de Défense de la Race Nègre (LDRN). The Ligue and its publication La Race Nègre, were ostensibly established to ‘work for the revolutionary education, organisations and complete emancipation of the entire Negro race’, but it seems that most of their activities focused on African seafarers and workers in France as well as establishing some influence in the French colonies in west and equatorial Africa. Kouyaté, who became the leading figure in the Ligue following Senghor’s premature death, was particularly successful at establishing independent unions of black seamen in some of
France’s main ports, even though his approach ran counter to that proposed by the Communist Party and the ITUCNW.

The ITUCNW, especially Padmore, took Kouyaté and the LDRN under its wing and helped them to establish a new publication the *Cri des Nègres*, a sister organization in Germany, the Liga zur Verteidigung der Negerasse (LVN) and, in 1932, a new organization in France the Union de Travailleurs Nègres (UTN). With ITUCNW support the UTN established its branches in Marseilles, Bordeaux and Le Havre, as well as in Paris, and even had some influence in Belgium. Communist-led Pan-African activity in France was hampered both by internal weaknesses and by the repressive actions of the police and security services, which managed to infiltrate agents into several organizations. Nonetheless, there were clearly successes and important networks established not only in the Francophone world but with those organizing in Europe, Africa, the Caribbean and the United States. In the late 1930s Paris became the headquarters of the ITUCNW and important Pan-African networks were established around the anti-colonial struggle, in the aftermath of the assassination of André Aliker, a communist newspaper editor from Martinique, and in opposition to the invasion of Ethiopia.

**Scottsboro and Ethiopia**

Two events were particularly significant in the development of global Pan-Africanism in the 1930s, namely the Scottsboro case in the United States and the invasion of Ethiopia by fascist Italy, and the Comintern and black communists were centrally involved in both.

In 1931 nine African American youths were arrested in Scottsboro, Alabama on bogus charges of raping two white women. They were subsequently convicted and all but one were sentenced to death. The Comintern transformed the case of the Scottsboro Boys, as the youths were known into a trial of racism in the United States and its campaign has been widely credited with saving the lives of the defendants. The campaign itself was a huge international event: ‘Workers and activists rallied in Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, across Europe and the United States, in parts of the British Empire and its dominions, and in the farming collectives of Russia.’ In Europe, much of the campaign centred on the speaking tour of Ada Wright, the mother of two of the Scottsboro boys and was organized by the communist-led International Labor Defence (ILD), an organization established to provide legal aid and support. The campaign presented communists with the opportunity to raise other aspects of the global Negro Question including anti-colonialism. In Germany Josef Bilé, a leader of the LVN, spoke of the consequences of colonialism in Cameroon; in Britain, Ward and Padmore spoke on Scottsboro platforms; while in West Africa, Wallace-Johnson organized support in the Gold Coast and Nigeria. The Haitian Scottsboro Defence Committee, led by Jacques Roumain,
the famous writer and the founder of the Communist Party of Haiti, was outlawed and Roumain subsequently arrested and imprisoned.72

Indeed, the Scottsboro Campaign helped the Comintern expand its Pan-Africanist activities. By the time of the first World Congress of the ILD in 1932, it had established branches in South Africa and Madagascar and was addressed by delegates from Trinidad, British Guiana, South Africa, Nigeria, Kenya and Liberia, while other delegates from France’s colonies were prevented from attending.73 Other communist-led organizations such as International Red Aid also expanded in Africa during this period, after the first Red Aid committee was established in Sierra Leone in 1931. By 1932 local committees had been established in Cameroon, Togo, Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, Nyasaland, Cote d’Ivoire, Madagascar and South Africa.74

The invasion of Ethiopia by fascist Italy in 1935 became a major cause célèbre for many throughout the world and particularly for Africans and those of African descent. The Italian invasion highlighted the injustice of colonial rule throughout Africa and was waged against the only African country that had successfully resisted colonial conquest. Ethiopia had become a symbol of independence and pride for black people all over the world and they rallied to its defence. Here too the communists were to play a key role. The Comintern, and especially black communists, vigorously supported Ethiopia’s struggle for independence, even before the invasion of October 1935, and viewed the attack on Ethiopia as a major step in the build-up to a new world war. Support for Ethiopia was strongly voiced by James Ford at the seventh congress of the Comintern, at which the need for the broadest unity against the danger of fascism and war was the main theme. James Ford explained that: ‘In the United States the American Negroes are seething with indignation against this attack on the Ethiopian people. In like manner, the toiling masses from South to North Africa, groaning under the heavy yoke of imperialist domination, are awakening to the call of battle for defence of the independence of Ethiopia.’75

In the United States, African American communists played a leading role in various Ethiopia defence committees. The campaign in support of Ethiopia’s independence created some of the conditions for the convening in 1936 of the historic National Negro Congress (NNC).76 Formed on the initiative of the CPUSA the NNC, which elected A. Philip Randolph as its president, was one of the broadest political bodies in African American history and included more than 500 organizations including the NAACP, the Urban League and many churches.77

Throughout the world black people rallied in defence of Ethiopia. In Trinidad where it has been claimed that ‘The Abyssinian War awakened the consciousness of the Trinidad working class,’ the communist-led NWCSA led a ‘Hands off Abyssinia’ campaign, just as it had organized earlier campaigns in defence of the Scottsboro Boys and Angelo Herndon.78 In Kenya at a meeting organized by the Kikuyu Central Association, Africans had resolved to ‘march to Ethiopia to defend their brothers’.79 In
the Gold Coast, Wallace-Johnson helped to establish an Ethiopia Defence Committee, while in South Africa, the CPSA organized ‘Hands off Ethiopia’ demonstrations, and successfully appealed to the harbour workers of Durban, who refused to load ships with supplies for the Italian Army. In Brazil too, there were demonstrations organized by the communists in support of Ethiopia.80 One of the most important centres of support for Ethiopia was in Paris, where an International Committee for the Defence of the Ethiopian People was established, which comprised some 200 organizations from several countries. In 1936, this Committee organized a conference of ‘Negroes and Arabs’ with the aim of ‘intensifying the struggle for Ethiopian independence’.81 In Britain the NWA took up the Ethiopian cause. It adopted a resolution, proposed by Jomo Kenyatta, that specifically stated that the NWA saw ‘symbolised in the fight of the Ethiopian people to maintain their independence, the whole struggle of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples for liberation’. The resolution concluded that ‘millions of colonial and semi-colonial people in Africa and throughout the East are gaining strength from the magnificent fight which is being put up by the Abyssinians to maintain their independence’.82

Conclusion

The international communist movement, and especially black communists, played an important role in the development of a new radical Pan-Africanism that emerged in the inter-war period as well as contributing to the specific struggles unfolding in Africa and the African diaspora. In South Africa, for example, the communists advanced the view that Africans must be their own liberators and at the centre of the struggle for liberation in that country, and created an alliance between the Communist Party and the African National Congress (ANC) which mobilized the masses of the South African people and eventually brought an end to the racist regime.83 That struggle led to the emergence of many heroic fighters and communists who became known globally such as Walter Sisulu and Nelson Mandela.

In the United States, African Americans and other communists played a leading role in the development of revolutionary politics and organizing amongst African Americans in the southern states, politics that would eventually culminate in the struggle for civil rights and the demand for black empowerment. The experience of African American communist Hosea Hudson in the 1930s is instructive. The communist press, he noted, ‘was always carrying something about the liberation of black people, something about Africa, something about the South, Scottsboro, etc etc. We would read this paper and this would give us great courage.’84 This courage and the communist worldview that produced it not only had a profound effect on post-Second World War struggles but also on a whole generation of African American activists and cultural workers, including Langston Hughes,

In other areas of the world the Comintern’s Pan-Africanist approach and analysis of the way forward for Africa and the diaspora provided similar inspiration. For example, despite attempts by the colonial authorities to ban *The Negro Worker* and other communist publications, the ITUCNW managed to influence the workers’ movement in the Caribbean, especially in Britain’s colonies, where large-scale strikes and anti-colonial rebellions broke out in the latter part of the 1930s.\textsuperscript{85} In West Africa too, the ITUCNW influenced the burgeoning workers’ movements which were destined to play such a key role in political events especially during the 1940s.

The impact of the communist movement and its politics can even be seen in the various Pan-African networks that emerged in the period. Thus, although George Padmore broke with the communist movement he continued to use the contacts and connections he had established in his later Pan-Africanist career, including associations with Jomo Kenyatta and Isaac Wallace-Johnson. This was evident with the unsuccessful attempts by Padmore and Kouyaté to convene a World Negro Unity Congress in Paris or London as early as 1935. The Comintern’s Pan-Africanist perspective created the conditions for the new Marxist-influenced Pan-Africanism during the 1930s and perhaps reached its apogee with the convening of the Manchester Pan-African Congress in 1945. The networks established by black communists and the Comintern endured for many years. In 1945, for example, the British-based communist Desmond Buckle from the Gold Coast drafted a Pan-African document to present to the United Nations. The text, *Manifesto on Africa in the Post-War World* was sent by a group of British-based and US Pan-Africanists under Padmore’s direction. In the same year Buckle, also represented the Transvaal Council of Non-European Trade Unions, a South African workers’ organization, at the inaugural meeting of the World Federation of Trade Unions. Most importantly, perhaps, the Comintern powerfully reinforced the internationalist and revolutionary perspectives in the Pan-African movement, perspectives that offered a vision of a world in which working and oppressed people cast off the yoke of oppression and took control of their own destinies.
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Early Pan-Africanists

In nineteenth-century France there were also important early manifestations of Pan-Africanism. Haitians Anténor Firmin and Benito Sylvain established a journal, *La Fraternité* in 1890, ‘to defend the interests of the Black race in Europe’. The journal, which was the first to have a black editor in France, was forced to cease publication in 1897 following the cessation of a subsidy paid by the Haitian government. In 1895 Sylvain proposed to Anténor that they should convene an anti-racist congress in Paris at the time of the Universal Exposition scheduled to be held in the city in 1900. Circumstances prevented them from so doing but in 1897 they became associated with Henry Sylvester Williams and his plans for a Pan-African conference through an introduction from Booker T. Washington. Other Haitians, such as the diplomat Louis-Joseph Janvier (1855–1911), can also be considered early Pan-Africanists in France. Another was Moussa Mangoumbel, a former soldier in the French Army from Senegal, who in 1899 had written a book, *Le catéchisme des noirs, électeurs du Sénégal et des colonies* and had also demanded compensation from the French government claiming to be the grandson of the king of Congo. In 1906 Mangoumbel wrote to Booker T. Washington and was encouraged by the latter to ‘promote world-wide Negro brotherhood’, but nothing more seems to be known about his activities.¹

The African diaspora in France

The First World War did, however, lead to an increase in the number of African and Caribbean residents in France, as well as the influx of African American troops. It is estimated that over 135,000 African soldiers and workers laboured or fought in France during the war, in addition to
another 20,000 from the Antilles. In total, France mobilized approximately 800,000 colonial workers and soldiers during the First World War. The war had a major impact on the combatants but also more generally on the consciousness of all those of African heritage in the Francophone world. It called into question the nature of the relationship between imperial France and its African and Antillean colonies; whether colonial rule should continue in the same form, and how it would be impacted by the notion of self-determination that was being promoted by the president of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, and others, in the aftermath of the war. Another question in the minds of many was whether there would be any reward for the enormous sacrifices made by black troops to defeat Germany and its allies and assure France’s victory? The question of this ‘blood debt’ loomed large in the period following the war. The war was also important as it undermined the idea of a civilized Europe and heightened the contradiction between the claim of Europe’s superiority and its alleged civilizing mission, on the one hand, and the continuing reality of an oppressive colonial rule on the other.

The colonial question was especially important in France, which had colonial possessions throughout the world and, consequently, probably the largest African and Caribbean population in Europe at the time, perhaps as many as 15,000 in Paris alone. This population originated from French colonies in West and Equatorial Africa, as well as from Guadeloupe, Martinique and other smaller colonies in the French Antilles. Others came from French Guiana in South America and from the former French colony of Haiti. Precise figures are scarce but it is estimated that in the period following the First World War there were at least 8,000 African factory workers, seamen and dock workers, and probably an equal number from the Antilles, in addition to the many students and professionals and the thousands who had been recruited into the French Army and were living in French cities such as Marseilles, Le Havre, Bordeaux and particularly Paris.

The experience of the war and its aftermath radicalized the African diaspora in France, just as it did elsewhere. Increasingly those from Africa and the Antilles opposed the indignities they suffered in France, as well as the perpetuation of colonial rule and the indigénat, the policy of assimilation, and the methods that continued to be used to recruit African troops into the French Army. There was also concern regarding the lack of political representation of the colonies in the National Assembly and the role of those politicians such as Gratien Candace and Blaise Diagne, who claimed to be the representatives of Africa and the Antilles. Both were seen by the black population as little more than recruiting sergeants and became increasingly discredited following the war. Moreover, they were little concerned with the post-war problems facing dockers, seamen and other black workers in France. In theory those in the Antilles enjoyed more rights than those in African colonies but in practice their lives and colonial status were little different. For most, lives and life chances were circumscribed by colonial
boundaries, a colonial economic system and an education system which was denied to many and functioned to assimilate and prepare a few for the positions required under colonial rule. The entire system was infused with white supremacy, racism and Eurocentrism, which was elaborated and practised in the official policy of assimilation. Moreover, while in France, Africans and Antillean were generally treated simply as nègres or noirs and were constantly under the surveillance of the Service de Controle et Assistance en France des Indigènes des Colonies (CAI), which was especially concerned to monitor the political activities of colonial subjects.6

The African diaspora in France also included significant numbers of former combatants and others from the French colonies of Madagascar, Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco. Unlike Britain, for example, it therefore contained continental Africans who were not normally involved in the wider and predominantly Anglophone Pan-African politics of that time. Some of the earliest anti-colonial and anti-racist organizations formed in post-war France had members who originated from these colonies. One example was the Ligue Française pour l’Accession aux Doits de Citoyen des Indigènes de Madagascar, which campaigned for French citizenship and equal rights for all Malagasies. It was founded in 1919 by Samuel Stéfany (1890–?) and Jean Ralaimongo (1884–1943) but also included Max Clainville-Bloncourt (1887–1974) a lawyer from Guadeloupe, who was the organization’s secretary-general and a key figure in many organizations in this period. He also worked closely with the Dahomean activist Louis Hunkanrin (1886–1964) and edited Le Messenger Dahoméen, the militant anti-colonial publication started by Hunkanrin in 1920.7 Thus Pan-African connections were formed even before specifically Pan-African organizations were established. Both Stéfany and Clainville-Bloncourt also became leading figures in the communist-led Union Intercoloniale (UI) which was probably initially based upon a merger between their Ligue Française and a Vietnamese organization.8

Union Intercoloniale

The UI was established in 1920 and soon published an influential monthly journal Le Paria.

It proclaimed that it was an organization that had as its goal ‘the liberation of the oppressed from the forces of domination, and the realization of love and fraternity’, and declared that it was opposed to the imperialist exploitation of the colonies and aimed to struggle to end the slavery and injustices that existed not only in the colonies but also in France.9 Its early members, who were mainly but not all communists, included those from Madagascar, Algeria, Réunion, Martinique, Guadeloupe, Haiti and French West Africa, as well as those from South East Asia. It was closely linked to the French Communist Party (PCF) and generally communist-led, which
gave the PCF the opportunity to provide training and an introduction to Marxism for several key activists from the Antilles and Africa. Stéphane Rosso, the UI’s treasurer from Guadeloupe for example, joined the PCF and became one of the party’s main Caribbean activists in Paris throughout the 1920s and 1930s. Clainville-Bloncourt, already a significant activist, soon became the leading figure in the UI and a member of the PCF’s Comité d’Etudes Coloniale. Tiemoko Garan Kouyaté, who later became one of the leading African political figures in inter-war France also joined the UI, as did Stéfany who became the UI’s first general secretary.

However, the UI’s most celebrated African member was undoubtedly the Senegalese war veteran Lamine Senghor. He seems to have had little in the way of formal European education, but he worked for a time for a colonial trading company before being enlisted in the French Army in 1915. He fought on the Somme, was wounded and gassed and subsequently awarded the Croix de Guerre. After being demobilized he returned to France in 1921 and worked as a postal clerk before joining the PCF, the UI and in 1924 the Confédération Générale du Travail Unitaire (CGTU), the trade union centre led by the French communists.

Le Paria, which was circulated in France’s African and Antillean colonies, contained a variety of articles and many critical of colonial rule. However, it also reminded its readers of the colonial contribution to the First World War and even contained coverage of the exploits of the Senegalese boxer Louis M’Barrick Fall (1897–1925), ‘Battling Siki’ another decorated war veteran who was for a time world light heavyweight champion. Le Paria and the UI gave those from all parts of Africa and the Antilles the opportunity to wage a joint anti-imperialist struggle, in unity with those from Vietnam and other parts of Asia, as well as with all those who were French citizens. However, this organizational unity did not last for long and by the mid-1920s the West African and Antillean members of the UI, led by Senghor, had established their own Pan-African organization.

René Maran and Batoula

One of the most significant post-war events in France following Du Bois’ Pan-African Congress in 1919, was the publication of René Maran’s novel Batoula in the autumn of 1921. Maran (1887–1960) was a poet and writer from Martinique who since 1909 had served as a colonial official in Ubangi-Shari, part of French Equatorial Africa and now part of the Central African Republic. His novel was an exposé of French colonialism that perhaps unexpectedly made Maran the first black writer to win the illustrious Prix Goncourt. Its main Pan-African importance, apart from the fact that it was written by an African of the diaspora about continental Africans, lies in the fact that it was well-received not only in France but also in the United States where it was praised by Du Bois, Garvey, Jessie Fauset and Hubert Harrison,
as well as by others connected with what became known as the Harlem Renaissance such as Langston Hughes and Claude McKay. Significantly Garvey opened the 1922 UNIA convention by referring to Maran’s book as evidence of ‘the universality of the dissatisfaction that now exists among far-seeing, self-respecting Negroes, over the mis-government and exploitation that is now carried on in Africa’. It is clear that Maran too recognized that his book dealt with the international ‘Negro Question’, that is the problems facing those of African descent throughout the world and how they might be resolved. In some ways Maran’s writing helped to establish France, and Paris in particular, as a centre of a new post-war Pan-Africanism that united the cultures of the ‘New Negro’ movement in the United States with what would become the Négritude movement in the Francophone world. However, Maran’s criticisms were mainly aimed at colonial officials, who he felt were misrepresenting France, rather than colonial rule itself. It was his view that, ‘the Negro in France is protected, cherished and by and by treated equally’.

Maran was not the only writer of the period to be concerned with a critique of colonialism and the question of African liberation as it posed itself in the Francophone world. Another was Suzanne Lacascade, the little-known author of the novel Claire-Solange, âme africaine, published in 1924. As a woman from the Antilles, Lacascade was less well-known and less influential than Maran, but her novel, which celebrates the African roots of Antillean languages and cultures and denounces French racism, also exhibits some aspects of an internationalisme noir.

Ligue Universelle pour la Défense de la Race Noire

Du Bois had allied with Candace and Diagne to convene the 1919 and 1921 Pan-African congresses and even established a short-lived Paris-based Association Panafricaine. However, during the early 1920s these two figures were already held in contempt by younger more radical elements, such as those connected with the Ligue Universelle pour la défense de la Race Noire, founded in Paris in 1924. The Ligue was led by Maran, who was designated vice-president and by its president, Kojo Tovalou Houénou (1887–1936), a Dahomean from a wealthy family in Cotonou, who had studied law and medicine at the University of Bordeaux and established a legal practice in Paris before the First World War. When war broke out he enlisted in the French Army and became a medical officer. In 1921 he wrote L’Involution des metamorphoses et des métempsychoses de l’univers in which he defended the equality of all cultures. The Ligue was established ‘to develop solidarity amongst individuals of the black race; to group them for the rebuilding of their native land; to protect them from acts of violence, physical cruelty
or abuse; to combat the dogma of the inferiority of races of colour; and
to assist its members morally and materially. In short it was clearly a
Pan-African formation with very definite Pan-African aims. Although
tensions would often surface between continental Africans and those from
the Antilles in the inter-war years, Paris and France in general remained an
important locale for ‘creating a climate conducive to the flourishing of Pan-
Africanism’.

Tovalou Houénou visited the United States in 1924, spoke at the UNIA
Convention ‘in the name of millions of Africans’ and, amongst other
things, informed those present that France refused to tolerate ‘colour
prejudice’, a view apparently resulting from the support he had personally
received in that country following several incidents of racism. During his
visit to the United States, where he spoke not only in New York but also
in other cities, he was described as the director of the French section of
Negro World and as the ‘UNIA Representative in France’. One historian
describes him as Garvey’s closest contact in Europe and Garvey claimed
to have ‘cemented a working plan’ and established a ‘sub-European
headquarters’ with him in France. Tovalou Houénou also made contact
with Du Bois and it seems that he hoped that his Ligue might act as the
organizing centre for all other Pan-African organizations, an aspiration
that remained unfulfilled.

In 1924 Tovalou Houénou established Les Continents, the monthly
journal of the Ligue Universelle, the title perhaps suggesting his desire
for Pan-African unity between those in Africa, Europe and the Americas.
The publication only endured for a few months in 1924, but contributors
included René Maran, who was also part of the editorial team. Maran
made use of Les Continents to write a critical open letter to the African
American writer and philosopher Alain Locke in which he denounced
French colonialism and racism and those politicians like Blaise Diagne
who defended it. Another article, probably written by Maran, that referred
to Diagne as a ‘traitor’ who had mastered the ‘art of selling his brothers’
forced Les Continents into extinction following a successful libel case by
Diagne.

The Pan-Africanists in France clearly kept abreast of developments in the
United States, as well as those in Africa, the Caribbean and Europe. Tovalou
Houénou promoted African American literature and music and the Ligue
aimed to ‘develop the bonds of solidarity and of universal brotherhood
between all members of the black race; to bring them together for the
restoration of their country of origin – Africa’. The Ligue criticized French
colonial rule and demanded citizenship rights for all colonial subjects, it also
aimed to fight against racism and to defend the sovereignty of Abyssinia,
Liberia, Haiti and the Dominican Republic. Tovalou Houénou was therefore
a willing collaborator with Garvey and others in the United States, but he
also had his own views on the Pan-African movement, the centre of which
he considered to be in Paris.
Comité de Défense de la Race Nègre

Yet another important source of Pan-African thought and activity during the 1920s in France were those of West African and Caribbean origin who were associated with the PCF. Many of the West African and Antillean members of the UI became dissatisfied with the lack of interest shown by the PCF for their Pan-African concerns regarding the colonies, as well as the plight of black workers in France. Such concerns exacerbated divisions, led to the UI’s demise and culminated in the founding of the Comité de Défense de la Race Nègre (CDRN) by Senghor and others in March 1926. They had clearly decided that a new Pan-African focus was required, which effectively separated West Africans and those from the Antilles from North Africans as well as the Vietnamese. In addition to Senghor, who became the president of the CDRN and Joseph Gothon-Lunion (1897–?), a law student from Guadeloupe, who became secretary-general, the CDRN’s other leading members included Stéphane Rosso, a communist from Guadeloupe who became treasurer, and Kouyaté who would subsequently emerge as one of the Comité’s principal leaders.27

It is to be noted that this organization and its successors chose to employ the word Nègre (capitalized but still a more derogatory term than the closest English equivalent Negro) rather than other current terms such as noir (black). The aim was to distinguish themselves from those assimilated individuals, who would have been uncomfortable with the term Nègre, to reject the attempts of French colonialism to divide and rule and to emphasize the nature of their common oppression as Africans. As was explained at the time:

It is with great honour that we revel in the glory of calling ourselves Nègre, with a capital N. It is our Nègre race that we wish to guide on its path to total liberation from the yoke of slavery to which it is subjected. We want to impose the respect due to our race as well as its equality with all the other races of the world, as is its right and our duty, and we proclaim ourselves Nègres!28

The use of the word Nègre was therefore an act of self-definition and self-liberation in much the same way as the use of the term Black would be in the 1960s.29 The use of Nègre was also important as an element in the development of internationalisme noir and in the emergence of Négritude.

The CDRN declared that it would introduce a new ‘positive element into the Negro Question – the affirmation of the Negro personality’, perhaps another early reference to what would later emerge as Négritude.30 It started by emphasizing its independence from the PCF and soon reported that it had attracted hundreds of adherents in France and in the colonies.31 However, by the end of 1926 its perilous financial situation led to a rapprochement
with the Communist Party, which offered a substantial subsidy to support a new publication, *La Voix des Nègres*, the first edition of which appeared in January 1927.\(^{32}\) The CDRN, largely as a result of the indefatigable efforts of Senghor, soon established ‘sections’ in Marseilles, Nice, Le Havre and Bordeaux, building on work already initiated by the UI, and drew wide support in Paris, as well as the French colonies in Africa and the Antilles.\(^{33}\)

### Kouyaté and the Ligue de Défense de la Race Nègre

Senghor was ultimately unable to retain unity within the CDRN, which was beset by major financial problems, as well as political differences, including rivalry between Africans and those from the Antilles, exacerbated by the activities of agent provocateurs. Senghor, Kouyaté, Rosso and others left the organization and with PCF support formed the Ligue de Défense de la Race Nègre (LDRN) in May 1927. The LDRN like the CDRN took an uncompromising position in opposition to French colonialism, as well as all forms of racism in France. It was established with the Pan-African aim to ‘work for the revolutionary education, organization and complete emancipation of the entire Negro race’, and from June 1927 produced a new publication entitled *La Race Nègre*.\(^{34}\) The LDRN utilized seamen to distribute its publication throughout French West Africa, as well as in the Caribbean, and so from its inception established a presence on the African continent that greatly concerned the colonial authorities. They issued alarmed reports that the LDRN had established branches in Senegal, Dahomey and Cameroon, had been responsible for demands for independence and even uprisings in French Congo and other parts of French Equatorial Africa.\(^{35}\) The LDRN was also in touch with the press in West Africa and the French Antilles and came under close government scrutiny. Several agents infiltrated the organization, meetings and mail were monitored, while publications such as *La Race Nègre* were banned in the colonies and copies sent by clandestine means were regularly intercepted and confiscated.\(^{36}\)

Senghor’s untimely death from tuberculosis in November 1927 cut short his leadership of the LDRN. However, in the space of a few years he had established two important organizations and a political orientation that was to remain a major influence throughout the next decade. He attempted to combine Pan-Africanist concerns with communism and internationalism. He sought the unity of the ‘Negro race’ and was in touch with organizations throughout Africa and the diaspora but evidently made special efforts to establish contacts and organize branches on the African continent. He also placed a special emphasis on organizing in the ports and amongst seafarers and they became the vital link between Europe, Africa and the Caribbean and the couriers of *La Race Nègre*.\(^{37}\)
After Senghor’s death leadership of the LDRN passed to Kouyaté who was born in Ségou in what is today Mali. He was educated locally and taught in Cote d’Ivoire before in 1923 gaining a government scholarship to study in France at the Ecole Normale in Aix-en-Provence. He was, however, soon expelled from that institution, apparently for his political activities, and made his way to Paris where he worked as a clerk and joined the UI and then the CDRN. Under his leadership the LDRN again initially attempted to assert some independence from the PCF, and even searched unsuccessfully for alternative sources of funding from amongst others Marcus Garvey and Du Bois and the NAACP. Neither Garvey nor the NAACP provided such funds and when Garvey visited Paris in October 1928 he completely ignored Kouyaté and the LDRN. Indeed, during this period Kouyaté contacted a range of potential funders and was also in contact with many other individuals and organizations including Ladipo Solanke and the London-based West African Students’ Union, the South Africans Clements Kadalie and Josiah Gumede and the Liga zur Verteidigung der Negerasse, a Berlin branch of the LDRN which he assisted in founding.

Throughout its existence the LDRN attempted to combine a fervent Pan-Africanism with certain aspects of the internationalist and revolutionary orientation of the Communist International. In 1928, La Race Nègre even declared that ‘the end of racial prejudice will arrive when a great black state will be constituted on a modern foundation: African Zionism’. The LDRN demanded self-determination and political independence, was opposed to Eurocentrism and the allegedly ‘civilising mission’ of France and was a strong advocate of the idea of a ‘personalité Nègre’ a concept which would later be further elaborated by the Négritude movement. Like the CDRN, however, it contained elements and personalities that could be in contradiction with each other, including those who were supporters of the PCF and those opposed to it. Kouyaté was certainly amongst those closest to the PCF but also one of the strongest advocates of the LDRN’s autonomy. There were also sometimes tensions between Africans and those from the Antilles and a balance had to be kept between these two constituencies. In part these reflected class differences, since many Africans from the continent were workers, while those from the Antilles were often intellectuals. Kouyaté even claimed that the post of president of the LDRN was always reserved for ‘an African national revolutionist’ in order to avoid the election of anyone ‘ideologically assimilated by French democracy’, a euphemism for those from the Caribbean who came from elite family backgrounds. Although such a simple dichotomy was often far from the reality, such divisions had existed in the CDRN and plagued later organizations too. The opposing forces remained together in the LDRN until 1931 when there was another split into two rival organizations, one led by Émile Faure (1892–1960), which retained the name LDRN, and the other led by Kouyaté.
Internationalisme Noir

In addition to the anti-colonial and internationalist orientation of the organizations connected with the PCF there were also several others that emerged in the period such as the Comité de Défense des Intérêts de la Race Noire, possibly initially founded as a reaction to the CDRN, and its publication *La Dépêche Africaine*. The publication, established by a Guadeloupean, Maurice Satineau in 1928, was particularly important because of the contributions of two Martinican sisters, Jane and Paulette Nardal. Paulette Nardal (1896–1985) was the eldest of the seven Nardal sisters born in Martinique to a father who was the first black construction engineer and a mother who was a piano teacher. Her younger sister Jane, or Jeanne Nardal (19?–1993), was born in the early years of the twentieth century. Paulette and Jane were educated in Martinique and subsequently they, and their two other sisters, moved to France. Both attended the Sorbonne, although Jane returned to Martinique as early as 1929. Paulette had also spent time in the British Caribbean and would later teach English, a language she spoke fluently.

*La Dépêche Africaine* described itself as an ‘independent journal of correspondence between blacks, for the moral and material interests of the indigenous populations, through the objective study of the larger colonial questions considered from the political, economic and social points of view’. However, it also had the motto ‘to defend our colonies is to fortify France’, an indication that its anti-colonialism and Pan-Africanism was of the moderate variety. Its initial issue featured a now famous article by Jane Nardal, ‘L’Internationalisme Noir’ (Black Internationalism). Nardal argued that in the post-war period ‘Blacks of all origins and nationalities, with different customs and religions, vaguely sense that they belong in spite of everything to a single and same race … From now on there will be a certain interest, a certain originality, a certain pride in being black, in turning back towards Africa, cradle of the blacks, in recalling a common origin.’ Nevertheless, Nardal’s black internationalism did not dismiss the importance of what she termed ‘certain benefits of white civilization’. Like other contributors, Nardal combined elements of Pan-Africanism with a moderate yet critical approach to French colonial rule. She also coined a new term for those who were black and French-speaking and their emerging culture of Francophone black internationalism, Afro-Latin.

*La Dépêche Africaine* and the Comité de Défense des Intérêts de la Race Noire employed a more moderate approach to politics than the organizations connected with the PCF, although Satineau was also in contact with Garvey for several years. The journal had a wide circulation and was often as concerned with cultural matters as it was with politics. It must be remembered that not only did those from the Antilles and African colonies face the constant impact of the colonial policy of assimilation but also that France was in the grip of the ‘vogue nègre’, sometimes referred
to as Negrophilia, a fashionable fascination for, and exoticism of, various aspects of African, Caribbean and African American culture, from jazz, and the performances of Josephine Baker, to the Antillean beguine dance and African ethnographic artefacts. Black intellectuals had to make sense of this apparent contradiction and establish their own attitude to cultural questions. *La Dépêche Africaine* therefore regularly featured articles on literature and music as well as short stories. It also featured articles by French women supporters, as well as those from Africa and the Caribbean, and established links with a range of French organizations, as well as international ones such as Garvey’s UNIA.46

In October 1931 Paulette Nardal was jointly involved alongside Léo Sajous, a Haitian dentist, with the founding of another journal, the bilingual *La Revue du monde noir*, a publication that was initially partly funded by the Ministry of Culture in France. Because of his profession Sajous was himself connected with a range of organizations and individuals in Paris, including the LDRN and was a member of the editorial board of *La Race nègre*. *La Revue du monde noir* was associated with the weekly ‘circle of friends’ that Jane and Paulette Nardal, with their other sister Andrée, held just outside Paris. This was a meeting place and opportunity for African Americans in Paris, as well as intellectuals from Africa and the Caribbean, to discuss Pan-African cultural and other issues of the day, often in English as well as French. There some of the pioneers of what would become known as the Négritude movement, such as the Nardals, Maran and Léopold Senghor, met with the leading figures of the Harlem Renaissance, Claude McKay, Countee Cullen, Alain Locke and Carter G. Woodson. The *Revue* carried news about the problems faced by African Americans in the United States as well as injustices in the French colonies and in France. In addition to various literary and cultural items it also carried articles concerned with Ethiopia and Liberia, the history of Haiti and the Haitian Revolution, or the problems confronting Afro-Cubans.47 It declared that its Pan-African aim was to ‘create among the Negroes of the entire world, regardless of nationality, an intellectual and moral bond that will permit them to know each other better, to love one another fraternally, to defend their collective interests more effectively and to glorify their race’.48 The existence of such journals, even if moderate in political orientation and aimed at ‘the intellectual elite of the black race and their friends’, mainly those from the French Antilles, emerged out of a Paris-based Pan-African milieu that would later give rise to what has become known as the Négritude movement. Within that setting the Nardal sisters who were both bilingual and interested themselves in all matters concerning Africa and the diaspora played a key role. Indeed, it is now considered that both Jane and Paulette Nardal may have played a role that hitherto has been rather overlooked in articulating what was a growing Pan-Africanism and ‘awakening of race consciousness’ in Paris in this period, some of it precipitated by the influence of the Harlem Renaissance writers. It is evident that Paulette Nardal identified the problems caused by
the French colonial policy of assimilation, as well as the wider problems of Eurocentrism and racism. Moreover, she suggested that a new ‘race consciousness’, a Pan-African approach to cultural matters, especially an identification with Africa as expressed in the Revue, and particularly by black women, was becoming instrumental in addressing such problems.49

All those of African and Caribbean heritage in France and its colonies faced problems, or had life experiences, that were a consequence of wider common circumstances, such as the policy of assimilation, Eurocentrism and racism arising from enslavement and colonial rule. There were differing responses to these circumstances and problems but what many had in common were elements of Pan-Africanism or Internationalisme Noir – the need for all those of African heritage to unite, both within France and internationally, so as to advance their common interests; a need to refute anti-African racism and therefore to express a closer identification with Africa and its history and a concern for the advancement of Africa and Africans. The fact that these elements may sometimes have been expressed culturally does not diminish their Pan-African significance.50

The Union des Travailleurs Nègres

In 1931, the LDRN was split by a major dispute between its members. When the French courts declared that its president Émile Faure’s faction was the only legitimate owner of the name and assets of the LDRN, including La Race Nègre, Kouyaté and his comrades were forced to launch a new organization, the Union des Travailleurs Nègres (UTN) in June 1932.51 The UTN presented itself as an association for the ‘mutual aid and cultural development’, of black workers and intellectuals in unity with the workers ‘of all races and all nationalities’.52 It aimed to carry on the work initiated by Senghor, provided some medical and legal support, especially for the unemployed, and attempted to organize and politicize African and Antillean workers, students and other residents in France. It also aimed to agitate amongst individuals and organizations in the French colonies, as well as those in French-speaking countries including Haiti and the Belgian Congo. The new secretary-general was the Malagasy communist, Thomas Ramananjato, while Kouyaté was given the position of assistant secretary. The activities of the UTN were compromised from its inception, since Ramananjato and some other leading figures were informers in the employ of the Ministry of Colonies.53

The production of a new publication Le Cri des Nègres, which first appeared in 1931 became one of the new organization’s main activities but it still struggled to find the necessary funds and launched a series of fundraising events for this purpose. The Cri des Nègres evidently lost subscribers because of its irregularity, but police reports suggest that even if it was not distributed in large numbers, its dissemination was widespread. It retained
However, the UTN still faced considerable difficulties. Its publications had to be smuggled by sea into the colonies, sometimes hidden inside other publications, and were often intercepted by the police and colonial authorities. There was growing internal unrest in the organization and it cannot be discounted that some of this was caused by agent provocateurs, since there were two state agents amongst its leaders. Public meetings were also poorly attended and to remedy this situation the UTN began to organize dances and social events in order to regain support and to find a new source of badly needed funds, a decision that also led to some dissension. It did, however, manage to play a key role in the events organized in 1932 as part of the international Scottsboro campaign.

The Nazi coup in Germany in 1933, the growth of the fascist movement in France together with Nazi demands for the return of its former African colonies and a real prospect of a new inter-imperialist war heightened anti-fascist activity in Paris, and led the UTN to call for a united anti-fascist response by all the African and Antillean organizations. There were also plans for a new publication, less openly communist in orientation, that would be established as part of a plan to unite several of the African and Antillean organizations in Paris. Since the organizations of students from Martinique, Guadeloupe and West Africa had expressed a wish to work with the UTN, this proposal initially found favour with the UTN’s leadership even though it was made at the same time as the continued non-appearance of the Cri des Nègres and more internal problems that eventually led to Kouyaté’s expulsion in 1933. Nevertheless, Kouyaté continued with his own Pan-African politics following his expulsion, most notably with attempts to convene with George Padmore a World Negro Unity Congress, a plan that involved former adversaries such as Maran, Faure and Satineau but which was doomed to failure.56

The UTN continued its work with the support of the PCF and the ITUCNW, including the publication of the Cri des Nègres, which appeared monthly from 1934 to early 1936 and was distributed throughout Francophone North and West Africa, and the Antilles. The publication now carried articles in Malagasy and Duala, as well as French, a development that was to continue throughout the remainder of its existence.57 In 1934 it began an extensive campaign following the brutal assassination of André Aliker, one of the leading communists in Martinique.38 The following year it celebrated the election victory of UTN member Felix Merlin, who stood as a communist candidate,
and became a municipal councillor, deputy mayor and subsequently mayor in the Paris suburb of Epinay. It was ostensibly for distributing the *Cri des Nègres* that the famous Haitian writer and communist Jacques Roumain (1907–1944) was arrested and imprisoned in 1934. When exiled to France three years later he worked closely with the UTN. Roumain’s poems *Bois d’ébène*, *Sales nègres* and *Nouveau sermon nègre* are all examples of his concern to link Pan-African and revolutionary themes.

**Ethiopia**

Fascist Italy’s invasion of Ethiopia in 1935 led to an unprecedented united front involving all the Paris-based African and Caribbean organizations, even those that hitherto had been in conflict. Italy’s aggression with the connivance of Britain, and particularly France, also led to wider unity between these organizations and others that voiced their opposition to fascist aggression, colonialism and imperialist war. It was during this period for example that the UTN began to work closely with Paulette Nardal, one of the few Antillean women who became active in the organization and who was at that time secretary of the World Committee Against Fascism and War. The UTN was probably one of the first organizations to condemn fascist Italy’s aggression. It then rallied others, including the LDRN, and the following month participated in a protest meeting organized by the World Committee against Fascism and War, which under the leadership of the League Against Imperialism subsequently created the International Committee for the Defence of the Ethiopian People (ICDEP). Nardal played a prominent role during this period, working with the ICDEP to channel funds raised in British West Africa to the Ethiopian government, writing on the significance of the invasion for the press in France and French West Africa and forming the Comité d’Action Ethiopienne. Thereafter many protest events were organized and Ethiopia’s defence became very much a cause célèbre. In July 1935, the UTN called for such a united front of all the African and Caribbean organizations in France and in early August invited the LDRN to participate in ‘action commune’ along with all the ‘organisations Nègre’ of Paris. Shortly afterwards the UTN, LDRN, the Comité Permanent Victor Schoelcher (an anti-colonial organization) and Kouyaté’s new Comité de Défense de l’Indépendence Nationale d’Éthiopie organized two illegal demonstrations that called on the ‘Nègres’ of all countries to show their solidarity with Ethiopia. It was in this context that Paulette Nardal would write of the ‘common soul’ that united all those of African descent ‘in the common defence of Ethiopia’. It was in the course of this united campaign that Kouyaté established his Comité and a new publication *Africa*, which claimed that it had enlisted ‘one hundred black voluntary reserve officers ready to go to sacrifice themselves to safeguard Ethiopian independence’. 
In January 1936, the ICDEP called for an ‘international conference of Blacks and Arabs’. The organizers of the conference took account of the solidarity movement in support of Ethiopia that was developing in Africa, the diaspora and elsewhere. The aim of the conference was not only to further develop support for Ethiopia, but also to highlight the wider issue of colonial rule and strengthen the French and international movements for colonial independence. The UTN played a prominent role in the preparations for the conference, where they again united with the LDRN and many other organizations. Originally scheduled to take place in Marseille, the conference finally took place in Paris in April 1936 and established contact between African (including North African) and Caribbean organizations throughout the world, as well as in France. The Comité du Coordination des Associations Noires et Arabe based in Paris was headed by a Tunisian, Hédi Nouira (later the prime minister of Tunisia) one of the leaders of the Étoile Nord Africaine (ÉTA), but even before it was established many Moroccans, Algerians and Tunisians had been involved in the protests including Messali Hadj, the prominent Algerian leader of the (ÉTA) who even protested in Geneva at the League of Nations. He is reported to have informed its secretary-general ‘for us, Africans, the independence of Ethiopia was a symbol, a living hope for our own independence’. That Pan-African unity extended beyond the Ethiopia campaign. The offices of the ÉTA’s banned publication El Ouma provided space for Kouyaté’s Africa, while the LDRN helped the ÉTA camouflage some of its subversive activities. The Pan-African unity over Ethiopia led to new anti-colonial organizations such as the Rassemblement Coloniale (RC), of which Ramananjato (UTN) was vice-president, Émile Faure (LDRN) secretary-general, Messali Hadj president and in which Kouyaté also played a key role. The RC based on Afro-Asian unity continued to support Ethiopia and was still discussing what further measures it could take on that issue as war loomed in 1939. It was this Pan-African unity in support of Ethiopia that was arguably a major contributory factor in the emergence of the Négritude movement.

Négritude

The immediate origins of what came later to be called Négritude (the affirmation of Blackness/Africaness) are often traced to the appearance of a new student magazine L’Étudiant noir, published in Paris in early 1935 and containing writing by Paulette Nardal, Aimé Césaire, president of the Martinique student association, Léopold Senghor (1906–2001), president of the West African student association, as well as others. Although perhaps Négritude is a term that should not be used to refer to any trend before 1939 when Aimé Césaire first employed it in his poem Cahir d’un retour au pays natal. Certainly, there had been an interchange of ideas within the Pan-African community in Paris and other French cities throughout
the inter-war years, most notably at the salon established by the Nardal sisters. One strand of thinking was represented by the young Antillean intellectuals including Leon-Gontron Damas (1912–1978) from French Guyane, who broke away from *La Revue du Monde Noir* and adopted a stance in opposition to assimilation with a Marxist as well as surrealist worldview. This group is most closely associated with Étienne Léro, René Ménil and Jules Monnerot who in 1932 produced a manifesto *Légitime Défense*.75 Those associated with this trend were opposed not only to colonial assimilation but the Eurocentric values that they considered had been adopted by their own parents in the Caribbean. They denounced the colonial and ‘bourgeois world’, and were also influenced by the writers of the Harlem Renaissance, particularly by Claude McKay. They sought to develop a new Antillean literature that was another response to the sense of alienation faced by the Francophone African diaspora resident in France.76

*L’Etudiant noir* had been formerly known as *L’Etudiant martiniquais* but its name had been changed at the close of 1934, apparently to indicate a more Pan-African orientation and to strengthen the unity between students from the Antilles and those from the African continent. According to Damas, later credited as one of the three ‘founding fathers’ of Négritude, the new publication saw itself ‘both as a fighting and a unifying body’.77 The second of the three founding fathers, Aimé Césaire, pointed out that the political concerns of the black youth of that time reflected a new Pan-African consciousness and that he wished the title to be *L’Etudiant nègre*.78 They were connected with their struggle against the colonial policy of assimilation, for emancipation, for the possibility of being themselves and not having to reject either their African identity or the cultures associated with it. They were concerned, Césaire states, with the ‘humanization of humanity’.79 Senghor the third key figure and contributor to *L’Étudiant noir*, returned to the ideas of the nineteenth century and the Pan-Africanism of Blyden, although not acknowledging the origin of his views, to argue that Africans had a particular spiritual contribution to make to a new humanism of the twentieth century. Senghor therefore urged a greater regard for African cultures, institutions and values but in part as a complement to those found in Europe. A synthesis of the two, he argued in the 1930s, was what was required and this, he suggested, was to be found in the literary work of Maran. Other contributors to *L’Étudiant noir* such as Paulette Nardal and the Martinican poet and teacher Gilbert Gratian (1895–1985) both presented their own views on key matters of concern to those of African heritage in the Francophone world. What they shared, was a recognition that they were grappling with the common problems facing Africans and Antilleans, colonialism, racism, Eurocentrism, assimilation, paternalism and the common view that they might benefit from a Pan-African unity, in cultural as well as other areas, and the emancipatory solutions that would emerge from it.

Senghor from Senegal, Césaire from Martinique and the Guyanese Damas had first met in Paris in the early 1930s and were like many at the time
influenced by the writers and artists of the Harlem Renaissance, as well as by black Francophone writers such as Maran, Firmin and another Haitian, Jean Price-Mars (1876–1969), a champion of the African roots of Haitian culture. They also studied French Africanist writers such as Delafosse and Delavignette and the German ethnologist Leo Frobenius, who provided some ammunition to refute the Eurocentric view of African history and civilization so prevalent at the time.\(^{80}\) The term Négritude does not appear in *L’Etudiant noir* and indeed does not appear in print until the publication of Césaire’s *Cahier d’un retour au pays natal* in 1939. One commentator has written that

Négritude in the 1930s was not a self-consciously organised movement. It consisted primarily of ‘interminable discussions’ among students who shared ideas, explored Paris, and began to write poetry. They engaged contemporary currents of colonial thought, French culture and black politics in order to fashion relationships to the colonial system in which they had been trained, to the French nation in which they now lived, and to the African societies to which they felt deeply connected.\(^ {81} \)

What Négritude eventually contained was a ‘rejection of assimilation, an identification with blackness, and a celebration of African civilisation’.\(^{82}\) Césaire later asserted ‘everyone has his own Negritude … we affirmed that we were Negroes and proud of it … we asserted that of Negro heritage was worthy of respect’. He added that the Haitian Revolution was an early example of Negritude, ‘the country where Negro people stood up for the first time, affirming their determination to shape a new world, a free world’.\(^ {83} \) Others have commented on the fact that there are no clear signs of what was to be called Négritude in *L’Etudiant noir* but also on the fact that its three acclaimed pioneers seemed to have borrowed liberally from the people and milieu that surrounded them without acknowledgement.\(^ {84} \) In many of the accounts of the pioneers there has been something of an erasure of the influence of the Nardal sisters. Paulette Nardal was also one of the contributors to the first edition of *L’Etudiant noir* but until recently was not seen as one of the pioneers of what came to be referred to as Négritude. While a single edition of *L’Etudiant noir* has assumed, or been given, more significance than all the editions of *La Dépêche Africaine* and *La Revue du Monde Noir*, which both dealt extensively with the cultural concerns of the day, and *Le Cri des Nègres* that focused more on political issues.\(^ {85} \) Indeed, it may be that Négritude’s relatively moderate approach and lack of formal organization allowed it to withstand the repressive measures often suffered by others. Perhaps what has been called Négritude can be considered merely a Francophone cultural form of Pan-Africanism, opposition to Eurocentrism and colonial assimilation, an approach that emerged from the Paris milieu in the 1930s. It then assumed some importance and influence amongst the African diaspora in the Francophone world but also had a significant influence in Cuba, Brazil and Lusophone countries in Africa.
The invasion of Ethiopia

The Italian invasion of Ethiopia in 1934, an attack on one of only two remaining independent states on the African continent, played a major role in galvanizing Pan-African protests in Africa and throughout the diaspora. It was a major turning point, consolidating a new, more militant brand of Pan-Africanism that eventually culminated in the famous Manchester Pan-African Congress in 1945. The period between 1935 and 1945 ushered in a new mass-based struggle not only in response to Ethiopia’s plight but also in opposition to colonial rule in general, most notably in West Africa and throughout the Caribbean. It became clear that the majority, the workers and farmers in the African and Caribbean colonies, would assume a much more important role in determining the political future. Although this upsurge was interrupted by the war years, this only intensified the demands for political change throughout Africa, the Caribbean, the United States and Europe.

Ethiopia, or Abyssinia as it was then often known, was one of only three states in the world which were widely recognized as being governed by Africans, or those of African descent, the others were Liberia and Haiti. It was also a state that had been coveted by the big powers, Britain, France, Italy and even Japan for several years. Indeed, in 1925 Britain and France had signed a secret agreement dividing Ethiopia into spheres of influence and both Britain and Italy had launched various provocations against Ethiopia before the infamous Wal Wal incident in November 1934. Amongst those in Africa and the diaspora, Ethiopia occupied a special place as a symbol of African and Pan-African independence and self-determination and biblical references only added to its significance. Kwame Nkrumah, who had recently arrived in Britain at that time, later recalled that when he first heard of the Italian invasion ‘it was almost as if the whole of London had suddenly declared war on me personally’, while the Gold Coast Spectator reported: ‘The Gold Coast man, down to the schoolboy, knows he has everything in
common with the Ethiopians.’ When riots broke out in the British colony of St Kitts in the Caribbean in 1935, a former colonial governor of Uganda attributed them to ‘the rise of feelings of racial antagonism’ occasioned by ‘the attack of white power on the only remaining Negro nation’, and warned of even more dire consequences if such attitudes should spread to Africa. In Britain the New Statesman and Nation warned that ‘to coloured people everywhere, the war would seem a concerted attack of white against black’.

Fascist Italy’s aggression was therefore widely seen as an attack on all Africans and resulted in heightened anti-colonial consciousness and activity. In the United States too there was a significant impact, as the African American writer Roi Ottley reflected several years later, ‘I know of no other event in recent times that has stirred the rank and file of Negroes more than the Italo-Ethiopian War.’

There was worldwide condemnation of fascist Italy’s warmongering too. Even before the full-scale invasion of October 1935, the International Secretariat of the League Against Imperialism (LAI) issued a statement condemning the ‘imperialist ambitions’ of Italy in Ethiopia and elsewhere in East Africa in December 1934, shortly after the Wal Wal incident. The full-scale invasion of Ethiopia by Italy in October 1935 signalled a crucial stage in the drive towards a new world war and demonstrated the lengths to which the fascist powers would go to re-divide the world in their interests. The invasion also highlighted the weakness of the appeasement policies of Britain and France, dealt a body blow to the credibility of the League of Nations, and contributed to the crisis that was engulfing the colonial world, calling into question the colonial system itself.

International African Friends of Abyssinia

It was in these circumstances when ‘the eyes and the thoughts of the world are focused on Ethiopia’, as Nancy Cunard wrote from Russia at the time, that many new Pan-African organizations and coalitions were formed throughout the world. One of the most significant was the International African Friends of Abyssinia (IAFA), formed in London in July 1935 by C. L. R James (1901–1989), Amy Ashwood Garvey, Chris Jones/Braithwaite (1885–1944), Jomo Kenyatta (1891–1978), George Padmore and others ‘to assist by all means in their power in the maintenance of the territorial integrity and political independence of Abyssinia’. Both James and Padmore later claimed to have founded this organization, but it seems more likely that it was the former, although Padmore was soon heavily involved. Interestingly, the IAFA and its successors re-employed the term African, to mean both Africans from the continent and the diaspora, in the same way as the African Association did at the turn of the century. James was chairman, Dr Peter Milliard (1882–c.1953), a Guyanese physician working in Manchester, and T. Albert Marryshaw, a Grenadian trade unionist,
were vice-chairmen, Jomo Kenyatta secretary and Amy Ashwood Garvey treasurer. Garvey’s long-time friend, the Trinidadian actor/singer/impresario Sam Manning, Ras Makonnen, from British Guiana, the Somali Mohammed Said and Padmore completed the executive committee.

Cyril Lionel Robert James had arrived in Britain from Trinidad in 1932 at the invitation of his compatriot, the cricketer Learie Constantine. He had worked as a journalist and writer and was an avowed Marxist, a supporter of Trotskyism, who involved himself in many organizations including the Independent Labour Party and the League of Coloured Peoples (LCP). Makonnen (1900–1983), who claimed Ethiopian descent, changed his name from George Thomas Nathaniel Griffith during this period and had already taken up the Ethiopian cause in both the United States and in Denmark, from where he was deported for his outspoken views. Several others later became part of the IAFA including the African American singer John Payne. J. B. Danquah, George Moore and Samuel Wood, who had been representatives of two delegations from the Gold Coast visiting London, were also involved.

According to Padmore’s account, the IAFA’s origins were to be found in an ‘ad hoc committee’ that he had chaired which had been formed to offer support to the two delegations from the Gold Coast visiting Britain to protest against various ‘obnoxious laws’ that had been introduced by the colonial authorities. What appears most likely is that the IAFA was formed by a number of politically active Pan-Africanists. Its founding highlights the significance of Pan-Africanism as an important political current amongst those whom Padmore referred to as ‘politically minded Negroes’, whether the focus was the Gold Coast, Ethiopia, the Caribbean, the United States or events in Britain. Indeed, in this period several activists called for a ‘Black United Front’, or common action to deal with common problems, as was the case in France, the United States and elsewhere. In these years, despite political differences, such action was not unusual and could involve the other principal African/black organizations in Britain, such as the West African Students’ Union (WASU), the Gold Coast Students’ Association, and the LCP and Negro Welfare Association (NWA). Although Makonnen claimed that the existing African and West Indian organizations in England at the time were ‘very mild’, he clearly arrived at a time of significant change.

The WASU had been founded in London in 1925 by Ladipo Solanke, a Nigerian law student and Dr H. C. Bankole-Bright, a leading member of the National Congress of British West Africa from Sierra Leone, who was visiting Britain at the time. The WASU established its own Wasu journal and the Africa House hostel in London and soon acted as the spokesperson not only for the majority of African students in Britain but also for anti-colonial opinion throughout British West Africa, where it had formed numerous local branches. It also had supporters in other African colonies as well as in Brazil, the Caribbean and the United States. The LCP had been established in London in 1931 by Harold Moody (1882–1947), a Jamaican physician. It
can be considered a Pan-African organization, although it also had British and South Asian members. It also concerned itself with colonial matters, maintained contact with supporters in Africa and the Caribbean and campaigned against racism and the colour bar in Britain. The NWA had been established in 1931 under the auspices of the LAI. It was a communist-led organization, connected with the ITUCNW, often represented by its secretary Arnold Ward, a former seaman from Barbados. It was described both as a ‘militant organisation of Negro workers’, and as a ‘fighting organisation of class conscious anti-imperialist and white workers’. The NWA had been established in 1931 under the auspices of the LAI. It was a communist-led organization, connected with the ITUCNW, often represented by its secretary Arnold Ward, a former seaman from Barbados. It was described both as a ‘militant organisation of Negro workers’, and as a ‘fighting organisation of class conscious anti-imperialist and white workers’.15

The IAFA established its headquarters at Amy Ashwood Garvey’s restaurant in London’s New Oxford Street, itself an important new Pan-African locale. At its first public meeting, in July 1935, it resolved to support Ethiopia’s struggle to maintain its independence. Subsequent meetings were held during the summer and autumn of 1935 throughout Britain, denouncing fascist Italy, calling on the League of Nations to intervene but also raising funds to send to Ethiopia ‘a body or bodies of men and women of African descent or race to be placed at the disposal of the Emperor to render service, military or civil’. According to reports many black women volunteered for ambulance work and as nurses. However, as James pointed out at the time ‘most of us who were in the organisation and who were supporting it, had a conception of politics very remote from debates and resolutions of the League [of Nations]. We wanted to form a military organisation which would go to fight with the Abyssinians against the Italians.’ It seems that James and other potential warriors were dissuaded from that course of action by Ethiopia’s representative in London. Nevertheless, this statement points to the fact that the Pan-Africanism of those residing in Britain during this period, partly as a response to the Italian invasion, showed a militancy that contrasted with the more formal protests of Du Bois’ congresses, as well as the more measured protests of the more established Pan-African organizations in Britain. In Cardiff, for example, Harry O’Connell, a Guyanese communist member of the NWA and leader of ‘colonial workers’, was alleged to have called on his comrades to ‘wreck’ the city’s Italian consulate. The militant style was exemplified by the resolution passed at the IAFA’s second public meeting in July which called ‘upon all Africans and people of African descent all over the world to ... pledge themselves to assist Abyssinia in her struggle by all means at their disposal’. It was also evident in the ‘Hands off Abyssinia’ manifesto written by Kenyatta, as general secretary of the renamed International African Friends of Ethiopia (IAFE), and published in the Communist Party of Great Britain’s Labour Monthly in September 1935.

Even the formerly more moderate LCP was radicalized by events in Ethiopia. According to an article written by James at the time, the invasion of Ethiopia had ‘been of immense benefit to the race as a whole’, since although ‘unfortunate for Abyssinia’ it had ‘shown the Negro only too plainly that he has got nothing to expect from them [the governments of
Britain, France and Italy] but exploitation, naked or wrapped in bluff'.

At the LCP’s Annual General Meeting in September 1935 a resolution was issued declaring to all the colonial powers ‘that the time is now right for them to consider a plan for the future of Africa which ... should be nothing less than the ultimate and complete freedom of Africa from any external domination whatsoever’. The WASU was also voicing its own protests and regarded the Italian invasion as almost tantamount to a ‘racial war’. It too considered that Italy’s aggression exposed not just the British government’s policy of appeasement but also the illegitimacy of Britain’s colonial rule and the ‘spiritual bankruptcy of the West’. It too considered that Italy’s aggression exposed not just the British government’s policy of appeasement but also the illegitimacy of Britain’s colonial rule and the ‘spiritual bankruptcy of the West’. Following an address to the WASU by Amy Ashwood Garvey, it established its own Ethiopian Defence Fund administered by an all-female committee. There were also demonstrations of support for Ethiopia by Africans in Cardiff, Liverpool, Edinburgh and elsewhere. It was in this context that the WASU declared ‘the Ethiopian disaster may yet prove a blessing in disguise if it succeeds in uniting the black peoples of the world’. At its annual conference in October 1935 the communist-led NWA with some justification could declare that ‘a mighty movement of solidarity is growing day by day throughout the world in support of the Abyssinian people in their struggle for independence’.

At the same time, African and Caribbean workers in Britain considered it necessary to form their own fighting organizations as exploited ‘colonial’ workers, in addition to Pan-African ones, as the Colonial Defence Association in Cardiff and the Colonial Seamen’s Association based in London demonstrated. In short, they were influenced not only by Pan-Africanism but also a wider internationalism, a consequence of their sojourn at the heart of the empire. It is significant that Padmore considered that one of the key tasks of the IAFE was to ‘arouse the sympathy and support of the British public’, a sentiment remarkably similar to that expressed by Sylvester Williams at the start of the century.

In 1936, it was the IAFE and other black organizations in Britain, including the newly-formed Pan-African Federation, the WASU, the NWA, the LCP, the UNIA and the Somali Association, which welcomed Ethiopia’s emperor Haile Selassie upon his arrival into exile in London. However, the emperor’s responses during an interview with the WASU president H. O. Davies did little to encourage the rising tide of Pan-Africanism. Haile Selassie reportedly admitted that Ethiopians did not regard themselves as ‘Negroes’ but were a ‘mixed Hamito-Semitic people’, and also apparently urged that support for Ethiopia should be given in cooperation with the British government. Such a response did not find favour with many including Marcus Garvey who publicly censured the emperor in the press as a ‘great coward’, arguing that ‘Haile Selassie has proved the incompetence of the Negro for political authority, but thank God there are Negroes who realise that Haile Selassie did not represent the truest qualities of the Negro race.’
Hands off Abyssinia

In May 1936 several organizations from Britain including the LCP and the African Churches Mission, attended the International Conference of Negroes and Arabs held in Paris. Participants included the International Trade Union Committee of Negro Workers (ITUCNW), the Union des Travailleurs Nègres (UTN), James Ford representing the National Negro Congress in the United States, as well as organizations representing the Surinamese in Holland, the Association of Haitian Writers and Journalists and many other organizations based in France, including the Ligue de Défence de la Race Nègre, the Étoile Nord Africaine and the Union Nationale Malagache. The IAFE was also most certainly in touch with events in France, since both James and Padmore had established contacts there. The WASU appears to have been in direct contact with the International Committee for the Defence of the Ethiopene People and Kouyaté’s Comité de Défense de l’Indépendence National de l’Ethiopie, so extensive Pan-African networks were utilized and consolidated during this period. The participants at the conferences in France stressed the importance of mass action to oppose fascist aggression. They no doubt had in mind the strike action organized by the port workers of Cape Town and Durban, who refused to load ships with provisions for the Italian Army, following a special appeal from the Communist Party of South Africa. By October 1935 there were already reports of protests throughout the United States, in Britain, Belgium, Holland, France as well as in several colonial and semi-colonial countries including South Africa, Liberia, Trinidad, St Lucia and British Guiana. In Holland, for example, the Union of Surinam Workers sent a protest resolution to the Italian government and formed an Ethiopia support committee.

The Caribbean

In the Caribbean, there was a general Pan-African sympathy with the plight of Ethiopia and a view that there was a connection between the anti-colonial and anti-fascist struggles in Africa and those waged by the masses of the people in the Caribbean. It is also evident that those in the Caribbean were aware of protests in Europe, the United States and elsewhere and often there were links between the Pan-African organizations. Various organizations and individuals in the region, including members of the Jamaican Universal Negro Improvement Association, volunteered to go and fight in Ethiopia. There were numerous mass meeting and other activities reported in the press, and fears were expressed by the colonial authorities that anger and sympathy regarding the war in Ethiopia might contribute towards overtly anti-colonial actions. In British Guiana, organizations sent resolutions to the governor, the British government as well as the emperor of Ethiopia, or like the Afro-American Association and League of Coloured Races
organized protests. The British Guiana Labour Union, for instance, sent a cable to Haile Selassie stating: ‘The Negroes of British Guiana hail your declaration that you will defend your Empire to the last man against foreign aggression.’ In Haiti, the Ligue Haitienne pour la Défense du Peuple Ethiopien was formed, while in Martinique the Group Jean Jaurès and Front Commun held meetings to discuss the implications of the war and a Comité de Défense du Peuple Ethiopien was established. In Cuba, several articles about the invasion appeared in the Afro-Cuban magazine Adelante, sixty nurses volunteered to serve in Ethiopia and, under the auspices of the Communist Party, a Comité Nacional Pro Abisinia was formed. There were also reports of protests and demonstrations in Grenada, St Lucia and St Vincent. In Trinidad, several organizations took action in support of Ethiopia including the Afro-West Indian League, the Friends of Ethiopia, the West Indian Youth Welfare League, the National Association of the African Progeny and the newly formed Negro Welfare, Cultural and Social Association (NWCSA).

The NWCSA was formed in 1934 to fight for the economic, political and social rights of the working class and the ‘oppressed Negro people’. It seems to have emerged from the Unemployed Workers’ League which had been founded earlier by Elma Francois (1897–1944), a domestic worker originally from St Vincent and Jim Headley, a seafarer who had previously been an activist in Britain. The NWCSA, which was connected to the ITUCNW as well as the NWA, linked the Ethiopian conflict with the problems facing working people in Trinidad. It pointed out that the preparation for fascist Italy’s attack on Ethiopia came ‘at the same time with the attack on the general living standards of the Negro peoples throughout the world’. It therefore concluded, ‘the people of Trinidad must protest against this attack on the standard of living of the Negro people. Protest against any attack on the Abyssinian Negro peoples.’ It then despatched several protest resolutions, including one to Mussolini demanding ‘Hands off Abyssinia’, and another to the League of Nations calling for the unconditional withdrawal of fascist Italy from Ethiopia and condemning ‘the policy of World Imperialism for the dividing up of Abyssinia’. Thereafter the NWCSA remained at the forefront of anti-colonial protests in Trinidad and subsequently played a leading role in the labour rebellion that broke out in the summer of 1937.

West Africa

In the British colonies, there was widespread consciousness about the significance of the war in Ethiopia, at least partly stimulated by connections with organizations and individuals in Britain, including the IAFA, the WASU, the LCP, the NWA and the LAI. These, along with the ITUCNW, were connected to established networks throughout the region. The WASU had many local branches in West Africa, the LCP established one in Freetown.
under the direction of Constance Cummings-John (1918–2000), while the
ITUCNW had its own activists in the area. It is evident that as well as the
circulation of publications, such as the Wasu journal and Negro Worker,
there was also an exchange of information between those in Britain’s West
African colonies and those in France and France’s West African colonies.
News about Ethiopia was circulated in the West African press in such
publications as the Comet, Vox Populi and the West African Pilot. During
the period of the Ethiopian crisis the press in British West Africa ‘became
much more pan-African in content’, especially after the Hoare-Laval pact
in December 1935 exposed the fact that Britain and France, the two major
colonial powers, were conniving to support fascist aggression.

The Ethiopia crisis provoked not only opposition to fascism but also
criticism of Europe, Christianity and the entire colonial order. There were
therefore numerous activities in support of Ethiopia. In Nigeria, many were
coordinated by the Nigerian Youth Movement, one of the first anti-colonial
organizations with country-wide support. It is reported to have organized a
meeting of over 2,000 in Lagos as early as September 1935. Other protests
were organized by the Prominent Lagos Women Society, that responded to
a plea from Princess Tsahai of Ethiopia, as well as by organizations in other
parts of the country. In Sierra Leone, the West African Youth League (WAYL),
founded by Isaac Wallace-Johnson and Cummings-John in 1938 played a
prominent role and an Ethiopia Relief Fund Committee was established.
In Gambia, the League of Coloured Peoples and the Gambia Outlook and
Senegambian Reporter organized protests.

In the Gold Coast, Wallace-Johnson’s WAYL played a significant role
in agitating amongst the population in support of Ethiopia. In October
1935, together with the Ex-Servicemen’s Union, the WAYL held a rally
at which over 1,000 gathered in Accra where, it was later reported, over
500 of the participants volunteered to go and fight in Ethiopia’s defence.
Subsequently, an Ethiopia Defence Committee was established and an
appeal for funds launched in the local press. The Committee was established
to educate ‘the masses’ not only on all matters relating to the invasion but
also ‘on matters of racial and national importance’. The WAYL declared
the 9–18 November 1935 an ‘Ethiopia week’, and raised funds ‘in aid of
distressed Ethiopians’ that were then forwarded to the Ethiopian legation
in London.

Wallace-Johnson used the invasion of Ethiopia to expose the nature of
the entire colonial system and to present the view that the African was the
equal of the European. His most famous article on this subject was entitled
‘Has the African a God’, and was published in the Morning Post in May
1936. Wallace-Johnson’s aim was to link the invasion of Ethiopia with
colonial rule in general and repressive legislation in the colonies. He called
on Africans to ‘worship Ethiopia’s God’, in other words to embrace their
own politics and traditions. For this protest he was subsequently arrested
and along with Nnamdi Azikiwe, the editor of the Morning Post, charged
with sedition and subsequently found guilty of this offence. The whole case became something of a Pan-African cause célèbre both in West Africa and in Britain where Wallace-Johnson decided to appeal against his conviction to the Court of the Privy Council, an appeal that he eventually lost.

**North America**

The African diaspora in the United States showed similar sympathy with Ethiopia and organized accordingly. Some important connections existed between African Americans and Ethiopia even before the invasion, which was almost universally condemned by a range of organizations including churches, the African American press, the UNIA, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the Communist Party, the Ethiopian World Federation and the influential Ethiopian Research Council (ERC) led by William Leo Hansberry (1894–1965). There were many lesser known organizations that expressed sympathy and several that were founded especially for that purpose, such as the Pan-African Reconstruction Association. Several key African American figures took a stand including Adam Clayton Powell Jr., W. E. B. Du Bois and Walter White of the NAACP, the historians J. A. Rogers, Carter G. Woodson and Dr Willis Huggins, as well as leading African American communists such as William Patterson and James Ford. Du Bois referred to ‘the last great effort of white Europe to secure the subjection of black men’, and concluded that ‘Black men and brown men have indeed been roused as seldom before’.

There were many demands for boycotts of Italian goods and businesses in the United States, some of which were implemented, and on occasions there were riots and other conflicts between African Americans and Italian Americans. The ERC and even the United States government received numerous enquiries from African Americans eager to volunteer to fight, or assist in Ethiopia, many of whom described themselves as Ethiopians, or the descendants of those forcibly taken from Africa who wished to return. Only a few volunteers eventually made it to Ethiopia, including two famous pilots: Hubert Julian a migrant from Trinidad and the African American John Robinson, known as the ‘Brown Condor’.

Perhaps the most significant development during this period was the organization of the Provisional Committee for the Defence of Ethiopia (PCDE) in New York in late 1934 and the founding of the Ethiopian World Federation in August 1937. Proposed by the Harlem section of the Communist Party, the PCDE brought together several divisions of the UNIA, the African Patriotic League, the YMCA, the Elks, the Urban League, in total some twenty organizations. The PCDE, chaired by Captain A. L. King of the UNIA, organized a series of rallies in Harlem which attracted thousands who pledged to provide arms and other aid for Ethiopia. It also held demonstrations outside the Italian consulate as well as organizing an
economic boycott of imported goods from Italy. In conjunction with the Medical Defence Committee of Ethiopia, a group of African American physicians, the PCDE sent medical supplies to Ethiopia and appears to have been in direct contact with Emperor Haile Selassie. The PCDE and other organizations then arranged to send Willis Huggins to Geneva to deliver a petition to the League of Nations on behalf of a newly formed International Council of Friends of Ethiopia, to support Ethiopia and demand that the League acted to restrain fascist Italy. Travelling via London and Paris, Huggins conferred with Paulette Nardal, Ladipo Solanke and the WASU, with whom he had corresponded for several years, as well as Amy Ashwood Garvey and the IAFA who put him in touch with the Ethiopian consul in London. Huggins subsequently delivered a petition which affirmed the pride with which ‘Africans and persons of African descent throughout the world’ regarded Ethiopia, evidently with the support of organizations in the United States, Britain and France, as well as Ethiopian diplomats in Europe.

The PCDE was an important manifestation of Pan-African unity, claiming as many as 15,000 members. It was also a body that under the influence of the communists, and others such as Adam Clayton Powell Jr., sought to encourage support for Ethiopia that was also opposition to fascism, rather than directed towards ‘race war’ or against Italian Americans. It was in this context that the PCDF chairman A. L. King was reprimanded by Marcus Garvey for his links with communists at a time when Garvey was also increasingly critical of Haile Selassie following the emperor’s exile in London. The influence of communists and Marxism was significant in many of the protests in Europe, the Caribbean and Africa, and was even evident in such countries as Brazil where the illegal Communist Party and Afro-Brazilian communists such as Claudio da Silva created ‘Black Front’ organizations that campaigned against the Italian invasion and in support of Ethiopia. In the United States Pan-African unity over Ethiopia also contributed to the founding of the National Negro Congress in 1936, the founding in 1937 of the International Committee on African Affairs by Paul Robeson, the famous singer, actor and human rights activist and Max Yergan (1892–1975), and a renewed African American concern with the anti-colonial struggle in Africa.

Indeed, several Pan-African coalitions were formed during this period including United Aid for Ethiopia and the Ethiopia World Federation (EWF). The founding of the EWF by Haile Selassie’s envoy Malaku Bayen in New York in 1937 was also undertaken with Pan-Africanism in mind since the founder was not only concerned about Ethiopia’s ‘independence from European imperialism’ but also ‘the solidarity of the Black race’. Bayen emphasized that ‘the philosophy of the Federation is to instil in the minds of the Black people of the world that the word Black is not to be considered in any way dishonourable but rather an honor and dignity because of the past history of the race’. Branches of the EWF were established throughout the United States, often initially based around supporters of the UNIA and...
its offshoots, and by 1939 nearly twenty were in existence at the time of its first international congress. Through its publication, the Voice of Ethiopia, the EWF soon spread to the Caribbean, South America and other parts of the world. The Voice of Ethiopia ‘a Paper for the Vast Universal Black Commonwealth and Friends of Ethiopia Everywhere’, also had a Pan-African perspective and covered not only Ethiopian affairs but also news from Africa, the Caribbean and elsewhere. Bayen was advised by the historian William Ferris, who had previously been the editor of Garvey’s Negro World, and he as well as Pan-Africanists such as Padmore and Azikiwe contributed articles. Bayen even claimed that he aimed to ‘create a United States of Africa’.56

There is no doubt that Italy’s invasion of Ethiopia did contribute to a much wider crisis of colonialism. Italian aggression and the collusion of the other big powers also created the conditions for a more strident anti-colonial Pan-Africanism throughout Africa and the diaspora. As W. Arthur Lewis later explained in regard to those in the Caribbean, Britain’s role as appeaser ‘tended to destroy their faith in white government, and to make them more willing to take their fate in their own hands’.57

International African Service Bureau

Undoubtedly the Ethiopian conflict brought several organizations in Britain closer together, although the IAPE did not endure long after the Italian conquest and, amidst several internal disagreements, C. L. R. James resigned from its ranks in the summer of 1936.58 Perhaps as early as 1935 Padmore had begun to form a new organization which was variously known in police reports as the Pan-African Brotherhood and Pan-Afro League, but eventually became known as the Pan-African Federation. It included amongst its membership Kenyatta, Wood and Moore and Mohammed Said from the IAPE and others including the veteran Pan-Africanist Robert Broadhurst (c.1859–1948), as well as Chris Jones and Ras Makonnen. Initially this group of activists held meetings and apparently produced a publication entitled Voice of Africa but they struggled financially and Padmore, Kenyatta and Makonnen appeared to lodge together wherever possible to save money. A not dissimilar group appears to have become consolidated after the arrival in Britain of Wallace-Johnson, when it re-emerged as the International African Service Bureau (IASB) in the early part of 1937.59

Police reports describe Wallace-Johnson as the ‘principal founder’ and ‘driving force’ behind the IASB but this may well be overstated since Wallace-Johnson did not remain permanently in London and appears to have been expelled from the IASB the following year.60 Whatever the case, Wallace-Johnson was initially elected general-secretary and Padmore chairman of the IASB. While Kenyatta and Amy Ashwood Garvey also played leading roles, Makonnen seems to have been the most important fundraiser and treasurer, Chris Jones (aka Braithwaite) was organizing secretary and C. L. R. James
editorial director. A full list of executive committee members also emerges from police reports and apparently included Garan Kouyaté, K. Salli Tamba who had worked with Padmore and the ITUCNW in West Africa, Nnamdi Azikiwe, and two women Elsie Duncan from West Africa and Aidi Bastian, a Jamaican who in 1937 was one of the founders of the EWF in New York. Africans from the continent are a clear majority but whether this reflects the influence of Wallace-Johnson is unclear. It is also likely that those involved were close to Padmore and a legacy of his abortive attempts to convene a ‘World Negro Unity Congress’ with Kouyaté and others in 1934. According to Padmore, at that time their aim was to ‘bring together leading negroes from Africa, West Indies and South Central America, USA and Europe, in order to launch a World Committee to decide what the negroes must do in the next war and to free themselves from white imperialism’. Perhaps here in embryo were the foundations of the Manchester congress.

The IASB ‘represented progressive and enlightened public opinion amongst Africans and peoples of African descent’, and aimed to ‘support the demands of Africans, Asians and other colonial peoples for democratic rights, civil liberties and self-determination’. Membership was open to those of African descent but ‘Europeans and others who desired to demonstrate in a practical way their interest in African welfare could become associate members’. Padmore made it clear that the IASB was opposed to ‘racial exclusiveness’ and that one of the ‘chief functions of the Bureau was to help enlighten public opinion ... as to the true conditions in the various colonies, protectorates and mandated territories in Africa and the West Indies’. To this end Padmore, James, Jones and others often spoke at the meetings of the Independent Labour Party or were involved with related organizations such as the British Centre Against Imperialism. For Padmore and the IASB, Pan-Africanism had to be linked with internationalism in a common struggle to end colonial rule and other forms of oppression, since many of those drawn to the organization considered themselves Marxists. According to Makonnen, the nature of the IASB was also influenced by the experience of the British-based India League, which was also internationalist in orientation and aimed to influence people in Britain against colonial rule in India. Makonnen explained that the IASB had ‘considered the possibility of reviving Du Bois’ pan-African movement’, but that ‘it seemed safer to operate under the umbrella of service rather than risk a frontal attack by taking a bolder pan-African title’. Their aim therefore was to ‘emphasise service to people of African descent in as many ways as possible’.

Another interesting feature in this regard was the IASB’s aim to work with ‘other existing organisations which have the welfare of the African at heart’. Indeed, the IASB strove to coordinate the activities of such organizations ‘which at present exist in different parts of the black world and ... bring them into closer fraternal relation with one another’. Here again is an example of Pan-African internationalism and from its inception the IASB
seems to have worked in cooperation with the US-based International Committee on African Affairs, the forerunner of the Council on African Affairs, led by Yergan and Robeson, which had its own international Pan-African connections. It also sent a representative to the World Congress against Racism and Anti-Semitism held in Paris in 1937, where connections were made with French-based Pan-Africanists, such as Émile Faure, as well as communists such as William Patterson and Louise Thompson.

The IASB initially produced two regular publications, *Africa and the World* as well as the *African Sentinel*, both edited by Wallace-Johnson, and then subsequently *International African Opinion*, at first edited by James and then by Makonnen. The *International African Opinion* carried the IASB motto ‘Educate, Co-operate, Emancipate. Neutral in nothing affecting the African people’, but many of its articles were addressed to ‘British workers’. The IASB organized itself as a Pan-African information bureau, collecting and disseminating information about the struggles of Africans globally. In addition, it organized public meetings and demonstrations and took a particularly keen interest in the labour rebellions in the Caribbean and the international campaign opposing any transfer of colonies to Nazi Germany. It also produced a series of pamphlets on important issues such as *Hands off the Protectorates* which focused on South Africa’s attempts to incorporate the three British protectorates Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland. The IASB also managed to get questions asked in Parliament through sympathetic MPs, such as Ellen Wilkinson and the future Labour Party Colonial Secretary, Arthur Creech-Jones. Other sympathizers included such notable British figures as Nancy Cunard, Stafford Cripps, Victor Gollancz and Sylvia Pankhurst.

**Organizing, press and publications**

In 1935 major labour rebellions broke out in the Anglophone Caribbean occasioned by poverty and unemployment but stirred by anti-colonial sentiment, as well as the Italian invasion of Ethiopia. They began with strikes in St Kitts and then strikes and protests in Trinidad, British Guiana, St Vincent and St Lucia. In the years following there was again significant unrest in Trinidad and Barbados, as well as elsewhere, culminating in a general strike in Jamaica in 1938 and further rebellions elsewhere that were severely suppressed leading to almost fifty deaths. The strikes marked an important stage in the anti-colonial struggle in the Caribbean and showed the political strength working people had at their disposal. In response, the British government despatched a Royal Commission chaired by Lord Moyne to investigate and make recommendations. As was the case in regard to Ethiopia, events in the Caribbean provoked protests by the IASB, LCP and NWA, demanding political reform and even self-government. It was in this period that W. Arthur Lewis, a former editor of *The Keys* wrote
Labour in the West Indies and the three organizations presented a joint memorandum on ‘economic, social and political conditions in the West Indies and British Guiana’ to the Moyne Commission. What is significant is the collective preparation of this document, involving the work of Padmore, James, Lewis, Peter Blackman (1909–1993), Moody, Makonnen and others, as well its reference to the significance of Ethiopia and the demand for an end to colonial rule.72

Unrest in the Caribbean occurred at the same time as the development of major protest in parts of Africa, including the ‘cocoa hold-ups’ in the Gold Coast and opposition to a racist and expansionist South Africa, as well as more general concerns about Nazi Germany’s demand for the return of former German colonies administered as League of Nations mandates by Britain and France. These demands, which also had supporters such as Lord Rothermere in Britain, again highlighted the iniquities of colonial rule and also led to joint action by the IASB, the LCP, the WASU and others. In 1938, the African Sentinel published resolutions and protests from the UTN and Rassamblment Coloniale in Paris, further evidence of coordinated anti-colonial internationalism and Pan-Africanism.73 This growing Pan-African unity was perhaps best illustrated by the Conference on African Peoples, Democracy and World Peace organized by the LCP, the NWA, the Gold Coast Students Association and others, including the IASB, on the eve of war in July 1939. The significance of this event is not only that it reflected a growing unity amongst British-based organizations but also the fact that the LCP had already discussed the idea of convening in 1940 a ‘world conference of Africans and those of African descent’, at its Annual General Meeting in 1938 and evidently it was the intention to invite what was referred to as ‘the powerful group of coloured American citizens’. Although the outbreak of war prevented this gathering taking place it had been viewed in some quarters as a potential ‘Pan-African World Congress’.74 The 1939 conference resolution condemned colonial rule, fascism and Britain’s appeasement, while self-determination demands for all those in Africa and the Caribbean certainly presaged some of the demands that would emerge from the Manchester Pan-African Congress six years later. It also highlighted a more general Pan-African and anti-colonial trend during this period in Britain which linked the plight of all Africans, whether in Africa or the Caribbean, and connected their struggle with all those struggling against colonial rule. It also increasingly stressed the important role of the working people and ‘coloured labour’ in anti-colonial struggle. As Makonnen expressed it, he and other Pan-Africanists insisted on ‘seeing the colonial world as a whole’. They would demand rights for all colonial trade unionists, for example, and circulate their demands throughout the Caribbean, North America and West Africa. He added that the same approach ‘brought us into close touch with other coloured groups in London’, including students and others from Asia, and that they ‘found it profitable to co-operate’ with them too.75
The radical Pan-Africanism that emerged in Britain in the 1930s and early 1940s was propagated and disseminated in a host of periodicals and other publications, many of them banned by the colonial authorities. Both the WASU and the LCP produced their own regular publications that circulated not only in Britain but also in parts of Africa, the Caribbean and North America, as well as in Europe. The WASU also had some links with Brazil primarily because of the significance of Yoruba language and culture in that country. The publications of these two organizations also began to reflect a more radical approach in the late 1930s and Peter Blackman, a communist, was for a time the editor of *The Keys*. The IASB also propagated its views through several publications and aimed ‘to create a connecting link between the Africans at home (in Africa) and the Africans abroad (in the West Indies, United States of America, and other Western countries)’ and indeed with ‘Negroes wherever they are’. Padmore often played a key role. He had been a prolific journalist and writer since his time as editor of *Negro Worker*. After his split with the communist movement his writings appeared regularly in such African American papers as the *Pittsburg Courier* and *Chicago Defender*, as well as in the African and Caribbean press and socialist publications in Britain. He also continued to distribute his *The Life and Struggles of Negro Toilers*, even though it had been written in 1931 when he was still a communist. In addition, he wrote or jointly authored several other books during the period including *How Britain Rules Africa* (1936), *Africa and World Peace* (1937) and *The White Man’s Duty* (1943). James wrote *A History of Negro Revolt* (1937) and *The Black Jacobins* (1938), the latter a major history of the Haitian Revolution but as James later acknowledged throughout the book ‘it is Africa and African emancipation that he has in mind’. Indeed, James argued that for those in the Anglophone Caribbean there was a necessary preoccupation with Africa in the period between the two wars, since, ‘before they could begin to see themselves as a free and independent people they had to clear from their minds the stigma that anything African was inherently inferior and degraded’. The Négritude of those in the French Caribbean fulfilled a similar aim. The IASB also produced a series of pamphlets during this period. All were written, as Padmore said of *How Britain Rules Africa*, to present things ‘from the point of view of the blacks’, and he added ‘the time has come for Africans to speak out for themselves’. It might also be said that all these publications, including *Life and Struggles* were collaborative efforts, examples of a new Marxist-influenced Pan-Africanism.

Another significant publication was Marcus Garvey’s the *Black Man*, published first in Jamaica in 1933 and then in Britain where Garvey resided until his death in June 1940. However, some of his pronouncements put him at odds even with leading members of the UNIA, as well as with others who disapproved of his criticism of Ethiopia’s emperor Haile Selassie. He was often a popular speaker in London’s Hyde Park but Garvey also faced criticism for his ‘anti-labor bias’ and his stand on Ethiopia particularly
from African students in London who, according to Padmore ‘attempted to break up his meetings’.81 Wallace-Johnson, on behalf of the IASB, openly attacked Garvey in the press for his stands and reported that the latter had been publicly challenged by Padmore and James for his attacks on Selassie and on striking Caribbean workers.82 Garvey had reportedly said that striking workers in Trinidad were being ‘used’ by the IASB, which he referred to as ‘Communist’ a view that did not endear him to the IASB nor the workers in Trinidad.83 Following his visit to that country in 1937 one local paper reported that ‘Garvey appears to have little sympathy for the poor.’84 Wallace-Johnson also took issue with Garvey’s claim that he was ‘a capitalist and favoured the ruling class’ and concluded that he had ‘obviously outlived his usefulness in so far as leading the African people may be concerned’.85 It was, however, during this period that Garvey made some of his most famous and historic speeches, in Canada for instance, and that his influence began to have a significant impact on the emergence of the first Rastafarians in Jamaica.

The Pan-African Federation and the Manchester Pan-African Congress

The outbreak of the Second World War in 1939 did little to diminish the activities of the Pan-African organizations in Britain. They were more acutely aware of the fact that Africa and the African diaspora were being asked to fight against fascism and for freedom at a time when the colonial world was not free but subject to severe repression. Some Pan-Africanists, such as Wallace-Johnson, were imprisoned for the duration of the war, while in Britain racism and the colour bar remained. Criticism of the war aims of Britain and the Allies grew following the signing of the Atlantic Charter by Churchill and Roosevelt in 1941. Clause three of this charter referred to the right of self-determination but Churchill clarified that this did not apply to the colonies. In 1942 the WASU began a series of wartime conferences initially demanding ‘internal self-government’ in the West African colonies. In 1943 Padmore and Nancy Cunard demanded a ‘Charter for the Colonies’ in The White Man’s Duty. The following year the LCP drew up a ‘Charter for Coloured Peoples’ which it sent to the British government, demanding political and economic reforms leading to self-government for Britain’s colonies. These demands were rejected.86

In 1944, on the initiative of the IASB, representatives of various African and British-based Pan-African organizations gathered in Manchester to form a ‘pan-African united front movement’ to be known as the Pan-African Federation (PAF). The president of this new organization was Milliard and its general-secretary was Ras Makonnen. The PAF was a coalition which included the Negro Association (Manchester), the Coloured Workers’
Association (London), the Coloured Peoples’ Association (Edinburgh), the African Union (Glasgow), the United Committee of Coloured and Colonial People’s Association (Cardiff), and the Association of Students of African Descent (Dublin). In addition, the PAF also included representatives from Kenyatta’s Kikuyu Central Association, Wallace-Johnson’s West African Youth League (Sierra Leone) and the Friends of African Freedom Society (Gold Coast). The LCP and the WASU were not formally members of the PAF but would often collaborate with it, thus almost all the major organizations in Britain were more or less united. The aims of the PAF were:

1. To promote the well-being and unity of African peoples and peoples of African descent throughout the world.
2. To demand self-determination and independence of African peoples, and other subject races from the domination of powers claiming sovereignty and trusteeship over them.
3. To secure equality of civil rights for African peoples and the total abolition of all forms of racial discrimination.
4. To strive to co-operate between African peoples and others who share our aspirations.87

The initiative to convene a post-war Pan-African congress was first taken by W. E. B. Du Bois, in consultation with Moody and Solanke in Britain, Amy Jacques Garvey in Jamaica and Robeson and Yergan of the Council on African Affairs (CAA) in the United States. But although some tentative plans were made for a Pan-African congress in London the initiative soon passed to the PAF, which saw possibilities created by the planned convening of the World Trade Union Conference in London in February 1945.88 Du Bois was not, however, the only African American concerned with post-war Pan-African matters. A. Phillip Randolph, for example, announced in 1944 that his March on Washington Movement wished to connect ‘the interest of the Negro people in America to the interest of Negroes all over the world’. While in April 1944, the CAA held a major conference, Africa – New Perspectives, that brought together African American and US-based African organizations such as the African Students’ Association, as well as individuals such as Kwame Nkrumah.89 In April 1945 Du Bois, the NAACP and others organized a Colonial Conference in Harlem with participants including Nkrumah, Amy Ashwood Garvey, the CAA, the EWF, the Jamaica Progressive League and others. This and other initiatives in the United States intensified leading up to the founding of the United Nations (UN) in 1945. There were growing expectation that the post-war colonial world would be transformed and that self-government would soon be achieved.90 But despite these initiatives the CAA had no connection with the PAF’s plans and Du Bois had only marginal involvement.
For the PAF the main significance of the World Trade Union Conference was the fact that trade unionists from the colonies and particularly British colonies in Africa and the Caribbean would for the first time be invited to participate. Wallace-Johnson and the Jamaican Ken Hill, who had both only just been released from prison were both invited and there were also representations from Nigeria, the Gold Coast, the Gambia and British Guiana. For the first time in history the workers of Africa and the Caribbean were to be represented at an international event. The West African delegates issued a statement declaring that the time was ripe for a West African trade union federation and similar discussions were taking place in the Caribbean. At the WFTU conference, Wallace-Johnson on behalf of all the colonial delegates proposed a ‘Charter of Labour for the Colonies’. The delegates also called for the condemnation of imperialism and demanded the right of self-determination. They clearly sought to gain the support of the international labour movement and to that end demanded trade union representation in the formation of the UN.91

At the end of February 1945, the African and Caribbean trade union delegates met with the PAF in Manchester and it was at this meeting that Padmore suggested that they convene a Pan-African congress later that year. At that time, it was proposed that it might be held in Paris in September following the second World Trade Union conference. A large public meeting was also held addressed by some of the trade unionists, Padmore and other members of the PAF. A provisional organizing committee was established including Padmore, Kenyatta, Wallace-Johnson, Makonnen, Milliard and James Taylor, from the Gold Coast, who was the treasurer of the PAF. The organizing committee asked Desmond Buckle, a communist and member of the LCP to draft a ‘call to action’ for the congress, later known as the Manifesto on Africa in Post-war World which, it was intended, would also be presented at the founding of the UN. The manifesto, first published in the Communist Party’s Labour Monthly, also set out a series of demands including ‘full self-government within a definite time limit’.92

It was only after seeing press reports that Du Bois learned of these developments and he immediately began a correspondence with Padmore explaining the steps he had already taken and expressing his view, shared by Moody, the WASU and others, that the next Pan-African congress should be held in Africa. Although Padmore claimed that arrangements in Britain were ‘tentative’ and signalled the readiness of the PAF to work with the NAACP, he made it clear that the former was ‘primarily concerned with the workers and peasants, who must be the driving force behind any movement which we middle class intellectuals may establish’. Padmore pointedly told Du Bois ‘Today the African masses, the common people are awake and not blindly looking to doctors and lawyers to tell them what to do.’ Nevertheless, it appeared that some agreement was reached that an ‘exploratory’ conference might still be held in Paris.93
Subject Peoples Conference

While preparations continued for an autumn conference, in June 1945 the PAF and the WASU joined with the Federation of Indian Organisations in Britain, the Ceylon Students’ Association and the Burma Association to hold a Subject Peoples’ Conference in London in which each colony was given equal status. Padmore, who opened the event hailed it as the precursor to a ‘Colonial International’. Here too there was a demand for the liquidation of imperialism and the conference issued its own manifesto *The Colonies and Peace* which, amongst other things, demanded that the UN establish a World Colonial Council as a step towards ‘the unconditional ending of all colonial systems within a definite and stipulated period’. Many of the participants concluded that their struggles were ‘fundamentally the same’ and the conference gave further impetus to African and Asian unity ten years before the famous Bandung Conference. This unity was manifested when the WASU and PAF organized a meeting in solidarity with the workers engaged in the Nigerian general strike which broke out in June 1945. The solidarity rally was said to be one of the largest gatherings of ‘coloured peoples’ ever seen in London and was followed by similar events in Manchester and Liverpool. The following October, a second Subject Peoples’ Conference was held in London, focusing on the struggles for liberation in Vietnam, Malaya, India and elsewhere in Asia. Its political orientation might be summed up by Wallace-Johnson who stated: ‘This unity amongst the coloured races may yet lay the foundation for the wider unity among all workers and exploited and oppressed.’ Here in essence was the politics of what was to become the Manchester Pan-African Congress.94

In the summer of 1945 it was decided that the proposed Pan-African Congress would be held in Britain not France because of travel and other difficulties. It was already clear that most delegates would come from Britain and the British Empire. It was stressed by the organizers that all participants would be representatives ‘not of the middle strata and professionals in the colonies, but of workers’ organisations, the co-operative societies, peasant associations, labour parties and national liberation organisations’.95 The location of the congress in Manchester appears to have been a last minute announcement based on the fact that the PAF was located in that city, that Makonnen was the proprietor of two restaurants there and other logistical advantages. Makonnen was also able, through his local connections, to secure Chorlton Town Hall as the venue for the congress.

The Manchester Pan-African Congress held in October 1945 has been described as the zenith of the Pan-African movement and perhaps the most important of all the Pan-African meetings held outside the African continent.96 Kwame Nkrumah, newly arrived from the United States was included as one of the main organizers, and he later referred to it as a
‘tremendous success’, where ‘both capitalist and reformist solutions to the African problems were rejected’. Nkrumah argued that in contrast to previous congresses ‘the delegates who attended were practical men of action’.\(^97\) Certainly it was attended by key figures, the majority originating on the African continent, such as Obafemi Awolowo, Jaja Wachuku, Hastings Banda, Jomo Kenyatta and Nkrumah who would play a key role in subsequent anti-colonial struggles in Africa, as well as leading Pan-Africanists such as Amy Ashwood Garvey, Du Bois, Padmore, Makonnen, Robert Broadhurst and trade unionists such as Wallace-Johnson, Ken Hill and Rupert Gittens. The Congress was in many ways the embodiment of the radical Pan-Africanism of the 1930s that commenced with the ITUCNW’s Hamburg conference in 1930 but had then been further developed in Britain. This Pan-Africanism stressed the important political role of the masses of the people and later drew on the experience of the Caribbean labour rebellions and strikes, as well as strikes and boycotts in West Africa and elsewhere. It recognized that it was the struggles of the working masses that would play a key role in bringing colonialism to an end.

The Congress held separate sessions on ‘The Colour Problem in Britain’; ‘Imperialism in North and West Africa’; ‘Oppression in South Africa’; ‘The East African Picture’; ‘Ethiopia and the Black Republics’; and ‘The Problem in the Caribbean’. In addition, Amy Ashwood Garvey reminded the predominantly male delegates that ‘for some reason very little has been said about the black woman’, who ‘has been shunted into the social background to be a child bearer’.\(^98\) The overall political orientation of the congress was summed up in two resolutions. The first, ‘the Challenge to the Colonial Powers’, condemned imperialism, demanded independence and for the first time argued that it might be necessary ‘to appeal to force to achieve freedom’. The second, a ‘Declaration to the Colonial Workers, Farmers and Intellectuals’, affirmed the right to be free from foreign domination, and determined that the attainment of political power was ‘the first step towards, and the necessary prerequisite to, complete social, economic and political emancipation’. It declared that ‘colonial workers must be in the front of the battle against imperialism’, and added ‘Your weapons – the Strike and the Boycott – are invincible.’ It concluded ‘Today there is only one road to effective action – the organisation of the masses. And in that organisation the educated colonials must join.’\(^99\) A third important document was a ‘Memorandum to the UN’ drafted by Du Bois which demanded the ‘participation of designated representatives of the African colonial peoples’ within the deliberations of the UN. It was supported by nearly forty organizations in the United States, the Caribbean, Africa and Europe, including the National Council of Negro Women, the CAA, the PAF, the LCP, the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons, the Non-European Unity Committee of South Africa, the Caribbean Labour Congress and the Kenya African Union.\(^100\)
The Manchester Congress was held at a time when colonialism was already under attack in the new UN and when the old colonial powers, especially Britain and France, were severely weakened both by the war and by the rising struggles of those in the colonies. Whatever its limitations it was able to give a voice, especially to those in Britain’s African and Caribbean colonies and to articulate their demands for an end to colonial rule and the ushering in of a new world.
Pan-Africanism returns home

The period following the Manchester Congress was immensely significant for the Pan-African movement. In the preparations for the congress there was an aspiration that future congresses should be held in Africa. The congress largely focused on Africa and in its immediate aftermath this shift in focus was maintained. It was further consolidated when Nkrumah returned to Africa and the period after 1945 is one in which Pan-Africanism also returned and consolidated itself on the African continent. One important consequence was that African unity in its continental form also included the states and peoples of North Africa, hitherto often excluded from manifestations of Pan-Africanism in the African diaspora.

The West African National Secretariat

One of the immediate consequences of the Manchester Pan-African Congress was the founding soon after of the West African National Secretariat (WANS) by Nkrumah and the other West African delegates at a meeting held in London in December 1945. The Aims and Objectives of the WANS make clear that it was concerned with ‘the building of African National Unity’, and that its formation was based on a proposal from the Gold Coast Aborigines Rights Protection Society (GCARPS) and Wallace-Johnson’s Sierra Leone Section of the West African Youth League.¹ According to Nkrumah’s account, he was approached by Wallace-Johnson; G. Ashie Nikoi, who had represented the GCARPS at the Manchester congress; Bankole Awooner-Renner, who had represented the Friends of Africa Freedom Society; Bankole Akpata, a member of the WASU; and Kojo Botsio, at that time also a student, to jointly establish the WANS. ‘It was established in order to put into action the new Pan-African nationalism, with particular reference to West Africa and with the object of calling a West African National Congress and of directing the programme of self-government for the West African colonies, British as well as French’.² Here it seems that Nkrumah and the others wished to develop
a modern version of the National Congress of British West Africa, formed in 1920, which had agitated for constitutional reforms based on the idea of a West African polity. What was new for the WANS was that this would include all of West Africa, not just the British colonies, and have a socialist orientation. In this connection, the WANS also called for the creation of a West African Federation of Trade Unions and Farmers’ Organisations.

The founding of the WANS might appear as a great paradox but Nkrumah, Wallace-Johnson and others clearly considered that this was a necessary practical first step on the road to African liberation and unity. It championed those resolutions passed by the West African Students’ Union (WASU) during the war years, and the views of the West African press delegation led by Azikiwe that visited Britain in 1943. Moreover, Nkrumah and the other founders explicitly stated that they were still operating ‘within the framework of the Pan-African Federation’. Padmore later wrote that the WANS aimed ‘to work out ways and means of implementing the basic policy resolutions endorsed by the Pan-African Congress on West Africa, and to harmonize the relationship between the intellectuals and the working class elements in Britain along the lines laid down in the Congress Declaration to the Colonial Peoples’. The WANS was specifically established ‘to educate the peoples and the working class in particular of the imperialist countries concerning the problems of West Africa’, to combat the ‘menace of artificial territorial divisions’, and to ‘work for unity and harmony among all West Africans who stand against imperialism’. It was primarily an information bureau aiming to consolidate ‘a West African Front for a United West African National Independence’.

The WANS believed that political independence, as well as the end of imperialism, required both the consciousness and political organization of the masses in West Africa, in addition to the education of the ‘common peoples’ of Britain and other imperialist countries. The WANS declared ‘West Africa is one country’, demanded ‘immediate self-government’, and urged ‘Peoples of West Africa Unite!’ To further its aims it also established a monthly newspaper *The New African*, which was ‘devoted to African National Affairs, containing articles of outstanding African leaders’. Wallace-Johnson became the first chairman, Nkrumah its first secretary-general and the first edition of *The New African*, with Nkrumah as editor, appeared in March 1946. It was subtitled ‘The Voice of the Awakened African’ with the motto ‘For Unity and Absolute Independence.’ Nkrumah later wrote that through its pages he preached ‘African unity and nationalism and attacked imperialism and the unjust laws in the colonies’. However, only five editions of *The New African* were published, the last in July 1946. It covered events in Britain and throughout the African continent, as well as in West Africa, while several articles were published from the *Moscow New Times*. One important development was the appearance of articles presenting news from French and Belgian colonies in West Africa and written in French, such as Léopold Senghor’s ‘Pour une renaissance africaine’.
explained that it was designed to ‘inspire the youths of Africa for definite political action’, and to ‘arouse in them a burning desire for freedom as well as bitterness against imperialism’.11

The other members of the WANS included Nii Odoi Annan, a student at Edinburgh University and Mrs Olabisi Awooner-Renner, who appears to have been the only female, although Enith H. Wallace-Johnson wrote ‘A message to African women’ in the first edition of The New African.12 Although the WANS was imbued with the spirit of Manchester it was also influenced by the Marxism of the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB). According to Nii Odoi Annan, he, Nkrumah, Awooner-Renner, Akpata, Botsio and others were connected with the Africa sub-committee of the CPGB and had also formed ‘The Circle’, a small, secret, organizing ‘vanguard group’ within the WASU and the WANS.13 According to Nkrumah, who was the group’s chairman, they ‘began to train themselves in order to be able to commence revolutionary work in any part of the African continent’.14 The Circle’s ultimate aim was a ‘Union of African Socialist Republics’, and in 1946 the WANS published the collected thoughts of Awooner-Renner contained in a pamphlet entitled West African Soviet Union.15 Nkrumah’s own thinking at this time is perhaps best summed up in his publication Towards Colonial Freedom, which he concludes with the words ‘the goal of the national liberation movement is the realization of complete and unconditional independence, and the building of a society of peoples in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all. Peoples of the colonies, unite: the working men of all countries are behind you’.16

The WANS immediately began to campaign for its aims, sending correspondence condemning colonialism to the newly formed United Nations (UN) and gaining support in West Africa, the United States and Britain. It often acted jointly with the WASU, announcing to the world that it stood for the ‘complete liquidation of the colonial system’ and looked forward to the independence and industrialization of West Africa as one united country. Once free, the WANS envisaged, West Africa would then ‘pull the rest of Africa with her’, so it appealed to all Africans to join its ranks.17 Its most significant activity involved sending Nkrumah to Paris in May 1946 to meet with the African members of the French National Assembly, including Sourou-Mignan Apithy (1913–1989), Léopold Senghor and Félix Houphouet-Boigny (1905–1993), as well as other Francophone Africans. Nkrumah’s visit was reciprocated and other British-based West Africans also travelled to Paris, so the aim of uniting West Africans irrespective of colonial boundaries began to gain momentum. When Apithy spoke at a joint WANS/WASU conference on ‘Unity and Independence of All West Africa’ in 1946 he referred to the ‘unnatural frontiers separating Africans’, and argued that ‘all Africans should be united as one African community’.18 This conference began preparations for a constitutional convention, or All West African National Congress in Lagos, Nigeria, in 1948 to be preceded by a further gathering in Europe in 1947, as a step towards West African unity.
and independence but with the ultimate aim of a United Socialist States of Africa. Although initially planned to take place in Paris, a second West African conference was held in London in 1947 at which Senghor was one of the principal speakers.19

This was the period following the founding of the Rassemblement Démocratique Africain (RDA) the Pan-African anti-colonial organization established in 1946 throughout French West and Equatorial Africa. The RDA was initiated by Houphouet-Boigny with the support of other anti-colonial politicians including Apithy and Gabriel D’Arboussier (1908–1976) but it was divided from the start by differing views on which alliances to pursue in the French National Assembly and whether to demand independence from France, as well as by local rivalries. It also often suffered from repression from the colonial authorities. Nonetheless, its formation simulated the activities and founding of several other Pan-African organizations in France.

Elaborate plans were made for the West African congress, appeals for funds were launched and it was envisaged that delegates would be sent from every West African colony. Nkrumah wrote at the time that ‘A united, free and independent West Africa is the political condition for Africa’s redemption and emancipation, for the emancipation of the Africans and peoples of African descent throughout the world.’ However, despite some support in Nigeria the congress did not take place because both funding and organization were entirely inadequate, indeed the WANS did not even have funds for its activities in Britain.20 Nkrumah’s return to the Gold Coast in 1947, as well as the departure of other members, was also an impediment. Although the WANS continued its existence in Britain for some years its Pan-Africanist activities were somewhat curtailed.

The Pan-African Federation and Pan-Africa

The work of the Pan-African Federation (PAF) following the Manchester congress initially focused on promoting the resolutions of the congress as widely as possible, especially in the colonial press. A press conference was organized for Du Bois and a lengthy telegram was sent to the British government’s Colonial Office outlining some of the demands made in Manchester. The PAF also published Padmore’s edited accounts of the founding of the World Federation of Trade Unions and the Manchester congress: The Voice of Coloured Labour: Speeches and Reports of Colonial Delegates to the World Trade Union Conference, 1945 and Colonial and Coloured Unity – A Programme of Action: History of the Pan-African Congress, which included additional material written by Du Bois.21 Various public meetings and even demonstrations were organized. PAF activities often involved organizing local protest actions in Britain, or involvement with local bodies such as the newly formed Asiatic-African United Front Committee, which organized a meeting on Sudan, the renamed British
Centre for Colonial Freedom, as well as with the WANS and the League of Coloured Peoples (LCP). In this period, much of the PAF's work was undertaken by Makonnen and Milliard in Manchester, as well as by Padmore, Peter Abrahams and Dorothy Pizer, who provided unpaid secretarial services, in London. International activities were organized with a variety of organizations in relation to South Africa, with the Jamaican Trade Union Congress in support of striking workers in Jamaica, as well as in support of press freedom in West Africa.

Padmore continued to develop his global networks and write for the colonial and African American press. He initially kept in close contact with Du Bois, as well as others in the United States, and urged him to popularize the decisions of the Manchester congress. Du Bois reported some progress but claimed that his activities in this regard were thwarted by the jealousies that existed amongst rival ‘Negro organisations’, as well as opposition within the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) to an ‘American Pan-African Movement’. Du Bois, as ‘President of the Pan-African Congress’, attempted to speak for Africa and the diaspora at the UN Assembly. However, he was eventually only able to submit a ‘Memorandum to the UNO’, based on the deliberations at Manchester, demanding the right of Africans to speak for themselves at the UN and signed by organizations in Britain, the United States, Anglophone Africa and the Caribbean.

Padmore was initially upbeat concerning their joint activity. In one letter to Du Bois he commented, ‘ideologically speaking, Pan-Africanism, it can safely be said, has found wide response throughout the world’. There is some truth in these remarks since in the United States the immediate post-war period ushered in a high point of Pan-Africanism, illustrated by the collaboration between the NAACP, the Council on African Affairs (CAA) and others that had led to the convening of a colonial conference in New York in April 1945. This gathering had included representatives from African, Caribbean and Asian countries, including Kwame Nkrumah, and agreed on anti-colonial resolutions to put before the UN. The CAA also circulated its own petition calling for African self-determination and self-government and subsequently forward it to the president of the United States. Du Bois, acting on behalf of the PAF encouraged several African American organizations including the CAA, the National Council of Negro Women, the Southern Negro Youth Congress and others to support the ‘Memorandum to the UNO’. The CAA, as well as other organizations, also supported the 1945 general strike in Nigeria and began to actively support the ANC, famine relief and the 1946 miner’s strike in South Africa, as well as opposing plans by the South African government to annex South West Africa (Namibia). In the immediate post-war period the CAA led initially by Paul Robeson, Alphaeus Hunton (1903–1970) and Max Yergan, and after 1948 by Robeson, Hunton and Du Bois emerged as the most significant African American-led organization focusing on the rights of Africans and was consequently the most persecuted by the authorities in the
United States. The CAA was persecuted as part of the Cold War offensive by the government of the United States on all individuals and organizations that were in opposition to foreign policy of the United States, or were accused of links to the international communist movement. The CAA’s publication *New Africa* was also banned from many African colonies by the colonial authorities as well as in South Africa, while both Robeson and Du Bois had their passports confiscated by the US government. Ultimately the CAA was crippled by the legal costs of defending itself against the US government and the attacks on its leaders and was forced to dissolve itself in 1955.29

Perhaps the most significant activity of the PAF was the publication of *Pan-Africa: A Monthly Journal of African Life, History and Thought* in January 1947. This was largely the work of Makonnen, aided initially by Peter Abrahams and subsequently by Dinah Stock, an English woman, who as a friend of Kenyatta had assisted him with the writing of *Facing Mount Kenya*, and in the second issue of *Pan-Africa* was acknowledged as executive editor. Associate editors included Nkrumah, Padmore, Kenyatta and others based in England, Africa and the Caribbean. Although no women were listed as associate editors they certainly wrote for the journal and the second edition includes an article on ‘Colour Persecution on Tyneside’ credited to Mary Winters. Makonnen remained publisher and managing editor and established a mail order Pan-African Bookshop as well as an actual bookshop, named the *Economist*, situated near Manchester University. The aims of *Pan-Africa* were ‘to act as a link between all peoples and between peoples of African origin in particular’.30 Initial subscribers were also entitled to a free copy of Padmore’s most recent book *How Russia Transformed Her Colonial Empire – A Challenge to Britain*, or a choice of several other books in the ‘Panaf Educational Series’. In addition to *Pan-Africa*, therefore, Makonnen also established a Pan-African publishing company with himself, Padmore, Kenyatta and Milliard as directors and with capital from the numerous restaurants and clubs that he had established in Manchester.31

Indeed, *Pan-Africa* provides a useful indication of PAF activities and concerns at the time. One special edition in the autumn of 1947, entitled *Nigerian Prospect* and available in Britain and the United States, was devoted to information concerning the visit to Britain of a delegation of the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons (NCNC), headed by Azikiwe, to protest attempts to impose an undemocratic constitution on Nigeria. The delegation received considerable support in Britain from the WANS, the WASU and others. Padmore and the PAF worked closely with it, publicized its aims and activities and encouraged a national speaking tour, ‘to appeal to the common people of Britain’, when the Colonial Secretary rejected demands for a new constitution and ‘immediate steps to self-government’. *Pan-Africa* provided an analysis of the tour and the NCNC’s demands, a lengthy interview with the delegation and other relevant material.32
Other editions of *Pan-Africa* highlighted its concern with the African continent but there were also articles focusing on the Caribbean and African Americans. There were, for example, articles on Ethiopia at the Paris Peace Conference, on opposition to continued French colonial rule in Tunisia and on the struggles for independence in Sudan, where the PAF was in close contact with the Sudanese Umma Party and the Sudan Independence Front. One edition of *Pan-Africa* reprints the ‘Declaration to the Nations of the World’, sent to the newly formed UN by the South Africa’s Non-European Unity Committee, which claimed to speak for 8 million disenfranchised people. There were also important articles relating to the PAF’s activity in opposition to racism in Britain, especially that perpetrated by the police, ‘local authorities and officials’ against Somali and other seamen. Makonnen clearly aimed to make *Pan-Africa* and other associated publications widely available. However, it became unsustainable, not least because in many colonies it had been banned, and ceased publication in early 1948 at the same time as the cessation of the activities of the PAF.

**Nkrumah and the Kumasi Conference**

Nkrumah returned to the Gold Coast from Britain in November 1947 at the invitation of the United Gold Coast Convention (UGCC) to become that organization’s general secretary. It was a period of rapid political change and within two years Nkrumah greatly expanded the UGCC, founded the *Accra Evening News* and the Committee on Youth Organisation, began to call for immediate self-government and eventually formed his own political party, the Convention People’s Party (CPP). In the following two years, Nkrumah and the CPP greatly accelerated the demands for self-government. Their demands were backed with the threat of a campaign of ‘Positive Action’, a civil disobedience campaign inspired by anti-colonial actions in India, including agitation and propaganda and ‘as a last resort, the constitutional application of strikes, boycotts, and non-cooperation based on the principles of absolute non-violence’. ‘Positive Action’ culminated in a general strike, which led to the colonial authorities calling a state of emergency, and the arrest of Nkrumah, as well as other CPP and trade union leaders. Nevertheless, Nkrumah and the CPP still managed to win a landslide victory in the 1951 elections, what Padmore later referred to as ‘the first victory for the ideology of Pan-Africanism’. The CPP reached an accommodation with the colonial authorities that led to Nkrumah’s release from prison and appointment as leader of government business and eventually led to formal independence for a renamed Ghana in March 1957.

It seems that Nkrumah had not lost sight of the aims of the WANS and the Manchester congress in the period immediately following his return to West Africa. Several other members of the WANS had returned with him, including Bankole Awooner-Renner and Kojo Botsio. Nkrumah
also remained in close contact with Padmore, who he viewed as his political adviser, and as early as 1951 the latter explained to Du Bois that immediately following his election victory Nkrumah had ‘agreed to take the initiative of convening a sixth [Pan-African] Congress on African soil later this year’. A few months later Padmore wrote to say that he was about to leave for West Africa ‘to help the comrades there prepare for another meeting of the Congress’. Du Bois in response confided that he wished to write a ‘Declaration of Independence for Africa … with as strong a stand for socialism as possible … I want to make this and a statement that shall be used in the Call for a Sixth Pan-African Congress’. Padmore stayed several months in the Gold Coast and worked closely with Nkrumah and the CPP but no such congress was organized, although there may have been several other attempts in the early 1950s, before Nkrumah finally managed to convene a Pan-African gathering in Kumasi in 1953.

Nkrumah initially called for a conference, to be held in August 1953, of ‘nationalist leaders in West Africa as well as leaders of other organisations against imperialism’. Apparently, participants at this conference would plan for a ‘united West African development and the co-ordination of nationalist movements’. The August conference, eventually held in December, would be the forerunner to a ‘Pan-African Conference in 1954 to discuss Africa as a whole’. It seems that Nkrumah invited several West African leaders including Houphouet-Boigny from the Ivory Coast and Gabriel d’Arboussier (1908–1976), at that time a member of France’s National Assembly. The announcement of the Kumasi conference was widely seen at the time as a step towards a West African Federation, a United States of West Africa and even a unitary African government. The organizers claimed that their aim was the ‘establishment of a strong and truly federal state … Such a state should give hope and create an atmosphere of goodwill among peoples of African descent all over the world.’

In short, the Kumasi gathering was an attempt to reconvene the Lagos conference that had been planned by the WANS in 1948. It was a significant event not only because it was held on the African continent but also because it was organized and supported by an African ‘Prime Minister’ and his ministers. But even in 1953 it seems that Nkrumah and the organizers had very severe difficulties convening such an event in a colony. Several Nigerians were able to participate including Nnamdi Azikiwe, Aminu Kano (1920–1983) and Funmilayo Ransome-Kuti (1900–1978), although it is evident that invitations were sent to many others in West Africa who could not, including Wallace-Johnson, Togolese politician Sylvanus Olympio (1902–1963) and ‘prominent African nationalists in Liberia and the French colonies’. As might be expected, prominent figures from the Gold Coast did attend including Botsio, Ako Adjei and Archie Casely-Hayford (1898–1977). Other attendees included the African American Horace M. Bond (1904–1972), president of Lincoln University, and representatives of the government of Liberia and of Milton Margai from Sierra Leone, who
could not be present. There is no doubt that it was not possible to hold as representative a conference as was intended, although Nkrumah concluded that it had been a ‘step in preparing for the liberation of Africa’. He told the participants that they had gathered in the spirit of the National Congress of British West Africa and that West Africans should be ‘a shining light to our oppressed brothers, not only in Africa, but in other parts of the world’. Azikiwe also spoke strongly in favour of West African unity and there was general agreement on the need for a West African federation.

A West African National Congress was formally established at the conference, whilst during it Azikiwe, Ransome-Kuti and others addressed thousands of Gold Coasters in a public rally. Padmore clearly considered it a significant event and in a telegram proposed that the Pan-African Congress should transfer its headquarters to Accra. In a series of articles in the local press he recommended the formation of political parties that would unify all in the colonies and which were ‘beyond tribal loyalties and reflect the social, political and economic hopes of the common people’. He added that ‘in their endeavours to create modern states … African leaders must always keep in view the objective of a Federated West Africa, the precursor of a United States of Africa’.

It is interesting to note that in 1954 following the Kumasi conference Padmore again wrote to Du Bois explaining that Nkrumah planned ‘to convene a Sixth Pan-African Congress in the Gold Coast as soon as independence is formally declared’. He added by way of elaboration, ‘We cannot do it before as we don’t want to create undue alarm before we have full power in our hands.’ On this occasion, Du Bois replied ‘I sincerely hope that a Sixth Pan-African Congress can be held soon.’ It seems that Nkrumah had already been contacted by UNIA leader William L. Sherrill and British politician Fenner Brockway of the Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism (COPAI), regarding a possible future Pan-African conference, and began making plans for an ‘All Africa Conference’ and for a publication entitled United Africa in 1955 following the Bandung Conference.

Du Bois had also been contacted by Walter Sisulu, secretary-general of the ANC in South Africa, who suggested ‘there is a greater need of the Pan-African Congress being summoned now than ever before’, and concluded, ‘I am convinced that a Pan-African Conference will be welcome to all the struggling peoples of Africa for the purpose of a coordinated effort against their oppressors and other imperialist powers.’ Sisulu had evidently contacted a range of organizations in Africa, and it is interesting to note these Pan-African concerns of the ANC some years before Robert Sobukwe (1924–1978) and others felt compelled to leave it and in 1959 founded the Pan-Africanist Congress in South Africa to struggle for ‘Africanist Socialist Democracy’. However, it seems that ANC plans for a Pan-African gathering eventually came to naught. Tentative plans for an All-Africa conference from the Europe-based COPAI, in which Padmore was also involved, that claimed to have secured some support from ‘national
democratic movements’ in Kenya, Uganda and North Africa also failed to materialize. Nevertheless, the British Colonial Office remained concerned about such apparently connected activities, which reflected the growing strength and unity of the anti-colonial movements in Africa.

Labour Pan-Africanism and the Cold War

The difficulties Nkrumah and the CPP experienced in the Gold Coast were exacerbated by the Cold War and the attempts of the British government and its allies to make sure that formal political independence would only be granted to ‘responsible’ leaders. British military intervention in British Guiana in 1953 and the declaration of the State of Emergency in Kenya highlighted the repressive measures that might be taken in this regard. The British colonial authorities were particularly alarmed by international organizations that were considered to be under the influence or control of communists, such as the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU). In the Gold Coast the colonial authorities targeted those they labelled as ‘communists’, initially including Nkrumah himself and then militant trade unionists such as Anthony Kobina Woode (1923–1986) who sought to organize workers independently of the CPP and ‘responsible’ trade unionism, and who were in constant contact with the WFTU. Nkrumah’s relationship with Padmore was also closely monitored by the British ‘security services’ but not seen as subversive as external communist connections. The British TUC along with the US-based Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) had initially supported the founding of the WFTU but by 1949 both bodies under the influence of their respective governments had created a split in the WFTU and subsequently formed the rival anti-communist International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU). By 1949 the WFTU had already begun to play an important role in supporting workers in Africa, the Caribbean and elsewhere both at its founding conferences and subsequently with a commitment to opposing colonial rule.

The WFTU organized two separate Pan-African trade union conferences. The first held in April 1947 in Dakar, Senegal, included sixty trade union representatives from twenty-five different African trade union centres in Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Gambia, South Africa and many French colonies including Algeria, Cameroun, Tunisia, Morocco, Madagascar, Senegal, Ivory Coast, Mauritania, French Congo as well as the Belgian Congo. Indeed, it was perhaps the most representative Pan-African gathering yet convened, although excluding those from the diaspora, and the first to be held on the African continent. Its convening owed much to the French trade union centre, the Confédération Générale du Travail (CGT), although many of the colonial trade unions were directly affiliated to the WFTU. The Dakar conference was mainly concerned with economic and social conditions on the continent and strengthening the trade union centres, most of which
were less than ten years old. At the same time, it also highlighted the racism that existed in the trade union movement in such places as South Africa and Northern Rhodesia. Paradoxically the conference did not focus on colonialism directly but demanded that African workers must be entitled to the same rights and social programmes as existed for workers in the imperialist countries, such as Britain, France and Belgium. It condemned all forms of racial discrimination, especially in South Africa, and demanded the creation of an All-African trade union movement. Two years after this conference Abdoulaye Diallo, from the French Soudan, was elected vice-president of the WFTU and served in that position for several years.55

After the split in 1949 the WFTU decided to intensify its work in Africa and in January 1951 the WFTU Preparatory Committee of the Pan-African Trade Union Conference met at the WFTU headquarters in Paris to organize a second conference in Douala, French Cameroun, even though the colonial authorities had refused permission. The WFTU prepared to organize protests against the French colonial authorities and expressed the view that the planned conference would help to develop the trade union movement and the unity of all workers and would ‘provide powerful support for the working masses fighting against colonial exploitation and for peace’.56 The Preparatory Committee comprised the leading figures in the WFTU, as well as trade union representatives from both the British Cameroons and French Cameroun, South Africa, French Soudan, Dahomey, Madagascar and Tunisia. A key member of the Committee was Desmond Buckle, originating from the Gold Coast and an alternate member of the executive of the WFTU, he represented the Transvaal Council of Non-European Trade Unions, a body that was prevented from sending its own representative. Buckle was also a well-known member of the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) whose activities were closely monitored by the British security services. The proposed Douala conference was clearly planned in opposition to the ICFTU and to expose the nature of French colonial rule in what was technically a territory under UN trusteeship. More generally it was an anti-colonial conference aiming to focus on the exploitative role of the major colonial powers in Africa. In response several British colonial authorities, including Nigeria and Northern Rhodesia, simply banned the importation of any information about the planned conference. Nevertheless, the WFTU continued with its Pan-African activities in Africa, as well as with attempts to work with trade unions in the Caribbean, and decided that the proposed conference should take place in Bamako, Mali in October 1951.57

Although efforts were made to gain the support of the NCNC almost all of the 142 delegates at the Bamako conference originated from French colonies in Africa. In addition to Abdoulaye Diallo and Bakary-Djibo, who were both key figures in the WFTU, the most prominent trade union leader present was Sékou Touré (1922–1984) from Guinée. The French colonial authorities had permitted the conference to be held in the hope that Sékou Touré would demand the creation of a Pan-African trade union movement
that was independent of the WFTU and the CGT. However, perhaps the main significance of the conference was its success in preventing an immediate split. This came later in 1955 when Touré and others formed the Confédération Générale du Travail-Autonome and in 1957 the more inclusive Union Générale des Travailleurs d’Afrique Noire (UGTAN). Although the WFTU Pan-African conferences had minimal impact in the British colonies in Africa, British colonial authorities were still wary of the WFTU and the possibility that it would establish a new colonial department under the Jamaican Ferdinand Smith, who in 1953 was banned from entering British colonies in West Africa. In 1954 Nkrumah’s Gold Coast government was also pressured to take measures to ban ‘communist’ publications, ban certain individuals from travelling abroad and prevent those labelled as communists being employed in the civil service. Anthony Woode was suspended from the CPP, allegedly for attending a meeting of the WFTU, and other radicals expelled. At the same time the Gold Coast Trade Union Congress joined the ICFTU.

Pan-Africanism or Communism

It was in the context of the Cold War that George Padmore wrote his most famous book Pan-Africanism or Communism: The Coming Struggle for Africa. Published in 1956, the book was dedicated to ‘the Youth of Africa – the Torchbearers of Pan-Africanism’, and included a foreword by Padmore’s friend Richard Wright (1908–1960) who had already spied on Padmore, Nkrumah and the CPP for the government of the United States during his visit to the Gold Coast in 1953. The book was initially intended to show that Africans had developed their own liberation movements, free of the influence of communism, an influence and inspiration that was alleged during the Cold War in order to discredit them. Padmore acknowledged that ‘Pan-Africanism recognises much that is true in the Marxist interpretation of history’, but added that it ‘refuses to accept the pretentious claims of doctrinaire Communism, that it alone has the solution to all the complex racial, tribal, and socio-economic problems facing Africa’. Ignoring his own communist past, Padmore presented communism as a spectre that might prove attractive to Africans if the imperialist powers did not grant speedy independence, or if African governments were unable to satisfy ‘the wants and material needs of the common people, which revolve primarily around food, clothing and shelter’. Nevertheless, he concluded that ‘in the coming struggle for Africa, the issue … will be between Pan-Africanism and Communism’.

Student Pan-Africanism

Certainly, these were the two major anti-colonial ideologies at the time, both posing a threat to the machinations of the United States and the colonial powers, as the First Pan-African Student Conference demonstrated. That
conference was held at Makerere College, Uganda in July 1958, under the auspices of the CIA backed International Student Conference (ISC). It was jointly funded from that source and by the British colonial authorities, who believed it prudent to allow it to take place where it could be closely monitored. The latter managed to prevent the participation of the International Union of Students (IUS), which was considered a ‘communist front’ organization, even though it had been invited by the organizers. The organizing committee consisted of the national student bodies of Nigeria, Tunisia, Sudan and South Africa which invited student organizations in Africa as well as those in France, the United States, Ireland, India and Britain. As a result, attending the conference were students from South Africa, Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Sudan, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, Ethiopia, Liberia, Nigeria, Ghana, French West Africa and Uganda as well as the Fédération des Etudiants Noire en France (FEANF), and the Association des Etudiants d’Origine Malgache. The conference was opened by the Ugandan Apollo Kironde (1915–2007) and the Kenyan Tom Mboya (1930–1969), the latter also speaking about Pan-Africanism and communism. Although much of the conference reflected Cold War tensions and the rivalry between the ISC and the IUS, it also reflected the students’ strong anti-colonial and anti-racist sympathies.63

French and Francophone student organizations had been particularly active both in France and West Africa following the founding of the RDA. Its activities were supported in France by the Association Générale des Etudiants Africain de Paris (AGEAP), founded in 1946, with independence as its main aim, and FEANF, a federation of fourteen student organizations, and the RDA’s own student organization, Association des Etudiants du RDA (AERDA) both established in 1950. Unlike the RDA itself, the AERDA continued to maintain links with the French Communist Party as did FEANF and both were close to the IUS.64 FEANF also established a working relationship with the WASU in London. From 1952 AERDA published the influential La voix de l’Afrique noire, which was edited by Cheikh Anta Diop and often reflected his view on the cultural and political unity of Africa, and the ‘African origin of civilization’, as well as his implied critique of Négritude.65

The IUS was invited to the founding of the West African Students’ Confederation (WASC) in Ghana in 1963 along with student unions from Ghana, Nigeria, Liberia, Gambia, Sierra Leone and Cameroon. Also attending were representatives of the WASU, FEANF, the Union Générale des Etudiants d’Afrique Occidentale (UGEAO), a pan-West African student organization formed in Senegal in 1954 and the National Union of Basutoland Students. However, the WASC was already also in contact with student unions in Angola, Mozambique, southern Rhodesia and South Africa, as well as student organizations in Europe, China and North America. The students present condemned racism, colonialism and neo-colonialism and the undemocratic actions of some African governments, especially those in Francophone Africa. They urged African and ‘world student’ unity,
demanded the establishment of a West African University and viewed the Confederation as a step towards the creation of the Pan-African Student Movement the following year.

A Pan-African Student Movement (MPE) was created a year later at the Pan-African Students’ Conference held in Nairobi, Kenya in 1964. This was attended by student union organizations from some twenty-four African countries, as well as the WASU, FEANF, the Prague-based Union of African Students in Europe and Uniao Geral dos Estudantes da Africa Negra sob Dominagao Colonial Portuguesa (UGEAN) the student union representing those in Portugal’s colonies in Africa. Formed in 1961, UGEAN was closely connected with the liberation organizations, MPLA, PAIGC and FRELIMO. Clearly Pan-African in orientation, it was officially formed in Ghana and held its first congress in Morocco. MPE was established to ‘unify the movement of African students’, and ‘to struggle for total and unconditional independence’, including the ‘liquidation of foreign monopolies’.

In this period, African students embraced the demands for political independence and African unity and were often at the forefront of Pan-African organizations on the continent and in the diaspora. One of the most prominent of these was the Committee of African Organisations (CAO). Initially led by members of the WASU it was formed in Britain in 1958 as a coalition of over a dozen African organizations that had worked together to oppose plans to establish a Central African Federation. The CAO aimed to spread ‘the spirit of Pan-Africanism’, and to ‘help keep the conscience of the world alive to problems facing Africa’. It operated as a Pan-African pressure group working with other anti-colonial organizations in Britain and with student bodies such as FEANF abroad, where it established the All-Africa Students’ Union (in Europe). Amongst other things the CAO organized an annual African Freedom Day celebration in Britain, in keeping with the proposals made by the two Accra conferences in 1958 that 15 April should be set aside as a day ‘which all African countries and all friends of Africa throughout the world shall observe as a rallying point for the forces of freedom’. It also initiated the Anti-Apartheid Movement in Britain, campaigned against racism and with Nkrumah’s support established its own Africa Unity House as a centre for Pan-African discussion and organizing in London. By 1965, as the Council of African Organisations, it included all the main African student organizations in Britain, as well as the South West Africa National Union and National Revolutionary Front for the Liberation of Portuguese Territories. In that year, Malcolm X addressed its first congress just a few weeks before his assassination.

‘Independence is meaningless … ’

Pan-Africanism certainly played a key role in the struggle for political independence in Africa and the anti-colonial struggles in individual
countries also strengthened the Pan-African movement. In 1952 Egypt, which had been nominally independent, but in fact under British colonial rule, witnessed a major crisis which culminated in an anti-British coup, led by Colonel Jamal Abd al-Nasir [Nasser] (1918–1970) and the Society of Free Officers, and the forced abdication of the king. Nasser soon emerged as a leading political figure in Africa, one who took a stand against the old colonial powers of Britain and France, especially over the Suez Canal which the Egyptian government nationalized. The subsequent failed invasion of Egypt in 1956, by Britain, France and Israel, only enhanced Nasser’s anti-imperialist credentials. After his participation in the famous Bandung Conference in 1955, Nasser also began to play a leading role in the emerging ‘Afro-Asian’ bloc of independent nations, and as an anti-colonial spokesman in Pan-African affairs. The Bandung Conference, held in Indonesia in 1955, reflected the growing ‘Afro-Asian’ unity of newly independent countries who wished to assert their opposition both to the old colonial powers and the polemics of the Cold War and asserted emerging ‘Third World’ concerns about economic cooperation and neutrality. Africa was represented by Egypt, Libya, Liberia and Ethiopia at Bandung, although the Gold Coast also sent observers. Two African Americans, Adam Clayton Powell Jr. (1908–1972) and the novelist Richard Wright also attended. The conference communiqué stressed the sovereignty and equality of all nations, as well as the principle of non-interference and symbolized a new ‘Bandung spirit’, that those who constituted the majority in the world would no longer be dictated to by others.

In Africa, Libya achieved formal independence in 1951 and Morocco, Tunisia and Sudan in 1956. However, it was Ghana’s independence in March 1957 that was viewed by many throughout Africa and the diaspora as a defining moment. As Padmore expressed it, Ghana was ‘the beacon light guiding an oppressed and exploited race out of the darkness of imperialism into the light of Freedom’.69 It is noteworthy that six years previously, when he had visited the United States, Nkrumah had invited African Americans to return to Africa and help build its future. In subsequent years several prominent African Americans, including Maya Angelou (1928–2014), and Du Bois accepted this offer and relocated to Ghana. From this time Ghana, the first sub-Saharan country to achieve independence, was seen by many in the diaspora, as well as those from the African continent, as a Pan-African base and refuge.70

African Americans, as well as several from the Caribbean, were also invited to Ghana’s independence celebrations including Du Bois, who could not attend since the United States government had confiscated his passport. Attendees included Martin Luther King (1929–1968), A. Phillip Randolph (1889–1979), Maida Springer (1910–2005), Ralph Bunche (1904–1971), Adam Clayton Powell Jr., Norman Manley (1893–1969) and Padmore, who had become Nkrumah’s official Adviser on African Affairs. Nkrumah’s remarks on that occasion are now well-known and suggest that he saw
Ghana’s independence as an historic step for all of the African continent and all Africans, a view he had earlier expressed in his ‘motion of destiny’ speech in 1953 and a sentiment with which he concluded his Autobiography. He quoted from Garvey in celebrating the achievement of ‘a government of a black people’ and declared:

Today, from now on, there is a new African in the world, and so that new African is ready to fight his own battles and show that after all the black man is capable of managing his own affairs. We are going to demonstrate to the world, to the other nations, young as we are, that we are prepared to lay our own foundation.

He then added further Pan-African sentiments: ‘We have done the battle and we again re-dedicate ourselves not only in the struggle to emancipate other countries in Africa. Our independence is meaningless unless it is linked up with the total liberation of the African continent.’

Just over a year after independence, Padmore and Nkrumah organized the First Conference of Independent African States in Accra, in April 1958, another significant Pan-African event signifying that indeed Pan-Africanism had returned to Africa. Delegates from Ethiopia, Libya, Tunisia, Morocco, Liberia, Sudan and the United Arab Republic attended the conference which was designed to coordinate foreign policy between the eight states. It was, Nkrumah told the participants, ‘the first time in history that representatives of independent sovereign States in Africa are meeting together with the aim of forging closer links of friendship, brotherhood, co-operation and solidarity between them’. The conference declaration is perhaps most noteworthy for the repeated use of the term ‘African Personality’, or a distinct African ‘unity of outlook’, which the signatories pledged to assert ‘on the side of peace’, as well as for constant reference to the historic Bandung Conference in 1955, which had asserted Asian-African unity and had taken a stand against the interference of the big powers. In addition, there was a pledge in support of African independence and self-determination, in support of the struggle of the Algerian people and against colonialism. Nkrumah and Padmore intended that African states should provide ‘all possible assistance’ to those still struggling for independence in Africa. The declaration also expressed its opposition to racism, especially in South Africa, and its support of nuclear disarmament. The delegates also pledged to coordinate economic planning and cooperation and there were commitments to encourage educational and cultural exchanges and the study of African history and cultures. Finally, the delegates agreed that such a conference should be held every two years.

Soon after the historic conference, Nkrumah and Padmore toured the other independent African states to consolidate the advances already made. The year ended with the historic All-African Peoples Conference held in Accra in December, yet another historic Pan-African gathering organized by Padmore, with a team including African Americans Bill Sutherland, St
Clair Drake and others, for political parties, unions, youth and women’s movements from across the continent. Among the delegates were Patrice Lumumba (1925–1961), Joshua Nkomo (1917–1999), Hastings Banda (1898–1997) and Kenneth Kaunda (1924–), Félix-Roland Moumié (1926–1960) and Holden Roberto (1923–2007). The ANC was banned from attending by the South African government but there was also a delegation from that country including the novelist Es’kia Mphahlele (1919–2008), who later wrote an account of the proceedings. In addition, there were delegations from the FLN in Algeria, Nigeria, Egypt, Kenya, including Tom Mboya, Togo, Senegal, Cameroun and many other countries as well as observers from the Soviet Union, China and the United States. Both Eslanda Robeson (1895–1965) and Shirley Graham Du Bois (1896–1977) were present. At the conference it was announced that a union had been formed between Ghana and Sékou Touré’s Guinée, both to save the latter from bankruptcy and to create the conditions for a wider African union. The two countries planned to coordinate defence, foreign and economic policies.

If the aim of the conference was to further build African unity and to find ways to strengthen the continental anti-colonial struggle there were also points of difference, if not of disunity. Already there were tensions over which countries should lead the struggle for African unity and independence, while the non-violence that had hitherto been a central tenet of Nkrumah’s Pan-Africanism was contested by those who had been forced to take up arms to free themselves as in Algeria and Kenya. The ‘highlight’ according to Mphahlele was a speech by Frantz Fanon (1925–1961), the writer from Martinique who had joined the Algerian liberation struggle but was largely unknown internationally at that time. He argued that all forms of struggle must be employed: ‘If Africa is awakening it must not make apologies or entreaties. We must wrest by force what belongs to us. No African must regard himself as demobilized from the struggle so long as any foreign nation dominates any part of Africa. All forms of struggle must be adopted, not excluding violence.’

Some organizations, such as the Pan-African movement for East and Central Africa (PAFMECA) formed at a conference in Tanganyika in September 1958, acted almost as a separate entity in Accra. PAFMECA was a loose grouping of political parties in Tanganyika, Kenya, Uganda, Northern and Southern Rhodesia, Nyasaland and Zanzibar, formed to ‘foster the spirit of Pan-Africanism in order to rid East and Central African territories of imperialism, white supremacy, economic exploitation and social degradation’. Its main leaders were Julius Nyerere (1922–1999), one of the founders of the Tanganyika African National Union, and Tom Mboya and it also had links with organizations in Mozambique, South Africa, French Congo and Ruanda-Urundi. By 1960 the PAFMECA leaders were advocating an East African Federation of Tanganyika, Kenya, Uganda and Zanzibar and Nyerere argued that such regional unity should be established even before political independence as a bulwark against the ‘balkanization’ of Africa.
The views of PAFMECA suggested that there were likely to be differing Pan-African visions and competing claims for leadership in Africa involving Nkrumah, Nasser, Nyerere and others. Even Padmore admitted that ‘though Pan-Africanism is widely believed in, we just do not know what we want specifically or how to get it’. However, the 1958 conference has since been viewed as historic and its quality is perhaps best summed up by Patrice Lumumba who declared on behalf of the Congolese National Movement:

This historical conference, which puts us in contact with experienced political figures from all the African countries and from all over the world, reveals one thing to us: despite the boundaries that separate us, despite our ethnic differences, we have the same awareness, the same soul plunged day and night in anguish, the same anxious desire to make this African continent a free and happy continent that has rid itself of unrest and of fear and of any sort of colonialist domination.

The conference also established Ghana not only as a base for Pan-Africanism and building African unity but also as a rallying point for anti-colonial forces in other parts of the continent. It resolved to establish a permanent All-African People’s Organisation and secretariat in Accra to ‘accelerate the liberation of Africa from Imperialism and colonialism’, and to create the conditions for ‘the emergence of a United States of Africa’, or what was also referred to as a ‘Pan-African Commonwealth of Free States’.

A second All-African People’s Conference was held in Tunis in 1960 and a third in Cairo in 1961. These gatherings were held at a time when some twenty African countries were still not independent, so much of the discussion and the ‘General Resolution’ in Tunis focused on the anti-colonial struggle and a condemnation of the imperialist countries, especially France and Portugal, as well as South Africa and ‘settler colonialism’ in Kenya, South West Africa and the Central African Federation. In addition, the Tunis conference strongly recommended further economic integration and the establishing of an African Common Market and agreed to convene a Festival of African Youth in Conakry in 1961. The conference directed special condemnation at France for its colonialist activities in Algeria and Cameroun. The Cairo conference discussed similar issues and therefore reaffirmed decisions and resolutions agreed at the previous conferences. In addition, there was an important resolution condemning neo-colonialism, ‘the survival of the colonial system in spite of formal recognition of political independence in emerging countries which become the victims of an indirect and subtle form of domination by political, economic, social, military or technical means’. The conference identified African unity, as well as the ‘mobilisation of the African masses’, as key to the struggle against neo-colonialism. In this connection, the conference called for conferences of African trade unions, women’s associations, youth associations and farmers’ associations.
Pan-African labour

The unity of African workers was a subject discussed at all three All-African People’s conferences. The Tunis conference passed a ‘Resolution on the Unity of African Trade Union Organisations’ and hailed the convening of the planned African Trade Union Congress in Casablanca in May 1960. The Cairo conference called ‘for the immediate launching of the All-Africa Trade Union Federation as an effective means of counteracting neocolonialism’. When UGTAN had been formed by Sékou Touré and others in 1957, its declared aim was to ‘unite and organize the workers of black Africa, to coordinate their trade union activities in the struggle against the colonial regime and all other forms of exploitation … and to affirm the personality of African trade unionism’. However, UGTAN was limited to Francophone West Africa and even there it faced severe difficulties. In Ghana, with Nkrumah’s blessing, the ICFTU had gained a foothold and held its first regional conference in Accra in 1957, attended by delegates from seventeen African countries. After independence and the first All-African People’s Conference, Nkrumah began to call for an African trade union movement linked with the struggle for ‘political freedom, independence and unity’ and not affiliated to ‘non-African bodies’, in other words independent of the Cold War rivalry that existed between the WFTU and ICFTU. Initially it seems that the Ghana Trade Union Congress attempted to secure Nigerian support to found a West African Federation of Trade Unions. It joined UGTAN, disaffiliated from the ICFTU and subsequently, in November 1959, hosted a meeting to organize an All-African Trade Union Federation (AATUF). That meeting, which included representatives from the trade union congresses of Ghana, Nigeria, Egypt, Algeria, Morocco and the UGTAN, planned a founding conference of the AATUF in Casablanca in May 1960. However, the founders of the AATUF encountered opposition from those, such as Tom Mboya and the Kenya Federation of Labour, who while recognizing the need for an AATUF did not see this as incompatible with adherence to ICFTU. Both sides stressed the importance of a ‘Pan-African Trade Union Federation’, but those who also supported close links with the ICFTU, which was dominated by the trade union centres of North America and Western Europe, began to accuse some African countries of creating splits in the ‘African Labour front’, and converting trade unions ‘into an arm of Government administration … a particularly dangerous threat to free and democratic trade unionism’. This situation was made more complicated by the fact that there was sometimes more than one trade union centre in African countries such as Nigeria, Morocco and South Africa and that both between and even within these centres differing views existed. There was general agreement that the AATUF should not affiliate to any international trade union organization, the question was whether national centres could still maintain that right.
These differences had not been fully resolved by the time the founding conference of the AATUF was finally convened in Casablanca in May 1961. The final decisions of the conference were then passed by acclamation rather than by a vote and allegations of irregularity dogged the proceedings. As a result, most African trade union centres did not accept membership of the AATUF and many criticized the proceedings. One of the most vociferous was Mboya who claimed that although he supported Pan-Africanism and the AATUF, he was concerned that the AATUF reflected splits amongst African states. In response John Tettegah of the Ghana TUC accused one rival trade union leader who did not wish to disaffiliate from the ICFTU of being ‘an imperialist puppet’, and threatened that the AATUF would wage ‘total war’ on those centres that refused to disaffiliate. It appeared that the AATUF was most closely linked to the Casablanca Group of more radical African states, although it also gained support from the WFTU. When in 1962 the new African Trade Union Confederation (ATUC) was founded in Dakar, led by trade unionists from Senegal, Kenya and Tunisia, over half of its members were affiliated to the ICFTU. In short, the rivalry between the AATUF and those who adhered to the ICFTU continued, even after the founding of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) in 1963, although African trade union support for the ICFTU, increasingly identified with the United States, the AFL-CIO and the CIA, declined. Within a few years, the AATUF again grew closer to the WFTU. The unity of African workers in one Pan-African labour organization as envisaged by Nkrumah and the All-African People’s Conference had not yet been possible.

The road to the OAU

Nkrumah’s Ghana had taken the lead in developing a new Pan-African continental unity both through the union with Guinea, which was codified in May 1959, and as the leading force in the two conferences held in Accra in 1958. The Ghana–Guinea Union was open to all independent African states, or federations, and was seen as the start of a Union of Independent African States with common economic, political and foreign policies. In July 1959 the heads of state of Ghana, Guinea and Liberia met in Sanniquellie, Liberia, to further discuss the nature of their proposed Union. The Sanniquellie Declaration that emerged from these talks referred to ‘The Community of Independent African States’ and stressed that each member ‘shall maintain its own national identity and constitutional structure’. It indicated that the ‘Community’ was not designed ‘to prejudice the present or future international policies, relations and obligations of the states involved’. Rather than the political unity of the Ghana–Guinea Union what was now emphasized was a looser economic cooperation and it seems that Nkrumah was prepared to accept this more flexible approach in order to assuage the concerns of countries such as Liberia. The Declaration also
proposed that a conference of independent African states, and those soon to be independent, would be held in 1960 ‘to discuss and work out a Charter which will achieve their ultimate goal of unity between independent African states’.93

In June 1960 the Second Conference of Independent African States was held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. This group now included the Provisional Government of Algeria, Nigeria, Somalia, Guinea, Cameroun, Togo and Congo, although the latter two did not attend. The representative of Ghana made clear that country’s commitment to a political Union of African States but accepted that a start might be made with an ‘Association’ based on ‘economic or cultural co-operation’. That was a minority view, however, and was most strongly opposed by Nigeria. The representative of that country asserted that it too wished to promote Pan-Africanism as ‘the only solution to our problems in Africa’, but believed that ‘the idea of forming a Union of African States is premature’. Nigeria, like Liberia, was not prepared to surrender its sovereignty in a political union.94 The differences between the approaches of Ghana and Nigeria highlighted key differences which divided the African states and were based as much on the pressures exerted on them by former colonial masters as by political rivalries, border disputes and other differences. The Nigerian representative had famously warned that ‘if anybody makes the mistake of feeling that he is a Messiah who has got a mission to lead Africa the whole purpose of Pan-Africanism will, I fear be defeated’.95 However, even this apparently veiled personal attack on Nkrumah reflected what has come to be seen as a split between radical and conservative African governments.

The Congo crisis also erupted in 1960. It was engineered by the governments of the United States, Belgium and others to prevent that country’s genuine independence and culminated in the death of the Congo’s first elected prime minister, Patrice Lumumba. He had proclaimed the country’s independence from Belgium ‘a decisive step towards the liberation of the whole African continent’, but his aspirations were betrayed by the big powers and the UN.96 Only a few weeks after independence an army mutiny and the secession of the mineral-rich Katanga province were engineered by foreign powers and the Congo entered a state of near anarchy, while the same foreign powers led by the US labelled Lumumba pro-communist. Lumumba called for UN intervention but the military forces that were sent, including those of African countries, were unable to save him or the Congo. His secret assassination carried out with the support of the US and Belgian governments in 1961 was condemned throughout Africa and beyond, as he and the Congo had come to symbolize African unity and independence. It was a particularly major blow for Nkrumah who at the height of the crisis had signed a secret agreement with Lumumba to establish a Union of Africa States. Nkrumah had sent Ghana’s troops to aid Lumumba and the crisis strengthened his view that there was a need for a Pan-African army, an African ‘combined high command’ and joint political action by African
governments to avoid the evils of neo-colonialism, ‘balkanisation, disunity and secession’.97

In December 1960, many of the Francophone African governments that remained closest to France signed the Brazzaville Declaration which, amongst other things, committed them to increase economic cooperation. A few months later in July 1961, Ghana, Guinea and Mali established a Union of African States (UAS), open to all African states and presented as ‘the nucleus of the United States of Africa’. The founders pledged themselves to ‘pool their resources’ and to harmonize their domestic and foreign policy. They also condemned the Brazzaville Group and all groups ‘based on the languages of the colonial powers’ as likely to ‘strengthen neo-colonialism’, and called on those states to ‘follow a higher and more healthy conception of African unity’. The founders also pledged to work jointly to ‘achieve the complete liquidation of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism in Africa’, and to develop the wealth of their countries ‘in the interests of their peoples’.98 Following a second meeting of the UAS in Bamako, Mali, in 1961 the members agreed to establish an African Common Market. Nkrumah certainly hoped that the UAS ‘may prove to be the successful pilot scheme which will lead eventually to full continental unity’.99

Another response to the Brazzaville Group was the convening of a conference in Casablanca by Morocco in January 1961. Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Libya, the United Arab Republic (UAR) and the Provisional Government of Algeria were represented. The Brazzaville Group was not invited although Nigeria, Tunisia, Ethiopia, Liberia, Sudan, Somalia and Togo were but declined to attend. On many questions there was no initial unanimity but the states eventually signed the Casablanca Charter with all but Libya also signing a separate Protocol. The Charter reaffirmed the decisions taken at the previous conferences of independent African states and committed the signatories to ‘liquidate colonialism and neo-colonialism in all their forms’ and to oppose foreign bases and troops and rid the continent of ‘economic interventions and pressures’. It also proposed a permanent African Consultative Assembly and political, economic, military and cultural committees to develop cooperation in these four areas. In particular the participants agreed on the creation of an African High Command and also reached agreement on specific issues relating to the Congo, Algeria, South Africa, nuclear tests in Africa, non-alignment and other matters. The Protocol, which was later signed in Cairo, reaffirmed the common position of the signatories and provided details of how they proposed to develop their cooperation.100 At the conclusion of the conference Nkrumah warned: ‘I can see no security for African states unless African leaders, like ourselves, have realized beyond all doubt that salvation for Africa lies in unity … for in unity lies strength, and as I see it, African states must unite or sell themselves out to imperialist and colonialist exploiters for a mess of potage or disintegrate individually.’101 In regard to political unity, however, Nkrumah spoke for a minority of African leaders. In addition to the leaders of Guinea
and Mali perhaps only Congo’s Patrice Lumumba had similar views. Those
countries represented at Casablanca issued a communique on the situation
in the Congo, threatened to withdraw their troops from the UN intervention
force and demanded the implementation of UN Security Council decisions.
However, they were powerless to defend the independence of the Congo or
the life of Lumumba.

The response to Casablanca was a conference in Monrovia, Liberia, in
May 1961 convened by Senegal, Togo, Nigeria, Ivory Coast and Cameroun.
They were joined by the Brazzaville Group, Somalia, Sierra Leone,
Ethiopia, Libya and Tunisia, although the latter only had observer status.
The Monrovia conference was the largest ever gathering of independent
African states, including most Anglophone and Francophone countries
despite the absence of the invited Casablanca Group. It focused not only
on the question of African unity but also on which countries might play a
leadership role, as well as on common issues of interest such as South Africa,
Angola, the Congo, Algeria and nuclear tests in Africa. In regard to Africa’s
unity the conference condemned ‘outside subversive action by neighbouring
states’, agreed on the need for cooperation and the ‘non-acceptance of any
leadership’. It was particularly concerned that some states were encouraging
‘dissidents’ and ‘subversive activities’ directed against other states, a veiled
criticism of Nkrumah, and concluded that the African unity desired ‘is not
the political integration of sovereign African states but unity of aspirations
and of action considered from the point of view of African social solidarity
and political identity’.

The Monrovia conference led to a major war of words between the
press in Ghana and Nigeria. This highlighted the fears of the former that
the conference participants were too firmly under the influence of the big
powers and the fears of the latter that Nkrumah wished to dominate, but
that his plans for political union had not even been possible in regard to
Ghana and Guinea. Political union was the major question that divided
the African states. Nkrumah was certainly the most vociferous proponent
of political union but perhaps only the governments of Guinea and Mali
demonstrated that they were as equally committed. Indeed in this period
there were differing conceptions of unity and of leadership in Africa
with some advocating regional communities based on forms of economic
cooperation or integration. All Africans states displayed their adherence to
Pan-Africanism in relation to South Africa and, at least in words, of ridding
the continent of the vestiges of colonialism. On most other questions there
were significant differences, although both the Monrovia and Casablanca
groups took measures to enhance economic cooperation.

The gap between the two groups was bridged by Haile Selassie,
the emperor of Ethiopia, who made a major intervention at the Lagos
conference of the Monrovia Group, held in January 1962. At that gathering
he lamented the absence of some states – Tunisia, Libya, the Sudan and
the Casablanca Group were absent – welcomed economic cooperation, but
also stressed the necessity of some form of political unity. He asserted that ‘Ethiopia considers herself a member of one group only – the African group,’ and urged that ways be found to involve all independent African nations. Although the words of Haile Selassie were a significant factor in encouraging unity amongst African states it was also the work of Kwame Nkrumah and others that created the conditions for the conference in Addis Ababa in 1963 and the founding of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU).

In his book *Africa Must Unite*, published in 1963, Nkrumah presented his view that there was no great divide between the aims of the various groups only a difference of approach. He outlined the benefit of an African Common Market, and other forms of economic integration, to avoid competition, pool resources and aid development, as well as to combat the ‘neo-colonialism of the European Common Market’ which was then seeking to dominate the African continent. Indeed neo-colonialism and ‘balkanization’ were, according to Nkrumah, the biggest dangers facing Africa against which unity was essential. Giving the example of the United States, the USSR, Canada and other states he attempted to show the benefits of unitary and continental governments. Nkrumah sent his ambassadors to all of Africa’s independent states to distribute the book and lobby governments to unite and develop common approaches to foreign policy, economic planning and currency, as well as security and defence. He concluded the book with the words:

> Here is a challenge which destiny has thrown out to the leaders of Africa. It is for us to grasp what is a golden opportunity to prove that the genius of the African people can surmount the separatist tendencies in sovereign nationhood by coming together speedily, for the sake of Africa’s greater glory and infinite well-being, into a Union of African States.

As if to add further weight to his words Nkrumah also made a speech at the Addis Ababa conference in which he summarized the book and argued that a Union of African States was vital. ‘We must unite now or perish,’ he said and concluded by proposing a Committee of Foreign Ministers be immediately empowered to establish a constitution and commission to work out plans for continental economic and industrial development, common defence and communications, and common African citizenship.

**Towards a Pan-African women’s organization**

The growing demands for unity in Africa can also be seen in the emergence of a Pan-African organization for women across the continent in 1962, the year before the founding of the OAU. By that time there were women’s organizations in many African countries and women had continued to play a crucial role in the anti-colonial struggle, including the armed struggle in
such countries as Kenya. Although women such as Funmilayo Ransome-Kuti, Mballa Camara (1929–1955), Gisèle Rabesahala (1929–2011), Aoua Keita (1912–1980) and Jeanne Martin Cissé (1926–2017) are now becoming more well-known for their role in the anti-colonial struggle in the years after 1945, and Keita and Cissé have written memoirs, the histories of women’s participation and the organizations they established are still in their infancy.

Ransome-Kuti, for example, as well as her activities in Nigeria as president of the Federation of Nigerian Women was also involved with women’s and other Pan-African struggles throughout West Africa, in South Africa, Trinidad and elsewhere. She corresponded with the UNIA and the WASU, collaborated with Amy Ashwood Garvey, as well as struggling for the rights of women internationally as a leading member of the Women’s International Democratic Federation (WIDF), an organization that also played a key role in Africa. According to her biographers, Ransome-Kuti was an important pioneer who participated in women’s conferences in Algeria, Guinea, Dahomey, Togo, Liberia even in the 1950s and is seen as playing a key role in the founding of women’s organizations in Sierra Leone and Ghana.

In Francophone Africa many women were mobilized through the RDA, which despite its internal problems continued to build grassroots support and was particularly successful in Guinea under the leadership of Sékou Touré, who openly campaigned against women’s oppression, as well as in French Soudan (Mali). In both colonies there was a strong emphasis on organizing amongst women, youth and workers. Through the RDA many women became more actively involved in the anti-colonial struggle, as well as in French and international politics. However, the oppression of women meant that they often faced many additional obstacles to their political involvement, were denied the right to speak or organize in public, and were often forced to operate clandestinely even within the RDA.

Aoua Keita, a midwife and trade unionist from French Soudan was one of the women leaders who emerged from the ranks of the RDA as an organizer of women and particularly female workers; Jeanne Martin Cissé from Guinea but also active in Senegal was another. Both became leading members of the Union des Femmes de l’Ouest Africaine (UFOA) established following a conference in Bamako in 1959, under the presidency of Sira Diop, and attended by women’s organizations from Guinea, Senegal, French Soudan (Mali) and Dahomey. The UFOA grew out of the Women’s Union of Ghana–Guinea established as a result of the All-African Peoples’ Conference in 1958, which had specifically called for an ‘African Women’s Association Conference with a view to creating a unified organization of African women’. Keita and Cissé as well as others then became leaders of a growing Pan-African women’s movement and organized a series of meetings throughout Africa in 1961. At a meeting in July 1961 in Guinea attended by women’s organizations from Senegal, Togo, Dahomey (Benin) Niger, Liberia, Sierra
Leone, Egypt, Morocco and Tunisia, a preparatory committee for a Pan-African women’s organization was established and invitations were sent to all women’s organizations in Africa, including those fighting for national liberation. In July 1962 women from across the continent assembled in Dar-es-Salaam to found this organization. Women from fourteen independent African countries were present: Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Senegal, Niger, Republic of Congo, Gabon, Ethiopia, Cote d’Ivoire, Kenya, Liberia, Togo, Tunisia and Tanganyika, while others such as Nigeria were conspicuous by their absence. There were also representatives from the ANC and PAC in South Africa, FRELIMO (Mozambique), FNL (Algeria), MPLA (Angola), FNLA (Angola), ZANU and ZAPU (Zimbabwe), PAIGC (Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde), SWAPO (Namibia), United National Independence Party of Northern Rhodesia (Zambia), Zanzibar National Party and Afro-Shirazi Party (Zanzibar). Those present founded the African Women’s Union (AWU) and declared that 31 July should be African Women’s Day. Jeanne Martin Cissé became the first secretary-general of the AWU, which until 1968 was based in Guinea, and thereafter in Algeria and Angola. In 1974, during its congress in Senegal the AWU was renamed the Pan-African Women’s Organisation (PAWO).

The Organisation of African Unity (OAU)

The OAU, a body of all thirty-two independent African states was founded at a conference held in Addis Ababa in May 1963. The participants adopted a Charter of African Unity which placed emphasis on areas of common agreement and agreed to form an organization open to all independent African states. Nkrumah’s pleas for a Union of African States went unheeded. The aims of the OAU were:

a) To promote the unity and solidarity of the African states;
b) To coordinate and intensify their cooperation and efforts to achieve a better life for the peoples of Africa;
c) To defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity and independence;
d) To eradicate all forms of colonialism from Africa;
e) To promote international cooperation, having due regard to the Charter of the UN and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The signatories agreed to ‘coordinate and harmonise’ policies and for this purpose created an Assembly of Heads of State, a Council of Ministers, a secretariat and a ‘Commission of Mediation, Conciliation and Arbitration’. The chair of the conference, Haile Selassie, stressed the need for unity and a ‘union of Africans’; nevertheless the agreements reached
necessarily involved some compromise. The participants were most united in their opposition to continued colonial and ‘settler’ rule and therefore to the governments of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal against which they agreed to impose sanctions. They also agreed to coordinate and support the activities of national liberation movements by establishing a Coordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa based in Dar-es-Salaam and to provide specific funding. The committee members were Algeria, Congo, Ethiopia, Guinea, Nigeria, Senegal, Tanzania and Egypt. All states also agreed to provide facilities for training for those still not yet free from colonialism and to establish 25 May as Africa Liberation Day, to celebrate the ongoing struggles for African liberation and unity. Although many African states made little or no contribution to these struggles, the work of the OAU to support the struggles against settler colonialism in southern Africa throughout the following thirty years might be considered one of its few Pan-African achievements. The new OAU also agreed on a policy of non-alignment and demanded greater representation at the UN, pledged itself in favour of ‘general disarmament’ and demanded the removal of foreign bases from Africa and the ending of military pacts with foreign powers. In regard to economic problems, African states agreed to investigate various cooperative measures including a ‘Pan-African monetary zone’.

Although the agreements reached at Addis Ababa certainly did not amount to a Union of African States it was, on paper at least, a significant advance. That was certainly the view of Nkrumah who, in a radio broadcast explained: ‘A major outcome of the Addis Ababa Conference is that the existing blocs have come to an end. There is now only one Africa, with a common aim and a common objective.”117
FIGURE 10 The 1945 Manchester Pan-African Congress. Source: John Deakin/ Picture Post/Getty Images.
FIGURE 13 Angela Davis, an icon of the Black Power era, shortly after losing her academic post for membership of the Communist Party. Source: Hulton Archive/ Getty Images.

FIGURE 16 Queen Mother Audley Moore. Source: Schlesinger Library, RIAS, Harvard University.
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Black Power

Origins

The ‘return’ of Pan-Africanism to the African continent and the upsurge of the anti-colonial struggle leading to political independence also had a major impact on those in the diaspora and therefore an influence on the ongoing struggles against racist oppression and for liberation and empowerment in the United States, the Caribbean and elsewhere. At the same time, disappointment in relation to the slow pace of transformation during the early years of neo-colonial independence in Africa and the Caribbean led to a search for new means of empowerment. It was in this period that new forms of Pan-Africanism emerged that self-identified, or came to be viewed, as part of a global struggle for Black Power. The actual derivation of this term is debatable but it emerged within the United States denoting ‘a movement for racial solidarity, cultural pride and self-determination’.¹

One of the first to popularize the term was the African American writer Richard Wright, who used the phrase as the title for the book detailing his 1953 visit to the Gold Coast to view the last stages of anti-colonial struggle under the leadership of Nkrumah’s Convention Peoples’ Party.² However, some have traced the concept of Black Power back to Marcus Garvey and beyond, while many of its key elements, especially the demand for self-determination and self-government can also be found in the Pan-African demands of communists in the 1920s and 1930s.³ Others have pointed to the importance of African American activist Paul Robeson, who in 1958 wrote of the need for ‘Negro power’ in the context of a changing global situation where ‘the colored peoples of the world are moving quite independently’. He concluded, ‘Mass action – in political life and elsewhere – is Negro power in motion; and it is the power to win.’⁴ Evidently the Bandung Conference in 1955, the growing national liberation struggles in Asia and the emergence of the People’s Republic of China, the revolution in Cuba in 1959, as well as the emergence of what came to be referred to as the ‘Third World’ also had a major influence on those seeking Black Power. What is clear is that in the
United States there were several antecedents contributing to the emergence of Black Power, including the activities of individuals such as Robert F. Williams (1925–1996), an influential activist of the NAACP, broadcaster on the Havana-based Radio Free Dixie and author of Negroes with Guns (1962); cultural workers such as Lorraine Hansberry (1930–1965), Rosa Guy (1922–2012) and Maya Angelou (1928–2014); and organizations such as the Revolutionary Action Movement and League of Revolutionary Black Workers.5

The promotion of the phrase as a political demand is usually associated with Stokely Carmichael/Kwame Ture (1941–1998), a Trinidad-born activist who emerged as a leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) in the United States during the Civil Rights struggles in the 1960s. Ture used the term during a speech in Greenwood, Mississippi, in June 1966, telling his audience ‘The only way we gonna stop them white man from whuppin’ us is to take over. We been saying freedom for six years and we ain’t got nothin’. What we gonna start saying now is Black Power!’ According to Ture, the call for Black Power ‘was nothing new, we’d been talking about nothing else in the Delta for years. The only difference was that this time the national media were there.’6 He subsequently explained that in practice Black Power in the United States would mean African Americans taking over the government of those areas where they were a majority and that such ‘black power will make Negroes proud of being Negroes’.7 In this regard there was nothing that was fundamentally new about the concept of ‘black self-determination’, meaning self-definition as well as empowerment, and ‘the necessity to reclaim our history and our identity’, but the use of the slogan came to be seen as signifying a more militant phase of the Civil Rights movement, as well as a cultural renaissance that was later summed up in the phrase ‘black is beautiful’. It also signalled a reclamation and growing usage of the term Black, hitherto generally viewed unfavourably, to self-describe and denote those of African descent.

The demand for Black Power did highlight differences of approach within the Civil Rights movement, while in the media there was also much disinformation, and Ture and the SNCC felt compelled to explain their understanding of Black Power in the articles ‘Towards Black Liberation’ and ‘Power and Racism’.8 To the SNCC, Black Power chiefly meant political control, ‘the coming together of black people to elect representatives and to force those representatives to speak to their needs’. The SNCC also explained the importance of Africa and how ‘the reality of black men ruling their own nations gives blacks elsewhere a sense of possibility, of power, which they do not now have’.9 In Ture’s subsequent elaboration of the phrase, he specifically mentions the need not just for African American unity but also wider Pan-African unity and the importance of African Americans uniting with those in Africa to achieve empowerment and liberation. He also argued that Black Power was part of a wider ‘Third World’ struggle for liberation that was also taking place in Asia, Latin America and elsewhere.
against domination by Europe and the United States.\textsuperscript{10} In relation to Africa, some leading figures in the SNCC attended an OAU meeting in 1965. James Forman (1928–2005) established links with African governments and liberation movements when he spoke for the SNCC at a UN seminar on racism and colonialism in 1967 and attended an OAU meeting in the Congo in an attempt to gain support for SNCC’s imprisoned leader H. Rap Brown/Jamil Abdullah Al-Amin (1943–).\textsuperscript{11} Brown too emphasized concern with Africa when in 1967 he proposed to the UN that the SNCC send an International Brigade to help liberate South West Africa (today Namibia).\textsuperscript{12}

\section*{Malcolm X and the OAAU}

One of those who was pivotal in the development of the notion of Black Power was Malcolm X (1925–1965). He became best known as the leading spokesperson of the Nation of Islam (NOI) and a major commentator on the Civil Rights movement in the United States in the early 1960s. While a member of the NOI Malcolm X had been inspired by the anti-colonial struggle in Africa and, especially following his 1959 journey to Egypt, Ghana, Nigeria and Sudan as an emissary for NOI’s leader Elijah Muhammed, often mentioned the importance of the Pan-African connections between African Americans and Africa. He used developments in Africa to provide a positive sense of identity for African Americans. After his return from Africa in 1959 he wrote ‘Africa is the New World – the world with the brightest future – a future in which the so-called American Negroes are destined to play a key role.’\textsuperscript{13} His travels also helped him to question the philosophy of the NOI and the lack of involvement of that organization in the struggle for African American liberation contributed to a growing estrangement between him and Elijah Muhammed. This culminated in his resignation from the NOI in 1964. In the last two years of his life, following his separation from the NOI, Malcolm X began to develop a new political philosophy that placed African American liberation within the context of wider Pan-African and global struggles. Malcolm X visited several African countries including Ghana, Liberia, Egypt, Senegal, Morocco, Algeria and Nigeria during April to May 1964, following his breach with the NOI, and on his return to the United States formed the Organization of Afro-American Unity (OAAU). He subsequently made an additional extensive five-month tour of the African continent in the second half of 1964, during which he met Nasser, Nyerere, Kenyatta, Sékou Touré, Azikiwe, Nkrumah and other African leaders. It was during his time in Africa in 1964 that Malcolm X became convinced that ‘it was time for all Afro-Americans to join the world’s Pan-Africanists’, and that they philosophically and culturally ‘needed to “return” to Africa … to help develop a working unity in the framework of Pan-Africanism’. One aspect of Malcolm X’s Pan-Africanism was his view that independent African nations should help bring the oppression of African Americans before the United
Nations. Another, the development of his view that the government of the United States and its political system, the oppressor of African Americans, was also the oppressor of those in the African continent and the supporter of other oppressors of Africans such as Portugal and South Africa. During his African sojourn Malcolm X met with Nkrumah and related that they ‘agreed that Pan-Africanism was the key also to the problems of those of African heritage’. In July 1964 he made his famous ‘Appeal to African Heads of State’ at the OAU summit meeting in Cairo, as a representative of the OAAU, urging the delegates to see the problem facing African Americans as their problem and to assist the OAAU to present it to the UN as a violation of human rights.

The main political legacy of this period was Malcolm X’s condemnation of US imperialism in Africa, for instance its military intervention in the Congo, his adoption of the term ‘Afro-American’ rather than Negro, and the founding of the OAAU in June 1964, when he emphasized that the organization’s aim was to gain freedom ‘by any means necessary’. Indeed, at the founding of the OAAU, Malcolm X explained that he had been to Africa ‘to try and find out what it was our African brothers had done to get results’, his conclusion stressed the importance of unity. Membership of the OAAU was initially open to all people of African descent on the American and African continents, although this was subsequently extended to ‘people of African descent wherever they may be’. It was a clearly Pan-African organization ‘patterned after the letter and spirit of the OAU’, organized on the basis that links between those of African descent in America and Africa must be re-established and strengthened and that ‘we must unite together to go forward together’. Its founding document clearly stated, ‘we have one destiny and we’ve had one past’, and it explained that the OAAU aimed to organize to empower ‘Afro-Americans’ to ‘control their destiny’ whether in America or Africa. In short it was an organization concerned with empowerment, or as it was termed at the time ‘self-determination … the right to direct and control our lives’. It was therefore one of the first organizations in this period to be specifically concerned with what came to be referred to as Black Power.

Malcolm X’s evolving political philosophy is most eloquently explained in his speeches in the last weeks of his life such as that presented at the London School of Economics in February 1965.

**The Black Panthers**

In the last years of his life Malcolm X’s politics and support for armed self-defence against racist attacks had begun to influence other Civil Rights organizations. After his assassination in February 1965 and his posthumously published *Autobiography* his influence became even greater. His growing influence and demands for Black Power also coincided with large-scale ‘black rebellions’ in many major cities in the United States. But the slogan could mean different things to different people and in 1968 was even
embraced during a presidential campaign by Richard Nixon. Perhaps the most internationally significant of the many organizations to emerge from this period was the Black Panther Party for Self-Defence (BPP). Formed in Oakland, California, in 1966 by two African Americans, Huey P. Newton (1942–1989) and Bobby Seale (1936–), its practice of armed community self-defence was strongly influenced by the ideas of Malcolm X, although also those of Robert Williams, Fanon, Nkrumah, Che Guevara and Mao Zedong. The BPP, which adopted its name and symbol from an earlier organization in Alabama, produced a ten-point ‘platform and program’, divided equally between ‘what we want’, for example, ‘we want power to determine the destiny of our Black community’ and ‘what we believe’ – namely ‘we believe that Black people will not be free until we are able to determine our destiny’. Newton explained that these demands had been voiced by African Americans for over a century and added ‘These things are directly related to the things we had before we left Africa.’

The BPP was mainly concerned with the problems of police violence, economic deprivation and political disempowerment facing African Americans in cities in the United States but it also became an important cultural as well as political force and was declared by the FBI to be the most dangerous organization in the United States and thus subjected to the full weight of the FBI’s infamous and covert counter intelligence program (COINTELPRO). In addition to its well-publicized armed monitoring of the police it also organized ‘survival programs’ – healthcare, including sickle cell screening, provided breakfast and ‘liberation schools’ for children and other initiatives that were subsequently emulated by others in the United States and abroad. At the height of its influence it included many leading activists amongst its members and supporters including Stokely Carmichael, Eldridge Cleaver (1935–1998), George Jackson (1941–1971) and Angela Davis (1944–). These high-profile figures, the campaigns associated with Huey P. Newton and Angela Davis, as well as the global distribution of The Black Panther, with its distinctive artwork, gave the BPP an international profile and influence. This was further developed with the appointment of an international coordinator, the activities of several solidarity committees in Europe and an International Section based in Algeria. Although some of the BPP’s leaders, such as Newton, were opposed to Pan-Africanism on various grounds, others were more favourably disposed and the BPP’s International Section temporarily managed to establish links not just with Algeria’s governing Front de Libération Nationale (FLN) but also with the government of the Peoples’ Republic of the Congo, Angola’s MPLA and other African liberation organizations. For many in the late 1960s and early 1970s, not just in the United States but throughout the African diaspora, the BPP symbolized the essence of militant Black Power politics and culture. Most strikingly the BPP demanded not just Black Power but ‘power to the people’, called for anti-imperialism and a united front against fascism, adopted various forms of Marxism and sought alliances with activists of all nationalities.
Global Black Power

The influence of Black Power soon spread through music, publications and such incidents as the famous 1968 protest by athletes John Carlos (1945–) and Tommie Smith (1944–), who each wore a black glove and gave a clenched fist salute during the playing of the national anthem of the United States at their Olympic Games medal ceremony. Indeed, there were many cultural manifestations of a new Black pride and identification with Africa, including the adoption of the Afro or natural hairstyle, the wearing of the ‘dashiki’, the use of Kiswahili words and the invention of the annual Kwanzaa celebration every December. It soon became evident that like others forms of Pan-Africanism, Black Power had many and sometimes conflicting manifestations, as well as relevance and resonance well outside the borders of the United States. In 1968 Nkrumah, then in exile, felt compelled to write ‘Black Power is part of the world rebellion of the oppressed against the oppressor, of the exploited against the exploiter … It is linked with the Pan-African struggle for unity on the African continent, and with all those who strive to establish a socialist society.’ Nkrumah added that the key to victory of the struggle for Black Power and similar struggles was the ‘political unification of Africa’. Two years later, Stokely Carmichael, having worked closely with Nkrumah following his own exile in Guinea, claimed that ‘the highest political expression of Black Power is Pan-Africanism’.

Canada

In Canada in 1968, a group of black students in Montreal, drawn from the country’s relatively small population of African Canadians and more recent migrants from the Caribbean, organized the ‘Congress of Black Writers: Towards the Second Emancipation, the Dynamics of Black Liberation’. A key organizer was Rosie Douglas (1941–2000), later prime minister of Dominica, and the event was strongly influenced by the liberation struggles and political crisis throughout the world, Douglas wrote at the time, how ‘does the black emancipation movement fit into this objective world situation? … What must we do and how must we achieve our objectives as Black people in a changing objective world?’

Speakers included C. L. R. James, Richard B. Moore, Stokely Carmichael, Walter Rodney (1942–1980), James Forman, Robert Hill and Rocky Jones (1941–2014). Women were certainly involved in organizing the event but were conspicuously absent from the list of main speakers, while Jones was the only African Canadian. Carmichael was perhaps the key speaker at an event that has been described as one that ‘temporarily transformed Canada and Montreal into the center of the Black Power Movement’. The congress also highlighted the connection between Black Power and other forms of Pan-Africanism. C. L. R. James spoke on his own experience of Pan-Africanist activism as well as Négritude.
and the Haitian Revolution, while Walter Rodney, amongst other things, spoke on ‘African History in the Service of Black Liberation’.  

In the context of African Canadian history, the congress was a significant event and many of those who gathered in Montreal went on to have a major impact elsewhere. The same year student and community activists began an anti-racist protest at Sir George Williams University in Montreal which culminated, in 1969, with an occupation and burning of the university computer centre. The politics of the congress as well as the wider Black Power and anti-imperialist movements of the time clearly played an influential role. Many of the leaders of the protest were of African or Caribbean heritage and some involved with the congress. The occupation was ended by a police assault and nearly 100 protesters were arrested. The most well-known leaders were Rosie Douglas and Anne Cools (later Canada’s first black female senator) who were both imprisoned. According to Douglas, another student protester, Coralee Hutchison, later died from injuries sustained during the police assault. The same year black activists in Montreal organized a joint protest with African American historian John Henrik Clarke (1915–1998), a former associate of Malcolm X and a founder of the OAAU, at the African Studies Association (ASA) conference. They demanded greater participation of people of African heritage in the ASA and academia in general in what one historian has termed ‘a defining moment in the history of African and Africana Studies in North America’.  

The significance of such events is that they heralded the emergence of a new Black Power consciousness in Canada, based around specific local problems but influenced by events, personalities and politics largely originating from the United States. Several activists were involved in all three events and, as elsewhere, the term of self-definition ‘Black’ became popular, rather than the previously preferred terms ‘Colored’ or ‘Negro’. Subsequently several new organizations were formed including Canada’s National Black Coalition. There were also ramifications in the Caribbean where Canada’s governor-general was confronted with protests. These continued the following year in response to the trial of ten Trinidadians in Montreal in relation to the Sir George Williams Affair, and contributed to what became Trinidad’s Black Power movement and major anti-government protests.  

Black Power in the Caribbean  

The Caribbean connection to events in Canada might however, be traced back to October 1968 when the Guyanese historian Walter Rodney, while attending the Montreal congress, was banned from returning to Jamaica where he was employed at the University of the West Indies. The ‘Rodney Riots’ that followed have been credited with ushering in the Black Power movement to the Caribbean. Its roots, however, lay much deeper. Black Power in the Caribbean was often a manifestation of opposition to the emergence
of neo-colonialism. It reflected the fact that the majority population of African descent were poor and disempowered, while political and economic power was, in Rodney’s words, in the hands of a few ‘representatives of metropolitan-imperialist interests’, who were ‘historically white and racist-oriented’, and therefore also opposed to Africa-centred cultural expression by the majority. In Jamaica, such expression had historically been most successfully promoted by the Rastafarians, who championed Marcus Garvey as well as an identification with Africa in general and Ethiopia in particular. Indeed, Garveyism remained an important ideological foundation for the emergence of Black Power in Jamaica and elsewhere in the Caribbean in the 1960s. The return of Garvey’s body to Jamaica in 1964 and his subsequent designation as National Hero only added to his significance, while the official visit of Ethiopia’s emperor Haile Selassie to Jamaica in 1966 added to the influence of Rastafarianism. However, these events only served to highlight the continued denial of Jamaica’s African heritage, as did other forms of repression, which included the banning of the work of Malcolm X and Stokely Carmichael.

In 1967 one of the first Black Power groups in Jamaica was established at the university and with Rodney’s active involvement spread into the capital Kingston where it included groups of Rastafarians. Amongst other things it aimed to: ‘create an awareness of what it means to be black; to mobilise and unify Black people to act in their own interests; to reject white cultural imperialism; to seek to ensure the rule of blacks in a black society’. Rodney put his knowledge of African history and Marxism at the service of the Jamaican people, including the Rastafarian-influenced Black Power activists. He helped edit their new publication Blackman Speaks and introduced them to the OAU Liberation Committee based in Tanzania. For Rodney, the term Black included all those who were ‘non-whites’, that is ‘the hundreds of millions of people whose homelands are in Asia and Africa, with another few millions in the Americas’, although he was particularly concerned with those of African heritage. In this regard Rodney also saw Black Power as linked to global ‘Third World’ struggles. He considered Garvey one of the first advocates of Black Power, which he defined as ‘a call to black peoples to throw off white domination and resume the handling of their own destinies’, and as ‘a movement and an ideology springing from the reality of oppression of black peoples by whites within the imperialist world as a whole’. In the Caribbean, Rodney concluded that Black Power had three main components: ‘the break with imperialism which is historically white racist; the assumption of power by the black masses in the islands; the cultural reconstruction of the society in the image of the blacks’. At the same time Rodney made it clear that Black Power was not incompatible with a ‘multi-racial society’ so long as ‘power is evenly distributed’. He therefore considered that Cuba had Black Power whilst the rest of the Caribbean languished under White Power and required revolutionary change. For Rodney, and others in the Caribbean, Black Power was therefore the solution to neo-colonialism and Eurocentrism.
Because of such views, Rodney and the Black Power activists were under surveillance by the Jamaican Intelligence Services. Rodney was seen as a particular threat because of his previous visits to Cuba and the Soviet Union, as well as his propagation of Marxism and Black Power. His ban, issued while he was in Montreal, and apparently not connected with the congress, was allegedly enforced to save Jamaica ‘from a Castro plot’, and because of Rodney’s ‘subversive activities’. According to Rodney it was the “grounding” with my black brothers that the regime found subversive. The ban led to immediate protests by the university students, led by Ralph Gonsalves (later prime minister of St Vincent and the Grenadines). The protests started by the students were soon dominated by the unemployed and those protesting against wider economic and political problems. Riots fuelled by police violence then ensued and culminated in looting and several deaths. Although the riots were not directly associated with the Jamaican Black Power movement, in their aftermath, and following Rodney’s expulsion, Black Power gained more adherents not just in Jamaica but throughout the Anglophone Caribbean. Several new publications appeared such as Abeng in Jamaica, which included articles on liberation struggles in Africa, women’s liberation, by the Black Panthers and Amilcar Cabral, as well as on socialism in Tanzania and Cuba. In Jamaica there was a developing ‘black-conscious message’ in the new reggae music, as well as other forms of cultural expression and a wider connection with Africa and recognition of Jamaica’s African heritage that even had its influence on national politics. In other islands in the Anglophone Caribbean there were not dissimilar developments, the emergence of new organizations, including local branches of the BPP, new publications and the influence of Black Power ideology on culture and politics.

The February Revolution in Trinidad and Tobago in 1970 was perhaps the most significant demonstration of Black Power in the Caribbean. It arose in response to dissatisfaction with the inequalities that still existed following the end of colonial rule and well as events in Canada. A significant role was played by students and lecturers at the local campus of the University of the West Indies, as well as other activists, who formed the National Joint Action Committee (NJAC) in 1969. Thousands were mobilized to prevent a campus visit by Canada’s governor-general and Trinidad and Tobago’s Prime Minister Eric Williams. The following February, protests continued and when their leaders were arrested only grew stronger and involved not just youth but workers of both African and Indian heritage who were only prevented from marching to the capital by the declaration of a state of emergency. Police shooting of an NJAC activist and the banning of Stokely Carmichael only intensified opposition to the government and subsequently led to an army mutiny as well as attempts at guerrilla warfare by the newly formed National Union of Freedom Fighters that were violently suppressed. The demands of the protesters in Trinidad and Tobago have been summed up by one historian as ‘black dignity, black consciousness and black economic power’, and even
Eric Williams claimed, once his government had suppressed the protests and the mutiny, ‘if this is Black Power then I am for Black Power’.\textsuperscript{43} The significance of events in Trinidad was that Black Power might be used as a mobilizing slogan even by those who were not of African descent in certain specific conditions. It was perhaps also the only time that Black Power threatened to bring down a government in the Caribbean. It is sometimes seen as having a significant impact on other radical Black Power influenced organizations in the Caribbean, including the Caribbean Liberation Movement in Antigua, the Working People’s Alliance in Guyana and the New Jewel Movement in Grenada.\textsuperscript{44} In some other Caribbean countries governments also attempted to adopt or manipulate some elements of Black Power for their own advantage. In Guyana, for example, Prime Minister Forbes Burnham declared that his government was ‘not hostile to Black Power, was not afraid of Black Power, and thinks that Black Power has a contribution to make, especially here in the Caribbean’.\textsuperscript{45} However, Burnham’s government later banned Walter Rodney from taking up an appointment at the University of Guyana in 1974 and is widely believed to have been involved in his violent and untimely death in 1980.

Black Power had many manifestations in the Caribbean and often in the most unexpected places. In the British colony of Bermuda, for example, it strongly influenced the anti-colonial movement, which was also a movement against racism as well as for suffrage. It was one of the leading advocates of Black Power in Bermuda, Member of Parliament for the newly-formed Progressive Labour Party (PLP), Pauulu Kamarakafego (1932–2007), who in 1968 initiated the demand for a Black Power conference outside the United States. The decision to hold such a conference in Bermuda in 1969 led to consternation amongst the island’s white elite who demanded a ban. This demand was rejected by the British government, which sought to limit participation at the conference, hosted by the PLP, and curtail its effectiveness. However, there were several high-profile participants, including the veterans C. L. R. James and Audley Moore, as well as over 1,000 local attendees. The conference focused on local and regional issues as well as wider Pan-African politics and included resolutions in support of the students in Montreal. Another feature of the conference was the many messages of support from international organizations in the Caribbean, Africa and the United States as well as from the Pacific islands, Vietnam, North Korea and Palestine. Greetings were received from the BPP, as well as from Stokely Carmichael and Kwame Nkrumah, who viewed the conference as part of ‘the world rebellion of the oppressed against the oppressor’\textsuperscript{46} The conference marked an important landmark in the emergence of Black Power in the Caribbean and helped to consolidate organizations such as the People’s Progressive Movement in Barbados; Afro-Caribbean Movement in Antigua; the Black Berret Cadre in Bermuda; Dominica’s Black Socialist Party; the Black Panther Party and NJAC in Trinidad and Tobago; and Guyana’s African Society for Cultural Relations with Independent Africa,
as well as developing links between such organizations and between them and Black Power organizations in the United States. Indeed, the conference had wider significance since it led to links between Kamarakafego and Black Power struggles amongst Australia’s Aborigines, as well as leading to discussions about the possibility of a 6th Pan-African Congress being held in Bermuda.47

Walter Rodney was perhaps the most well-known proponent of Black Power in the Caribbean and he was also one of those most associated with a Marxist analysis of society and history. One of the features of many of the leading figures in the Black Power movement in the United States, as well as the Caribbean, was an adherence to what appeared to be contradictory doctrines as Black Power embraced, and to varying degrees combined, elements of Garveyism, and other forms of Black nationalism, as well as Marxism and a socialist orientation. Certainly, by the early 1970s a significant number of Black Power advocates and their adherents had adopted what they referred to as Marxism–Leninism as their guiding ideology. This had been a trend within the BPP and was reflected, for example, in the founding of the Workers Party and the Youth Forces for National Liberation in Jamaica and in 1974 by the founding of the New Jewel Movement in Grenada.48

Black Consciousness in South Africa

The origins of a new Black politics in South Africa are usually traced to the activities of Bantu Steve Biko (1946–1977), a medical student who in 1968 began to organize an all-black student organization to oppose what was felt to be the ineffective liberal politics of the National Union of South African Students (NUSAS). This was in the period following the Sharpeville Massacre and the banning of major African liberation organizations, the African National Congress (ANC) and Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC), in many ways a low point in the liberation struggle when political activities were mainly organized underground. Apartheid meant that black students were in segregated universities and some even barred from joining the NUSAS, or from entering ‘white’ universities or locations where NUSAS conferences were held. Those that could existed as a minority of 3,000 within an organization of 30,000 students.49 A new all-black South African Students Organisation (SASO) was subsequently founded in July 1969 with Biko as president. By 1970 SASO declared that ‘the emancipation of the black people in this country depends entirely on the role black people themselves are prepared to play’.50

The SASO was convinced of the need for black self-reliance and was also critical of what it viewed as attempts by liberal white activists to determine the nature and direction of the struggle in South Africa. This approach, Biko argued, was also a form of racism with the limited aim of the integration or assimilation of black people. Biko added that he was opposed to ‘the fact that
a settler minority should impose an entire system of values on an indigenous people’, and that anyone should dictate to black people how they should respond to racist oppression. He maintained that it was quite permissible for black people to respond to ‘white racism’ as a group and that they could not be considered as racists for so doing. Indeed for SASO ‘group cohesion and solidarity’ were vital in order to make black people aware of their collective economic and political power and to instil a sense of pride. Nevertheless, many initially viewed SASO’s politics as an unhealthy example of ‘black separatism’ aimed not against the enemy but against their allies and even as a promotion of apartheid.

At the same time as his critique of ‘white liberal’ politics Biko and SASO also began to develop the doctrine of what he referred to as Black Consciousness. This was defined as:

in essence the realization by the Black man of the need to rally together with his brothers around the cause of their oppression - the blackness of their skin and to operate as a group in order to rid themselves of the shackles that bind them to perpetual servitude ... Black consciousness ... seeks to infuse the black community with a new-found pride in themselves, their efforts, their value systems, their culture, their religion and their outlook to life.

Biko suggested that the consequence of apartheid and the so-called Bantu Education system was that black South Africans had internalized a sense of their own inferiority. ‘The first step’, in the struggle against apartheid he argued, ‘is to make the black man come to himself, to pump back life into his empty shell; to infuse him with pride and dignity, to remind him of his complicity in the crime of allowing himself to be misused and therefore letting evil reign supreme in the land of his birth’. In this regard, Biko viewed the reclaiming and rewriting of the distorted history of Africa as vital. Perhaps paraphrasing Garvey, he explained that ‘a people without a positive history is like a vehicle without an engine’. He argued that black South Africans were constantly humiliated by having to celebrate their own historical defeats. In the struggle against racism, Eurocentrism and capitalism there was therefore a need for the appreciation and defence of ‘socialistic’ African cultures, values and outlook. In short, there was a need to place South Africa within its African context and, as others had argued elsewhere, for black self-definition and self-determination. Biko also saw the need for a ‘black theology’ that, ‘while basing itself on the Christian message’, must ‘preach that it is a sin to allow oneself to be oppressed’.

It seems that Biko’s approach to Black Consciousness was influenced by the ideas of the leaders of other struggles in Africa, such as Sékou Touré, Nyerere, Nkrumah and Kaunda, by the ideas of the Brazilian educationalist Paulo Friere, by Aimé Césaire and in particular by Frantz Fanon, whose insights on the psychological effect of racism and Eurocentrism were
particularly relevant. Biko and SASO were also influenced by the writings of Robert F. Williams, Cleaver, Carmichael, Malcolm X and others from the Black Power movement in the United States. It is also clear that Biko identified with the sentiment in James Brown’s song ‘Say it loud, I’m Black and I’m Proud’, and the expression ‘black is beautiful’. Also of major importance were the ideas of ‘Black Theology’ emerging from the United States in the late 1960s and championed by Basil Moore, president of the University Christian Movement (UCM) founded in South Africa in 1967. Moore and the UCM were in touch with the Black Power movement in the United States and were influenced by the work of African American theologian James Cone (1938–). Cone defined Black Theology as ‘that theology that arises out of the need to articulate the significance of Black presence in a White hostile world’, and Black Consciousness as ‘the Black man’s self-awareness … the Black person knows that his blackness is the reason for his oppression’. In several important ways SASO grew out of the activities of the UCM and Biko and other leaders of the SASO, such as Barney Pityana (1945–), were also leading figures in the UCM.

However, it is also important to bear in mind that the idea of Black Consciousness and the demand for Black Power in South Africa has much older antecedents that might even include the demands for a Black Republic made by communists in the 1920s. However, it is more usually associated with the development of the doctrine of ‘Africanism’ by Anton Lembede (1914–1947), the first leader of the ANC Youth League in the mid-1940s. Lembede’s ‘Africanism’ or African Nationalism, a variety of Pan-Africanism included black pride, African unity and cooperation (African unity before ‘Non-European’ unity), the need for African leadership and self-reliance, pride in Africa’s history and heroes, and a tradition-inspired socialism. Lembede was of the view that Africans needed to be psychologically inspired to action. His views were further elaborated by his successor A. S. Peter Mda (1916–1993) and others in the Youth League who stressed the need for revolutionary struggle based around the masses of the people, but rejected the views of Garvey and the slogan ‘Hurl the White man to the sea’. The Youth League recognized that all in South Africa ‘have come to stay’ and Mda accepted the possibility of joint struggle with Indians and ‘Coloureds’. He also explained ‘we as African Nationalists are not against the European – we have no racial hatred – we only hate white oppression and white domination and not white people themselves’. Mda established an informal Bureau of African Nationalism within the ANC that produced a bulletin to champion and discuss ‘Africanism’, which in the early 1950s often manifested itself in opposition to the participation of Indians and communists in the Defiance Campaign and to the new Congress Alliance. In 1954, a new publication The Africanist appeared representing the views of those like Mda, P. K. Leballo (1915–1986) and Robert Sobukwe (1924–1978) who opposed the principle enshrined in the 1955 Freedom Charter that ‘South Africa belongs to all who live in it’. To the Africanists Africa belonged to Africans, others were mere
The Africanists were opposed to white activists being involved in deciding the nature of the struggle, since in their eyes this undermined African self-reliance and psychological independence, and in the context of the Cold War they were also anti-communist. This trend eventually led to a split in the ranks of the ANC and the emergence of the Pan-Africanist Congress in 1959 with Robert Sobukwe as its first president. Sobukwe too, was concerned with the need to liberate the African masses from mental slavery but situated the PAC within the emerging Pan-African movement and its vision of a United States of Africa as well as the PAC’s notion of ‘Africanist Socialist Democracy’. Steve Biko later referred to this period and the activities of ‘a group of angry young black men’, as ‘the first real signs that the blacks in South Africa were beginning to realise the need to go it alone and to evolve a philosophy based on, and directed by, blacks. In other words Black Consciousness was slowly manifesting itself’. An important aspect of Black Consciousness was its substitution of ‘Black’ for the term ‘non-white’. In the South African context, the term Black included those previously defined as Indian and ‘Coloured’. Those who had mentally emancipated themselves had Black Consciousness and had become ‘consciencized’, as opposed to those who remained ‘non-white’. According to SASO blacks were ‘those who are by law or tradition politically, economically and socially discriminated against as a group ... and identifying as a unit in the struggle towards the realisation of their aspirations’. As in the United States, the term was being positively reclaimed and there was a conscious refusal ‘to be regarded as non-persons’. Nevertheless, wide-scale adoption of the new terminology took some time, as much within Indian and ‘Coloured’ circles as within the mainstream media. Some have argued that ‘Black’ unity was a vital part of the SASO strategy to build unity amongst a common oppressive enemy. Certainly, there was a need to unite all Africans against attempts by the apartheid regime to divide them on the basis of nationality and ‘bantustans’. However, Biko argued that “white hatred” is negative though understandable’, and that Black Consciousness aimed to ‘channel the pent-up forces of the angry black masses to meaningful and directional opposition’. Nevertheless, one consequence of Black Consciousness was the idea that ‘in all matters relating to the struggle ... whites must be excluded’.

The SASO emerged at a time when there was a significant vacuum in South African politics because of the banning of the ANC and the PAC and Biko and others considered that this had led to a pessimism that had to be addressed. In such circumstances the idea of Black Consciousness led to the politicization of students and other youths, especially in 1972 when SASO more openly condemned the ‘Bantustans’ so-called ‘Bantu Education’ and other racist institutions developed and promoted by the apartheid regime. In the same year, after consultation with other groups, the SASO launched the national Black People’s Convention (BPC), aiming to provide student or youthful leadership to the wider political struggles and to ‘unite all south
African blacks in to a political movement which would seek liberation and emancipation of black people from psychological and physical oppression’.68

The change from student to national politics achieved some initial success and included establishing the Black Community Programmes, which focused on community development projects in health, education, job creation, housing, water and sanitation. The aim was to find ways for the students to work with and serve the people. In addition, there was the founding of the Black Workers’ Project (BWP) and Black Renaissance Project (BRC). In 1974, the BRC brought together black clergymen to discuss Black Theology, an occasion when James Cone sent a paper entitled ‘Black Consciousness and the Black Church: An Historical-Theological Interpretation’.69 The BWP attempted to organize a Black Workers’ Council to negotiate for Black workers since it was critical of the existing trade union structure. It is interesting to note that in its appeal to workers the BWP quotes both from African American Robert Williams and Aimé Césaire to substantiate the need for self-reliance. It also demanded that the Black Worker’s Council should organize literacy and leadership training, as well as other support for workers.70 Although Black Consciousness advocated community activity and leadership training, the building of community organizations rather than activism against the apartheid regime, such initiatives almost immediately led to intensified state repression, including the 1973 banning of BPC’s leaders including Biko and Pityana, as well as the banning of SASO publications.

Nevertheless, the Black Consciousness movement appears to have been responsible for and reflected a growing militancy amongst significant sections of the Black population in South Africa, but most importantly amongst the youth, both those at university and younger teenagers. Black Consciousness student protests simmered for some years and then erupted in 1972 following the expulsion of a SASO leader from the University of the North and spread throughout the country, leading to the founding of the South African Students’ Movement in Soweto and the National Youth Organisation, a federation of organizations in the Cape, Transvaal and Natal. Repressive measures by the state, including the banning of demonstrations by the BPC and SASO to celebrate the 1974 fall of the fascist government in Portugal and FRELIMO’s transitional government in Mozambique, and the imprisonment of SASO leaders on Robben Island, did nothing to stem the flow of a movement that had also been buoyed by workers strikes in Durban in early 1973. This rising militancy culminated in the famous Soweto Uprising in 1976 when students organized by the Soweto Students’ Representative Council and the South African Students’ Movement demonstrated in their thousands against the imposition of the Africaans language, ‘the language of the oppressor’, as a medium of instruction in schools. The violent suppression of these peaceful protests, which culminated in the deaths of at least 176 students, shocked the world and led to a major upsurge of the struggles of youth and others in South Africa and a new phase in the
liberation struggle to end the apartheid regime. Biko was still alive during the Soweto Uprising but was killed in detention by the apartheid regime in 1977, the same year that the BPC and eighteen affiliated organizations were banned. It is interesting to note that even after Soweto he still maintained an essentially non-violent approach to political change in South Africa and he and others looked forward to a non-racial ‘socialist’ society with majority rule and an economy based on a ‘judicious blending’ of public and private ownership. The Black Consciousness movement has also been criticized for its male-centred approach and language and lack of gender sensitivity, even though it included several leading women activists such as Mamphela Ramphele. Throughout the 1970s Black Consciousness stuck rather firmly to its Christian and liberal roots until in 1978 supporters of the Black Consciousness movement formed the Azanian People’s Organisation (AZAPO). AZAPO increasingly incorporated a Marxist and socialist orientation along with elements of Black Consciousness.

Black Power in Britain

The Black Power movement in Britain has sometimes been dated from the visit of Stokely Carmichael to speak at the Dialectics of Liberation Conference in July 1967 and the adoption, the following month, of the ‘Black Power ideology’ by the newly-formed Universal Coloured People’s Association (UCPA), which thereafter began to produce a Black Power Newsletter and later Black Power Speaks. However, its roots can be traced back long before this period, perhaps to the 1930s or the Subject Peoples’ conferences and Pan-African Congress of 1945. One of the defining characteristics of the Black Power movement in Britain, as in South Africa, was that Black was a term that came to be applied not only to those of African origin but also to those of Asian origin, many of whom were recent migrants, or the children of migrants who had previously been referred to as ‘coloured’ people. Certainly the UCPA, first formed in June 1967 had members drawn from African, Caribbean and Asian communities and its first president was a Nigerian, Obi Egbuna (1938–2014). However, there was always a view that ‘political blackness’ could not totally include people of Asian origin and by the mid-1970s ‘Black’ increasingly referred to people of African heritage. The members of Black Power organizations in Britain, however, were predominately of Caribbean origin. Egbuna was formerly a leading member of the Committee of African Organisations (CAO), which had hosted Malcolm X in London in 1965, and which had its roots in the West African Students’ Union established in the 1920s. He had visited the United States in the summer of 1966 and was also in contact with the Zanzibari Pan-Africanist Mohamed Babu. Egbuna, who clearly recognized the importance of Carmichael’s visit, stated that it was ‘manna from heaven’ and not until that time that ‘Black Power got a foothold in Britain’.
The origins of the Black Power movement in Britain can clearly be traced to an earlier period. The Racial Awareness Action Society (RAAS), another early Black Power organization, had been formed by Roy Sawh and Michael de Freitas (Michael X) in the wake of Malcolm X’s visit to London in early 1965. Michael X suggested that RAAS was a child of the 1958 racist attacks and riots in London and Nottingham, thereby highlighting the fact that Black Power in Britain grew out of the struggle of the migrant communities, especially those of Caribbean origin, against state organized and sanctioned racism, as well as from a dissatisfaction with existing anti-racist organizations, such as the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination (CARD). The anti-colonial and anti-racist struggles in Britain, as well as the international situation had created the conditions for some, especially younger people, to embrace the new militancy that appeared to be represented by the UCPA and Black Power. Under Sawh’s and Egbuna’s leadership the UCPA soon published its own statement Black Power in Britain: A Special Statement. For the UCPA, Black Power was the ‘totality of the economic, cultural, political, and if necessary, military power which the black people of the world must acquire in order to get the white oppressor of their backs’. Elsewhere it declared that Black Power meant ‘that the blacks of this world are out to liquidate capitalist oppression by any means necessary’. However, reaching agreement on the meaning of Black Power in Britain proved difficult and the UCPA was soon plagued by ideological differences and divisions. Sawh soon left and the following year became a leading member of the Black People’s Alliance, ‘a militant front for Black Consciousness and against racialism’, while Egbuna formed the British Black Panther Party, later the Black Panther Movement (BPM), the first such organization to be formed outside the United States. By 1970, following Egbuna’s arrest and temporary imprisonment for an article threatening to kill police officers, ‘What to do when cops lay their hands on a black man at the Speakers’ Corner’, the BPM was led by a Trinidadian student, Althea Lecointe, one of only two women to lead such an organization in Britain. Gender sensitivity became one of the most important questions for the Black Power movement in Britain, which was often presented in terms of masculinity, and several Black women’s groups eventually emerged from this movement. The majority of UCPA’s remaining membership reconstituted themselves as the Black Unity and Freedom Party (BUFP), also formed in 1970.

The UCPA soon established a political style and approach that characterized similar organizations well into the 1970s. It supported the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, Maoism, Pan-Africanism, Third World unity, anti-imperialism and various forms of ‘black consciousness’, including Garveyism, as well as being in opposition to all forms of racism. There was sometimes the need for demonstrations and picketing but at the same time, there was an emphasis on community activism – establishing nurseries, advice bureaux, self-defence classes and study groups. Much of its
activity was based around the publication and dissemination of publications, the Black Power Newsletter, BPM’s Black Power Speaks and Freedom News, or later the BUFP’s Black Voice and Black Liberation Front’s Grass Roots, as well as other pamphlets and leaflets on topical issues of concern. As in the United States and elsewhere, there was a particular concern with ‘Black culture’, music, poetry, drama and film that reflected Pan-African or Black Power themes, as well as with Black history. ‘It is only by getting to know ourselves and our history that we will be able to effectively fight to liberate ourselves’, the BPM explained in 1969. Initially established in London, Black Power organizations, or their local branches, soon established a presence in other major towns and cities. The early Black Power organizations also established wider Pan-African connections. Egbuna, for example, visited Nkrumah in Guinea and returned with the latter’s famous ‘Message to the Black People of Britain’, which was subsequently published by the BPM. There were also links with Caribbean-based organizations such as the Youth Forces for National Liberation in Jamaica. Most British organizations made efforts to support the liberation struggles in Africa, in South Africa, Zimbabwe, Namibia, Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique, for example, and annually organized an appropriate event each May to celebrate Africa Liberation Day.

Symbols and slogans, the clenched fist and the black panther, were readily borrowed from the United States by Black Power organizations in Britain, that were also influenced by the high-profile campaigns in support of Angela Davis, George Jackson and Bobby Seale. The politics of leading African American figures, Carmichael, Eldridge Cleaver, Maulana Karenga and others was also influential. However, young black people in Britain were drawn to such politics as a result of the racism and other problems they faced. As in the United States, the Caribbean and elsewhere there were significant discussions about whether Black Power should have a socialist and Marxist orientation, or adopt a largely ‘cultural nationalist’ approach. Such considerations were often connected with the question of whether alliances, or joint activities, were possible with predominately white organizations in Britain, since some Black Power adherents including Egbuna, maintained that Black Power organizations had to remain independent and retain their self-reliance. Others took a different view and the BPM under Lecointe’s leadership recognized the importance of joint struggle with the working class movement. Socialism became particularly influential because of the influence of Maoism and Kwame Nkrumah, the inspiring example of developments in Vietnam and Cuba at the time the African liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau and the influence of the Black Panthers in the United States. By the early 1970s, organizations such as the BUFP and the BPM viewed themselves as guided by various forms of Marxism, while at the same time they were concerned to develop community welfare programmes. These included supplementary education classes for children, who were being failed by
mainstream education, and organising support for black people who had been imprisoned. Self-help and community organizing were two of the main legacies of Black Power in Britain. Anti-imperialist politics meant supporting the struggle for national liberation in Vietnam and to end British rule in Ireland, as well as a liberated and united Africa.

The Black Liberation Front (BLF) was formed in 1971 by Tony Soares and other former members of the BPM. Soares, who had been a founder member of the UCPA, developed a close relationship with Robert F. Williams, as well as Eldridge and Kathleen Cleaver and other Black Panthers. Although Soares had also been involved in anti-Vietnam protests the BLF initially showed less sympathy for the BPM’s Marxism and more for ‘cultural nationalism’ but by the mid-1970s it too increasingly became influenced by developments in China, Mao’s support for ‘the complete emancipation of black people’ and a vision of a socialist future.98 There was, however, often a tendency of British Black Power organizations to support the aim of socialism and revolution in other countries, especially African and Caribbean ones, but to be rather more circumspect about organizing for it alongside predominately white organizations in Britain.99

The BLF had its own youth wing, while other organizations, such as the London-based Fasimbas, also concentrated on young people who faced institutional racism at school and from the police and criminal justice system.100 The BLF established its own book stores in London and even established the successful Ujima Housing Association, providing rented accommodation for those unable to secure it from the local government sector, just one of several significant welfare projects that emerged from the Black Power era. The BLF and other Black Power organizations became nationally known as a result of several high-profile court cases. Tony Soares faced serious charges when the organization’s Grassroots newspaper republished from the Black Panther in the United States instructions for making a petrol bomb. Soares absconded and spent time in Algeria with Eldridge and Kathleen Cleaver before his day in court. The BLF was also indirectly connected to the Spaghetti House robbery and kidnapping case in 1973 and the Oval Four case, where under-cover police attacked and arrested four members of the Fasimbas, the same year.101 Black Power was also seen as being at the heart of another cause célèbre, the so-called Mangrove Nine trial in 1971, which involved police attacks on a popular restaurant frequented by Black Power activists and the arrest of three leading members of the BPM.102 Such direct attacks on the Black Power movement, as well as increasing government funding for community programmes, were regarded as successful attempts to undermine it. However, the Black Power movement was significant enough to be consulted by the organizers of the Sixth Pan-African Congress, who apparently found rather more support for Black Power than for Pan-Africanism when they visited Britain in preparations for the congress and held discussions with the BPM, the Afro-Caribbean Self-Help Organisation (Birmingham) and other organizations throughout England.103
The 1974 Sixth Pan-African Congress

The Sixth Pan-African Congress emerged out of the Black Power era, indeed one of its organizers claimed that the idea for such a congress was first mooted during the Black Power conference held in Bermuda in 1969. On that occasion Kwame Nkrumah, in a letter to participants, had suggested that ‘a meeting of Black people take place on the African continent’. The conference organizers attempted to convene a further Black Power conference in Barbados in 1970 as a prelude to a Pan-African congress, but could not get the support of the Barbadian or any other Caribbean government since the region was in the grip of political upheavals inspired by demands for Black Power. Eventually a Congress of African People was held in Atlanta in the United States in 1970 but this initially focused mainly on the problems facing African Americans. Consequently, and with Nkrumah’s support, plans were then made to convene a Pan-African congress in Tanzania, the main base for many of Africa’s liberation movements, the headquarters of the OAU’s Liberation Committee and, under Julius Nyerere, renowned as the builder of Ujamaa, or ‘African socialism’. The coordinator of these plans was Roosevelt Browne/Pauulu Kamarakafego, the main organizer of the Bermuda conference. At an early stage both C. L. R. James and Walter Rodney became involved, as well as those in the United States connected with Drum and Spear Press and the Washington DC-based Centre for Black Education, such as James P. Garrett and Courtland Cox. Other early key members included those involved with the Black Arts Movement in the United States, such as Sonia Sanchez and Calvin Hicks (1933–2013), and later academics James Turner and Sylvia Hill. Many of those who became the main organizers were in fact former members of SNCC, or were associated with the Africa Liberation Support Committee (ALSD) initiated by Owusu Saduakai/Howard Fuller (1941–) in 1971. The ALSD organized support for the national liberation struggles in Africa and from 1972 annual Africa Liberation Day celebrations; it also collaborated with similar bodies in the Caribbean and throughout the diaspora. It subsequently became the arena for major disputes about the orientation of Black Power and Pan-Africanism in the United States.

Initially it was envisaged that the congress would consist of non-governmental participants, although the Tanzanian government was already involved, and concern itself with ‘aiding in the establishment of economic and military sovereignty of people of African descent’. Few outside the small organizing group knew that a Pan-African congress was being planned. However, in 1972 several of the organizers, assisted by C. L. R. James, travelled to Europe to consult with organizations in Britain and France. These included the BPM in Britain, FEANF and Présence Africaine in France, as well African national liberation organizations such as FRELIMO. A similar organizing trip was also made to the Caribbean. It became clear in Europe that there was some scepticism about the aims and politics of such
a congress, and that the organizers were not fully aware of the significance of political differences that existed amongst those who might otherwise consider themselves Pan-Africanists or supporters of Black Power. It is noteworthy that many of the Black Power organizations in Britain argued that those of Asian origin should also be involved and demanded that any congress 'should take a decidedly anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist and anti-racist stand'.

James apparently also played a key role in drafting the ‘Call’ for the congress, the first paragraph of which began with the sentence ‘the 20th century is the century of Black Power’, continued by stressing the significance of the ‘Third World’, and ended with the view that ‘the most significant members of the Third World are those who strive for power to the people and Black power to Black People’. Significantly ‘The Call’ also demanded the drawing of ‘a line of steel against those’ who were defenders or apologists for neo-colonialism. Other publicity material stressed the non-governmental nature of the congress which had the objectives and goals of increasing unity and self-reliance, strengthening support for the liberation struggles in Guinea-Bissau and southern Africa, establishing a Pan-African science and technology centre, developing ‘mechanisms for inter-communications’ and establishing a permanent secretariat.

The United States-based organizing committee, by 1973 under the leadership of Cox but with the direct involvement of James, continued to involve governments including those in Jamaica, Guyana, Ghana and Nigeria, which also alienated many potential supporters. Even before the congress was finally held in 1974 there were evidence of significant differences between those designated ‘nationalist’ and ‘Marxist’, as well as between those in the circles around the organizing committee welcoming governmental involvement and those opposed to neo-colonialism. These differences were unresolved at the time that a new international steering committee was formed. This included the national liberation movements, representatives of the governments of Algeria, Cuba, Egypt, Guinea, Nigeria and Tanzania, as well as Cox. In essence, the congress had been transformed into one dominated by governments, although the OAU was not itself involved. All governments and ruling parties of ‘Black states’ were invited, whilst their opponents were barred from attending. This mean that Eusi Kwayana, a Guyanese ‘sponsor’ of the congress and other delegates from the Caribbean were effectively prevented from participating. At this stage James, who had been instrumental in inviting government participation and who was himself a sponsor, withdrew his support for the congress and many activists in the Caribbean decided to boycott it.

When the Sixth Pan-African Congress, the first of its kind to be held in Africa, finally convened in Tanzania in June 1974, it was already mired in controversy. Some key figures such as Walter Rodney had already identified neo-colonialism and the ‘conflict between the majority of the Black working masses and a small African possessing class’ as the key issues for the
Rodney pointed out that most of those attending the congress would be spokespersons of ‘African and Caribbean states which in so many ways represent the negation of Pan-Africanism’. Thus those issues relating to class and internationalism that had led to conflicting definitions of Black Power also came to dominate definitions of Pan-Africanism. Eventually a key focus of the conference became the necessity of uniting all the participants in the struggle to rid the African continent of various forms of settler colonialism. This issue had particular relevance because the struggle in the former Portuguese colonies had contributed to the fall of the Portuguese dictatorship in April 1974.

Over 600 participants attended the congress, with representatives from twenty-six African states, several countries in Europe, including Britain, and the Caribbean including Cuba. Over 200 participants came from the United States, often giving the appearance that they dominated proceedings. Key figures included Imamu Amiri Baraka (1934–2014), Owusu Sadaukai/Howard Fuller and Queen Mother Audley Moore (1898–1987), Wole Soyinka from Nigeria, Dennis Brutus (1924–2009) from South Africa and Ras Makonnen, one of the organizers of the Manchester congress, as well as representatives of the ANC, PAC, ZANU, ZAPU, UNITA and FRELIMO. The most notable absence was Walter Rodney due to ill-health. Keynote addresses were provided by Nyerere and by Sékou Touré who called for a ‘Revolutionary Pan-Africanism’.

Overall, as the first of its type located in Africa, the Pan-African Congress could be considered a major victory bringing together those from the continent and the diaspora, despite acute political differences. It provided a steep learning curve for many participants, perhaps especially those from the United States, visiting Africa and often engaging with those fighting for the liberation of the continent and their politics for the first time. Some, like congress organizer Sylvia Hill, returned to the United States to commit themselves to the struggle against apartheid and in support of the liberation struggles throughout southern Africa. The Congress passed resolutions drafted by its economic and political committees demanding an end to foreign domination, capitalism and neo-colonialism in Africa and ‘Third World countries’, advocating a ‘revolutionary Pan-Africanism’ based on ‘the aspirations of the masses of the African people’, and embracing ‘the cause of all oppressed peoples of the world’. There were also important resolutions on the oppression of black women. However, plans for an Institute of Science and Technology were eventually dropped, the proposal for a permanent secretariat was also rejected, and no plans were made for a seventh congress. The most notable feature of the congress was the significant political differences that existed amongst the adherents of Pan-Africanism.
The Black Power era is associated with demands for political empowerment in the African diaspora, as well as the African continent, but also with a significant critique of Eurocentrism and its denigration of African culture. In opposition, there emerged numerous manifestations of a cultural revival, which again stressed the importance of respect and admiration for African cultures, history, languages, textiles, clothing, hairstyles, aesthetics and music and was most succinctly encapsulated in the memorable phrase ‘Black is beautiful.’ There were, of course, earlier manifestations of this approach such as the Harlem Renaissance and New Negro movements in the United States in the 1920s, and in those trends that culminated in the emergence of Négritude in the Francophone world in the 1930s. Indeed, the affirmation of the legitimacy of African/Black culture has been a constant feature of Pan-African struggles against racism and Eurocentrism throughout the twentieth century as well as before. It is evident in the activities of numerous personalities including Martiniano Eliseu do Bomfim (1859–1943) in Brazil, Jacques Roumain (1907–1944) in Haiti, Nicolas Guillen (1902–1989) in Cuba as well as those of Amy Ashwood Garvey (1897–1969), Katherine Dunham (1909–2006), Paul Robeson and many others. In the post-1945 period such concerns remained, as did the efforts to address them. Several significant initiatives occurred in Europe and Africa in this period, some inspired by the famous Bandung Conference.

However, initiatives which emerged at the height of the Cold War and bi-polar division of the world were subject to the political contention and dynamics of that period which intensified following the announcement by the government of the United States of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan in the late 1940s. From this time criticism of the foreign policy of the United States and anti-colonial and anti-imperialist perspectives were often presented as sympathy for communism. They were often used as a pretext to attack those struggling for African and Pan-African liberation.
In the United States, leading cultural figures and intellectuals such as Paul Robeson and Du Bois, as well as their campaigning organization, the Council on African Affairs, were especially targeted by the government. In Nigeria, Funmi Ransome-Kuti received similar treatment. The Cold War period also highlighted significant differences of orientation amongst those who considered themselves adherents of Pan-Africanism. The post-war period was one in which two distinct trends emerged within the broad Pan-African movement, especially regarding cultural matters. One tended towards an emphasis on forms of Négritude, black pride and cultural nationalism and the other towards an emphasis on class struggle, internationalism and various forms of Marxism. This divergence was particularly evident at the time of the Sixth Pan-African Congress in 1974 but it had first manifested itself much earlier in the century.

Centre for African Studies

One of the most important initiatives in the post-1945 period was the founding in 1950 of the Centre for African Studies in Lisbon, Portugal, by Amilcar Cabral (1924–1973), Agostinho Neto (1922–1979), Mario de Andrade (1928–1990), Marcelino dos Santos (1929–) and others from Portugal’s African colonies. The centre was designed to foster the development of African culture, literature, languages, music and history and was inspired by the literary and cultural movement developing in Angola, associated with poets such as Variato da Cruz (1928–1973), and the magazine Mensagem with its slogan ‘We will discover Angola’. It is important to note that de Andrade and da Cruz went on to found and lead the MPLA, Neto became one of the later leaders of the national liberation movement in Angola, Cabral founded the PAIGC and led the liberation movement in Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde and dos Santos became one of the founders of FRELIMO in Mozambique. They were later joined by others including Déolinda de Almeida who became one of the leading women in Angola’s liberation movement. This cultural movement, which developed at a time when even the use of the word ‘African’ to describe Portugal’s colonies and their cultural traditions was banned by the Portuguese government, united those based in Europe with their compatriots in Africa. It had the aim of ‘re-africanising the mind’ and often viewed cultural work and political activism as indivisible. The movement was Pan-African in orientation, sometimes influenced by the Afro-Brazilian cultural movement, or elements of Négritude, while its leading activists had close connections with the international communist movement. The cultural movement and the Centre for African Studies were also typical of the Pan-African outlook of Lusophone Africans and the close organizational connections that would endure throughout the future armed struggle.
World Congress of Negro Writers and Artists

The first World Congress of Negro Writers and Artists, a key cultural event in this period, was held at the Sorbonne in Paris in September 1956, followed by a second in Rome in March 1959. Both were organized under the auspices of the Négritude-oriented Présence Africaine, the publishing house and ‘cultural journal of the Negro world’, founded in Paris in 1947 by the Senegalese politician Alioune Diop (1910–1980) and his wife Christiane Yandé-Diop (1926–), ‘to affirm the presence, or ethos, of the black communities of the world, and to defend the originality of their way of life and the dignity of their culture’. Its founders, partly inspired by the spirit of Bandung, were mainly concerned with rescuing African and African diaspora cultures, or what they referred to as ‘the African personality’ from the bane of Eurocentrism, which they recognized was a consequence of colonial rule. Their aim was to ‘confirm, exalt and glorify the culture of the Negro peoples’. It is possible to see here a direct line from the concerns of Francophone African and Antillean intellectuals in the 1930s, who fashioned earlier movements of Pan-Africanism and Négritude.

The theme of the first congress was ‘the crisis of Negro culture’ and it drew many eminent participants including Jean Price-Mars, Aimé Césaire, Frantz Fanon, Richard Wright, Mercer Cook, George Lamming, Cheikh Anta Diop, Jacques Rabemananjara, Mario de Andrade, Davidson Nicol, Peter Blackman, Léopold Senghor, James Baldwin, Chester Himes and Cedric Dover. In total, there were sixty delegates but many more observers and much of the conference was open to the public. There were, however, no delegates from Latin America, South Africa, nor the Gold Coast, while two prominent African Americans, Du Bois and Robeson, were prevented from attending as their passports were withheld by the government of the United States. Women, it must be added, were almost entirely absent but it is perhaps even more surprising that following this glaring omission the conference resolved to establish an International Société Africaine de Culture (SAC), that again excluded women. Presided over initially by Jean Price-Mars, with Alione Diop as secretary-general, the Société aimed to unite ‘men of culture of the black world’, to create the conditions for ‘the development of their own cultures’ and ‘the development and consolidation of universal culture’.

The ‘crisis’, which was the main theme of the congress, was one that left African intellectual and cultural workers grappling with the problem of establishing their role and orientation in ‘Western’, as well as in African societies, in the face of racism, Eurocentrism, assimilation and colonialism. In addition to this preoccupation, many also anticipated the struggles ahead and the need for new forms of cultural freedom to accompany post-colonial political liberation. The congress also reflected on the ties that united, and sometimes divided, those from Africa, the Caribbean and the United States. There was much that was anti-colonial and Pan-Africanist in its deliberations.
and this is reflected in the conference resolutions. Amongst other things, the conference welcomed advances throughout the world ‘which imply a general abolition of the colonial system, as well as the final and universal liquidation of racialism’. It urged ‘Negro intellectuals and all justice-loving men to struggle to create the practical conditions for the revival and growth of Negro cultures’.

One eye-witness concluded: ‘It should have been a Pan-African rather than a cultural Congress. But French authorities would not have permitted the holding of a nationalistically-oriented, French-African managed congress anywhere in French territory, and least of all in Paris. The organisers got around this opposition by calling it a Congrès des Ecrivains et Artistes Noirs’. Although there were many established writers and artists present, including Senghor and Césaire, the congress is perhaps most significant today for the presentation of the ideas of two figures who were barely known at the time, Frantz Fanon and Cheikh Anta Diop. Fanon’s presentation was entitled ‘Racism and Culture’ and Diop’s ‘The Cultural Contributions and Prospects of Africa’, so both can be said to have spoken on their specialist subjects.

Fanon, born in Martinique in 1925 had been one of Césaire’s students whilst still at school. He served in the Free French forces in North Africa and Europe during the Second World War and then trained as a psychiatrist in France. He soon began to be recognized as a specialist in the study of the effects of racism both in Martinique and France, especially after the publication of his first book Black Skins, White Masks in 1955. He then practised psychiatry in Algeria, as the anti-colonial struggle against France erupted, treating both French and Algerian casualties, the tortured and their torturers, and becoming a secret member of the Front de Libération Nationale (FLN). Fanon’s view presented in Paris that ‘it is not possible to enslave men without logically making them inferior … racism is only the emotional, affective, sometimes intellectual explanation of this inferiorisation’, was based on research, practice and lived experience. He argued that one of the most significant forms of racism was the ‘destruction of cultural values’, a result of colonialism, that led to the alienation of people from their own national cultures and the hegemony of Eurocentrism and ‘Western values’. For Fanon, the solution to this situation was to be found in the ‘total liberation of the national territory’ which could lead to brotherhood and the mutual enrichment of cultures.

The Senegalese historian, Egyptologist and scientist Cheikh Anta Diop (1923–1986), had already seen the results of his doctoral thesis on ancient Egyptian history published by Presence Africaine as Nations Nègre et Culture in 1954. He was destined to become perhaps the most important and controversial historian of Africa of his generation. In Paris, Diop presented many of the ideas that led to such controversy, the basis of which was that ‘the ancient Egyptian and Pharaonic civilisation was a Negro civilisation’ and that Egypt was the ‘great initiator of the Mediterranean world’, of Greece and Rome. As proof for this view he cited ancient writers.
such as Herodotus, as well as more modern ones such as Count Volney. Diop believed that restoring the truth of Africa’s history, ‘an African historical consciousness and its ancient cultural unity’, were important weapons in the struggle for the liberation of the continent and the ‘creation of a multinational sovereign state’. As he put it, ‘you do not know where you are going until you know where you have come from’. He also stressed the importance of replacing European languages in Africa and finding appropriate African languages that could be used as lingua franca. In short, he argued that African intellectuals must apply themselves to solving the problems facing Africa, such as the need for industrialization of the continent. While regarding the Caribbean, he argued for a federation that would establish ‘relations of fraternity and kinship’ with Africa.

The Pan-African theme of the second congress, held in Rome, was ‘the unity of African Negro culture’, which reflected ‘the unity of the African world’, and the responsibilities of individual disciplines, in the arts, humanities and sciences in creating this unity. It stressed the need for cultural and economic independence as well as political independence for the African continent and remained concerned with combating the pervasive influence of Eurocentrism. Participation was again confined to ‘men of culture’ who included Mars, Césaire, Senghor, Alioune Diop, Cheikh Anta Diop and Fanon who also used his time in Rome to meet with representatives of the national liberation movement in Angola to offer military training in Algeria. Other participants included Eric Williams, the future prime minister of Trinidad and Tobago, who spoke on the ‘the political leader as a man of culture’, Sékou Touré, who made a presentation entitled ‘the political leader considered as the representative of a culture’ as well as African American academic St Claire Drake, Brazilian writer Henrique Alves and South African writer Es’kia Mphahlele. The presentations that have become most well-known were again those given by Fanon and Cheikh Anta Diop. The latter presented his well-known thesis on African cultural unity which was further elaborated in The Cultural Unity of Black Africa, first published by Présence Africaine. The former spoke on ‘the reciprocal basis of national cultures and the struggles for liberation’, the relationship between national culture and African culture, ‘national consciousness’ and ‘international consciousness’. His main thesis was that ‘the organised and conscious struggle undertaken by a colonized people to restore the sovereignty of the nation, constitutes the most fully cultural manifestation there is’. Fanon’s emphasis therefore was on national liberation, which he viewed as also the means to liberate national culture stifled under colonialism, and as the basis for Pan-African unity. Indeed, in his subsequent presentation of this thesis on ‘National Culture’ in The Wretched of the Earth Fanon, although recognizing the common problem of Eurocentrism, is rather scathing about Négritude, the SAC and those like Senghor who demand African cultural unity but opposed the struggle for national liberation in Algeria. It was in this context that he made his famous pronouncement, ‘It is around the
people’s struggles that African-Negro culture takes on substance and not around songs, poems, and folklore’.12

The 1959 conference affirmed the view that ‘political independence and economic liberation are the essential conditions for the cultural advance of the underdeveloped countries in general and the Negro-African countries in particular’. It was also convinced of the need for ‘every effort towards the regrouping of countries or nations artificially divided by imperialism’. The congress recommended that the ‘essential task and sacred mission’ of every artist and writer was to ‘bring their cultural activity within the scope of the great movement for the liberation of their individual peoples’. It decided to divide the 200 delegates from thirty countries into distinct commissions on specific disciplines: literature, philosophy (with a sub-commission on theology), the arts and ‘technical sciences and medicine’. These commissions carried out preparatory work and proposed resolutions, while the congress also condemned wars in defence of colonial rule in Africa and nuclear tests on the continent. The other major feature of the congress was a motion by ‘a group of Marxists’, including Césaire, and probably de Andrade and dos Santos too, inviting other ‘African Marxists to develop their doctrine on the basis of the real history, aspirations and economic situation of their peoples and to build and found it on the authority of their own culture’.13 In short, the second congress showed that there was considerable opposition to many of the key elements of Négritude.

The American Society of African Culture

One noticeable feature of both congresses was the difficulty that the delegates experienced reaching a consensus. The differences between the experiences and orientation of African American participants and those from African and Caribbean colonies were most noticeable at the Paris congress, whilst other political differences were perhaps more pronounced in Rome. One of the key moments in Paris was the reading of a message from Du Bois which stated: ‘I am not present at your meeting because the US government will not give me a passport,’ which apparently did not find favour with some of the other American delegates.14 Du Bois had added, ‘Any American Negro travelling abroad today must either not care about Negroes or say what the State Department wishes him to say.’ The exposure of the US delegation was almost complete, as the writer James Baldwin made clear in his report of the event.15

African American involvement in Paris had been partly organized by the novelist Richard Wright. He had been in self-imposed exile in Paris for almost a decade and was already working with the United States embassy in that city to ‘offset Communist influence’ at the congress. In 1955 Wright had been funded by a CIA front organization to attend the Bandung Conference, and it seems likely that the African American delegation that attended the
Paris congress was also indirectly funded by the CIA through the American Information Committee on Race and Caste, which soon changed its name to the Council on Race and Caste in World Affairs (CORAC). The delegation also met with United States embassy officials and several delegates subsequently wrote reports that suggest that ‘Communist influence’ at the event was uppermost in their minds. The delegation also met with United States embassy officials and several delegates subsequently wrote reports that suggest that ‘Communist influence’ at the event was uppermost in their minds.16

One of the lasting legacies of the Paris congress was the founding in 1957 of the American Society of African Culture (AMSAC), an affiliate of the SAC in Paris.17 The SAC had initially suggested that Du Bois and Paul Robeson might join its executive but this proposal was vetoed by those in the United States who had organized AMSAC, who were also connected with the CIA-led CORAC. There is some evidence that the AMSAC attempted to use CIA funds to influence Présence Africaine and certainly there were discussions between the increasingly disillusioned Wright and others regarding how best to influence Alioune Diop and his colleagues in Paris.18

The AMSAC were a group of scholars, writers and activists, including St Clair Drake, Horace Mann Bond, Mercer Cook Sr., led by John Davis, whose aim was ostensibly to study ‘the high culture of Africa in order to bring about an appreciation of the cultural validity of Africa amongst Africans, American Negroes and the nations of the world’.19 In particular it aimed to build unity between Africans and African Americans through various forms of cultural exchange. It is clear that there were often differences between the eminent African American personalities who engaged with AMSAC, even in regard to connections with Africa, but its Pan-African orientation, albeit limited and directed by the CIA, was always evident, especially in such publications as Africa Seen by American Negro Scholars.20 It organized conferences and produced various other publications such as the American Negro Writer and His Roots, a report of the AMSAC’s 1959 conference on African American writers.21 However, despite this cultural bias the AMSAC held conferences devoted to Pan-Africanism and political change in southern Africa, and one of its objectives was to disseminate ‘accurate information concerning the progress of Negroes under American democracy’.22 It clearly operated in the context of the Cold War and US foreign policy objectives, both in regard to Africa and the need to counter the negative image of the government of the United States resulting from the struggle for Civil Rights.

In the early 1960s AMSAC even opened an office in Lagos, Nigeria, much to the concern of SAC in Paris, and in 1965 published its own journal African Forum, which focused on contemporary African affairs. As well as sponsoring seminars for African writers and musicians in the United States, the AMSAC sponsored speaking tours for representatives of the NAACP and Congress of Racial Equality in Africa to counter any negative impressions that Africans might have formed. In 1964 AMSAC even financed an African tour by civil rights leader James Farmer, in order to counter a recent visit by Malcolm X.23 In this instance the tour was not an unqualified CIA success, since it was viewed with suspicion in some quarters and because Farmer
had a tendency to be critical of the government of the United States.\textsuperscript{24} The AMSAC undoubtedly was successful in courting major cultural figures: Duke Ellington, Langston Hughes, Nina Simone, although some people clearly had suspicions about its ‘Uncle Tom’ nature and its most significant feature, the fact that it was secretly financed by the CIA.\textsuperscript{25}

**First World Festival of Negro Arts**

Cold War tensions were also evident in the First World Festival of Negro Arts which took place in Dakar, Senegal, from April to May 1966 with over 2,500 participants from over forty countries. Organized by the government of Senegal and SAC and under the auspices of UNESCO, it was advertised as a manifestation of the Négritude espoused by Senegal’s president Léopold Senghor but also aimed to showcase ‘the Negro’s unique creative ability’, and to ‘permit Negro artists throughout the world to return periodically to the sources of their art’.\textsuperscript{26} The essence of the festival was captured in the William Greaves film *The First World Festival of Negro Arts* (1968). Participants included such internationally famous names as Duke Ellington, Josephine Baker, Rosa Guy, Langston Hughes, Aimé Césaire, Ousmane Sembene and Wole Soyinka but the festival also had its critics. James Baldwin, Harry Belafonte, Sidney Poitier and others boycotted it and many more were opposed to a central focus on Négritude, the perceived neo-colonial relationship between Senegal and France, as well as an apparent lack of concern with contemporary anti-colonial struggles. The festival was held just a few months after the government of the United States had supported the coup in the Congo which brought Mobutu to power, and the coup in Ghana which removed Nkrumah from power. The apolitical nature of the festival was also a stark contrast with the recently held Tri-continental Conference held in Cuba. The famous Tri-continental Conference represented one of the key moments of Third World anti-imperialist solidarity organized, as the Moroccan Mehdi Ben Barka explained, with the clear aim to ‘blend the two great currents of world revolution: that which was born in 1917 with the Russian Revolution, and that which represents the anti-imperialist and national liberation movements of today’.\textsuperscript{27} The Dakar festival, in contrast, presented an opportunity not only for the promotion of Négritude but also for furthering the imperialist aims of France and the United States in Africa. Indeed, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs was an honoured guest and speaker at the festival.

The government of the United States hoped to use the festival to restore its tarnished reputation in Africa and directly sponsored many of those attending, as well as indirectly financing the travel of others through the auspices of the AMSAC. Undoubtedly, African American performers such as Duke Ellington made a big impact in Dakar as the government of the United States had intended. Nevertheless, the government of the United States was severely criticized for what many saw as the paucity of its funding and it could not prevent criticisms
of racism in the United States, nor of its foreign policy in Africa and elsewhere from being expressed by some performers. Contemporary accounts were also critical of the composition of the US organizing committee, co-chaired by John Davis of AMSAC, its selection of the US delegation, and the fact that most African Americans knew nothing of the festival. The approach of the American organizers therefore tended to further expose the role and aims of the government of the United States and the CIA.

Although Dakar was dedicated to a ‘defense and illustration of négritude’, and in Senghor’s words ‘the elaboration of a new humanism which this time will include all of humanity’, criticism of the concept continued during the festival. It emerged from the Nigerian writer Wole Soyinka, as well as the African American choreographer Katherine Dunham who acted as a cultural advisor to Senghor but who declared that the term Négritude was ‘meaningless’. Others were critical of the fact that participation was limited to delegations from states, so liberation movements were excluded and all participants were required to seek the approval of their own governments. Those who were not part of official delegations, such as the exiled Brazilian cultural worker Abdias do Nascimento, were excluded. Do Nascimento subsequently responded with his scathing ‘Open Letter to the World Festival of Negro Arts’, which professed both his fervent adherence to a conception of Négritude but at the same time his opposition to the Brazilian government’s treatment of Afro-Brazilians.

Brazil and the Latin American connection

Brazil is the country that has the largest population of African heritage outside the African continent, the enslavement of Africans in Brazil was not abolished until 1888, but is also one where racial oppression and disadvantage has persisted despite the promotion of a global image suggesting otherwise. However, many other countries in Latin America also have significant African-descendant populations including Uruguay, Colombia, Peru, Mexico, Costa Rica, Panama, Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico. Indeed, it is now considered that about a quarter of the entire population of Latin America is of African origin, perhaps not a surprising figure considering that nearly 6 million Africans were enslaved and brought to this region, initially dominated by Spain and Portugal, ten times as many as were transported to the United States. However, despite this history there have been persistent attempts in Brazil and elsewhere to deny and hide the existence of ‘Afrodescendants’ (a term coined during the Latin American Regional Conference Against Racism in Santiago de Chile, in 2000) and the fact that state-organized racism exists. For example, as late as 1966 the government of Brazil would claim, ‘the majority of the Brazilian population is made up of whites’, a statement that may or may not be mathematically correct but disguises the fact that even according to official
statistics at least 44 per cent are Afrodescendants. Afro-Brazilian activists generally consider that at least half of the population has this origin, the largest black population outside Africa.34

In Brazil, especially, there has also been a long history of Afro-Brazilian political mobilization and organizing, some of which had an important cultural element. The Brazilian Black Front was first established in 1931 and its publication *A Voz de Raca* two years later but the Partido Independiente do Color in Cuba was founded even earlier in 1908. Both parties had a short life-span, as did the Partido Autóctono Negro in Uruguay, formed in 1936.35 The Black Front in Brazil was influenced by Garveyism and campaigned to end institutional racism and segregation and to gain political representation; however, it was banned under the Vargas dictatorship in 1937. Other organizations followed including the Socialist Black Front and Brazilian Black Union, the Afro-Campineiro Youth Congress (1938), the Black Experimental Theatre (1944), Association of Brazilian Blacks and the Afro-Brazilian Democratic Committee (1945). Two National Black Conventions were held in 1945 and 1946, the National Conference of Blacks was convened in 1949 and the first National Congress of Brazilian Blacks and National Council of Black Women in 1950.36

A significant ‘black press’ also developed in Brazil including *Quilombo*, the paper published in 1948 by the Black Experimental Theatre (BET), founded by do Nascimento, which regularly featured coverage of African American and African affairs and which had contact with representatives of *Presence Africaine* in France and Senegal. From this period do Nascimento became one of the leading Afro-Brazilian and Pan-African activists. Because of severe political repression, especially during the period of military rule do Nascimento and other activists often formed cultural organizations rather than overtly political ones. The BET was one of the most significant and it also held literacy and cultural classes, organized beauty contests amongst Afro-Brazilian women, championed the notion ‘Black is Beautiful’ in the early 1950s, well before it became in vogue in the United States. In 1955 it organized a ‘Black Christ’ art competition to oppose Eurocentrism and racism.37 The BET believed that various forms of cultural self-determination were vitally necessary acts of resistance and empowerment. This approach could also be seen with the emergence of the Teatro y Danzas Negras in Peru and similar development in Colombia and elsewhere. Afro-Brazilian organizations also showed a growing awareness of the need for ‘independent Black institutions’, a kind of Brazilian Négritude strongly opposed to assimilation developed as part of a concern with wider Pan-African connections.38 In his ‘Open Letter’, do Nascimento refers to many of these cultural developments in Brazil but it is important to bear in mind that the BET also played a key role in political developments such as the convening of the National Black Convention in 1946.

Such concerns had existed well before this period of course. Some Afro-Brazilians returned to West Africa even in the nineteenth century and during
the 1930s there were some connections between Afro-Brazilians and other diasporic Africans. There were also strong cultural ties between Brazil and West Africa. For example, Martiniano Eliseu do Bomfim (1859–1943), an Afro-Brazilian of Yoruba origin, returned to Lagos, Nigeria, in 1875, with his father who had formally been enslaved. He attended school and became fluent in English and Yoruba before returning to Brazil in 1886. In 1937 for the Second Afro-Brazilian Congress, an event concerned with Afro-Brazilian studies, do Bomfim translated ‘The Yoruba Conception of God’, an article by Ladipo Solanke, a British-based Nigerian who had founded the West African Students’ Union in 1925.39

The first National Congress of Brazilian Blacks in 1950 was a landmark in Brazilian history. Afro-Brazilian participants organized the event and demanded not only political and constitutional changes but also those relating to culture and Eurocentrism in all aspects of Brazilian society. The first anti-racism law was enacted in 1951, largely as a result of the discrimination faced by the famous African American choreographer Katherine Dunham and as a result of agitation by the BET and other organizations.40 It ushered in a period in the 1960s in which more open protests against racism were made even during a time of military dictatorship. Publications such as New Horizon proposed a united black front against US intervention in the Congo and Abdias do Nascimento represented the Angolan MPLA in Brazil and organized protests against the apartheid regime in South Africa. However, the military regime effectively banned discussion on racism in the 1960s and 1970s, so do Nascimento was himself forced into exile in 1968, before a resurgence in protests occasioned by internal factors and the liberation struggles in Angola, Mozambique and elsewhere, as well as a growing Pan-African/Black Power consciousness that was influenced by developments in the United States and worldwide in the late 1960s and early 1970s.41 It was not until 1974, at the Pan-African Congress in Tanzania, that an Afro-Brazilian was able to make an intervention concerning racism in Brazil to an international Pan-African gathering.42

The Pan-African Cultural Festival, Algiers

The Pan-African Cultural Festival convened by the OAU and the Algerian government in 1969 was a significant contrast to the Dakar festival. It openly celebrated African liberation and aimed to represent the ‘cultural renaissance of the Third World in general and Africa in particular’. Algeria had been chosen as host specifically because it was the African country that had at that time fought the longest war of national liberation to achieve its independence.43 It was also a base for several African liberation movements. As Amilcar Cabral explained in a press conference during the festival, ‘Pick up a pen and take note: the Muslims make the pilgrimage to Mecca, the Christians to the Vatican and the national liberation movements to Algiers.’44
The festival’s main themes were the important role of African culture ‘in the struggle for liberation, in the condition of African Unity, and the economic and social development of Africa’. The Algerian president, Houari Boumediene, opened the festival by denouncing European colonial rule and stating that ‘culture is a weapon in our struggle for liberation’, as some 4,000 participants from twenty-four African countries paraded through the capital. Boumediene was also an adherent of the view that African intellectuals and cultural workers must reconnect with and learn from the culture of ‘the mass of the people’. The Algiers Festival rejected the overall orientation of the Dakar festival, that culture was somehow divorced from politics and the need for African liberation. It was much more in keeping with the views of Fanon and Cabral than it was those of Senghor and the adherents of Négritude.

Algeria had already established itself as an OAU designated haven for revolutionaries and radicals. South African exile Miriam Makeba was granted Algerian citizenship, for instance, and so in addition to the African countries represented there were also delegations from six national liberation organizations: MPLA, FRELIMO, PAIGC, ANC, SWAPO and ZAPU. In addition, there were revolutionary organizations from the diaspora including several leading figures from the US Black Panther Party (BPP) such as Eldridge and Kathleen Cleaver and Emory Douglas, as well as former BPP member Stokely Carmichael. As Kathleen Cleaver has stated, the Black Panthers and many other African Americans had already been inspired both by Algeria’s struggle for independence and the writing of its most famous champion Frantz Fanon. There were also several cultural performers and intellectuals from the United States participating including Nina Simone, Maya Angelou, Rosa Guy and Archie Shepp. The revolutionary spirit that pervaded the entire festival was vividly captured in William Klein’s memorable films Festival panafricain d’Alger (1970) and Eldridge Cleaver, Black Panther (1970).

Yet another distinctive feature of the Algiers festival was the opposition to Négritude, despite Senghor’s intervention, that was evident in many of speeches about culture and is evident in Klein’s Festival panafricain d’Alger. In part this was because the festival represented the unity of the entire African continent and Négritude was not a concept that incorporated all Africans, especially those in North Africa. What united many of those in Algiers was a common experience of colonialism and imperialism and the struggle against neo-colonialism and for the total liberation of the African continent. There was therefore criticism of Négritude from Guinea’s Sékou Touré, from the delegations of Algeria, Sudan, Dahomey and Congo–Brazzaville as well as from the well-known Haitian poet René Depestre and many of the liberation movements. Agostinho Neto one of the leaders of the MPLA, for instance, expressed the view that ‘Our struggle for national liberation is also a struggle for the culture of our people.’ The sentiments of the majority at the festival that ‘African culture is a culture of combat’
and ‘African culture will be revolutionary or will not be’ were presented in a Pan-African Cultural Manifesto which made some forty recommendations for Pan-African unity. It stressed the need for complete decolonization of education, the building of Pan-African institutions for women, youths and workers, and the necessity for artists and intellectuals to foster Pan-African unity by being at one with the masses of the people.

In addition, the struggle against Eurocentrism was viewed not as a question of reclaiming the past, but of taking practical measures to elevate the importance of African languages and the cultures of the masses of the people to unite and free the entire continent. Solving the political questions relating to liberation and economic development and opposition to neo-colonialism were thus uppermost in the minds of many delegations, especially those from countries where liberation struggles had taken, or were taking place, such as Algeria, South Africa, Namibia, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau. In these countries the question of revolutionary culture and ‘revolutionary consciousness’ was clearly a matter of life and death. The delegates from the Confederation of National Organisations in the Portuguese Colonies, representing FRELIMO, MPLA and PAIGC, also highlighted the fact that a new revolutionary consciousness and revolutionary culture were both a product of, and a determining factor in, the struggle for national liberation. It was a summation of experience which in many ways anticipated Amilcar Cabral’s famous presentation on ‘National Liberation and Culture’ delivered the following year.

The practice, experience and theory derived from the national liberation movements had a profound impact throughout the African continent but also on those from the diaspora. At the same time the connections between African and African diasporic cultures were further strengthened, most notably in the performances and compositions of Archie Shepp. During a performance of his We Have Come Back with Algerian musicians, Shepp proclaimed: ‘We have come back to our land of Africa. Jazz is Black Power. Jazz is an African Power! Jazz is an African music! We have come back!’ A greater Pan-Africanist orientation might also be discerned in the renaming of the African American publication Negro Digest which became Black World in 1970. Its editor, Hoyt Fuller, had attended both the Dakar and Algiers festivals. He was extremely critical of the former but appears to have been inspired by the latter. Black World soon included a regular ‘Towards Pan-Africanism’ feature ‘with the central purpose of illuminating the condition or status of Black people in particular places and situations relative to Pan-Africanism’.

The leading members of the Black Panther Party who attended the Algiers festival further strengthened their view that ‘the liberation of Blacks from racist oppression and capitalist exploitation required a social revolution to transform the economic and political institutions of the United States’. At the same time, they were profoundly influenced by the most well-known personality of the Algerian revolution, Frantz
Fanon, and attempted to adapt his analysis of colonial oppression to the situation they faced in the United States. Following its sojourn in Algiers the ‘International Section’ of the BPP also grew closer to the MPLA, FRELIMO and PAIGC and especially the government of the Peoples’ Republic of the Congo, as well as the governments of North Korea and North Vietnam.57

Pan-African arts and culture

Several other major Pan-African cultural festivals were held during the 1970s most notably the Soul Power Festival held in Kinshasa in 1974, originally aimed to coincide with the world boxing championship bout between Mohammed Ali and George Foreman (the ‘rumble in the jungle’). It was followed by the Congress of the African Writers’ Union held in 1976, the First Congress of Black Culture in the Americas, held in Colombia in 1977 and the Second World Black and African Festival of Arts and Culture (FESTAC) held in Nigeria in 1977. The Soul Power Festival aimed to unite musicians from Africa and the African diaspora, most of whom were African Americans, but otherwise had limited political aims other than acting as a public relations exercise for the US-backed dictator Mobutu’s Zaire. It was financed by Liberian bankers and featured James Brown, B. B. King, Bill Withers, Miriam Makeba, Celia Cruz and TPOK Jazz Second. The festival is the subject of Levy-Hinte’s film Soul Power (2009).

More significant in Pan-African terms was the Congress of the African Writers’ Union, sometimes known as the First Congress of All African Writers, which was held in Dakar in 1976, convened by the Nigeria writer Wole Soyinka and hosted by Léopold Senghor. Participants included the Kenyan poet Barhadur Tejani, African Americans Haki Madhubuti and Harold Cruse, Cuban Carlos Moore, Venezuelan Joaquin Baez Dias, as well as Abdias do Nascimento from Brazil and C. L. R. James who gave a keynote address on the history of Pan-Africanism, as well as the prospects for a Seventh Pan-African Congress.58 The Congress established an Association of Researchers and Scholars of the African World presided over by Cheikh Anta Diop.

In many ways FESTAC revived the orientation of the Dakar festival and was originally planned as a successor which would be convened in 1970. The International Festival Committee first met in 1972 and took five years to complete all the preparations in part due to political changes in Nigeria, but also significant differences between major players as to whether the festival should focus on African or ‘Black’ culture, in short, if the orientation of the adherents of Négritude should dominate. Eventually a compromise was proposed and accepted.59 The festival committee was presided over by Alioune Diop and supported by several governments in Africa and the
Caribbean, as well as in the United States. Unlike the Dakar festival, African liberation movements were represented and had their own representative on the organizing committee as one of sixteen geographical zones. The aims of the festival were very similar to those expressed in 1966 in Dakar,

To ensure the revival, resurgence, propagation and promotion of Black and African culture and black and African cultural values and civilization; to present black and African culture in its highest and widest conception; to bring to light the diverse contributions of black and African peoples to the universal currents of thought and arts; to promote black and African artists, performers and writers and facilitate their world acceptance and their access to world outlets; to promote better international and interracial understanding; to facilitate a periodic return to origin in Africa by black artists, writers and performers uprooted to other continents.

Although FESTAC did not officially embrace Négritude, this orientation and the concept of the uniqueness of African cultural features both within the continent and the diaspora was a major theme throughout the festival.

In total seventy-five countries were represented by thousands of participants, including major international cultural figures such as Stevie Wonder, Miriam Makeba, Bembaya Jazz and Dudu Pukwana. The African American delegation was again a significant one, numbering over 500 and led by Maulana Karenga, but there were also delegations from Europe, the Caribbean and South America as well as those from the African continent. A key aspect of FESTAC was the colloquium, a series of discussions on political, economic and cultural issues relating to Pan-Africanism that took place throughout the festival. However, the colloquium was organized in such a way that governments made the final decision concerning who should participate, which led to the exclusion of several significant intellectuals. Once again do Nascimento was excluded from the Brazilian delegation, despite a previous invitation but was eventually permitted to speak with support from other delegates. Several diasporic delegations joined together to produce a ‘Minority Report’ that was critical of what they viewed as their marginalization. In fact, the colloquium itself was eventually marginalized and its deliberations and recommendations ignored.

Just a few months after FESTAC, the First Congress of Black Culture in the Americas was held in Colombia, as if to emphasize that Afrodescendants in the Americas had hitherto largely been excluded from the wider Pan-African movement and festivals. The key organizers were the Centre for Afro-Colombian Studies, the Colombian Foundation for Folkloric Studies, the Cultural Association of Black Peruvian Youth and the Colombian writer and folklorist Manuel Zapata Olivella. In congress publicity the organizers made clear that they were concerned with the ‘social decolonisation of the African contribution in the continent’. Moreover, for them the discussion and investigation of culture was ‘an activity with which to impregnate and
give impulse to the political, social, economic and cultural re-vindication of the population of African origin in our continent’. The Congress itself called for the teaching of African languages in South America and issued a Declaration of Solidarity with the Goals and Decisions of the World Conference Against Apartheid and Racial Discrimination, which was taking place in Lagos at that time. Amongst other things, the Congress resolved that the struggle against apartheid and other minority regimes in southern Africa ‘involve all of us, Black peoples of all the parts of the world’. The Congress exhibited a certain support for some forms of Négritude but at the same time recognized the need for revolutionary transformations that would permit ‘neither class exploitation nor racism’. It has been viewed as the first major Pan-African event in South America. A second congress took place three years later in Panama and a third in Brazil in 1982.63

Black Arts Movement

As well as the formally organized cultural festivals and congresses, the period since the 1960s has witnessed a major revival of arts, music and culture employing Pan-African themes, much of it a response to the dominant global Eurocentrism. A self-styled Black Arts Movement emerged in the United States in the mid-1960s, taking its name from the founding of the Black Arts School Theatre (BARTS) by Leroi Jones (Amiri Baraka) in 1965 in New York, his poem Black Art published the same year, and closely linked to the emerging Black Power movement. The Movement’s defining manifesto is generally considered to have been written in 1968 by Larry Neal (1937–1981), who referred to it as the ‘aesthetic and spiritual sister of the Black Power concept’.64

There were, however, several earlier attempts to develop organizations of African American writers and other cultural workers, such as the Harlem Writers’ Guild, founded in 1950, the New York-based On Guard for Freedom as well as Umbra Workshop and Magazine. A characteristic of many of these organizations was not just their intention that artistic endeavour should serve the interests of black people in some way, but also the fact that their members were sometimes at the forefront of Pan-African struggles themselves. One notable example was Rosa Guy (1922–2012), a Trinidad-born New York-based writer, who was a founding member of the Harlem Writers Guild, On Guard for Freedom and the Cultural Association for Women of African Heritage. She and others, including Maya Angelou (1928–2014) and singer Abbey Lincoln (1930–2010) took a leading role in the demonstrations at the UN Security Council meeting in New York in February 1961, condemning the assassination of Patrice Lumumba.65

The Black Arts Movement was influenced by the politics of a range of organizations and individuals including Paul Robeson, Malcolm X, Robert F. Williams, Langston Hughes, the Black Panther Party, Maulana Karenaga’s
US organization, as well as the Nation of Islam and the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM). Initially predominantly a literary movement, including drama, its writings were disseminated by an emerging black cultural press including such publications as Freedomways, Liberator, The Black Scholar and Negro Digest (renamed Black World in 1970). The Movement reflected the ongoing struggles within the United States, but often sought to establish a ‘Black Aesthetic’ or ‘trans-Africa’ style and had other Pan-African aspects, not least the tendency to connect new African American cultural productions to an African cultural framework or foundation. Underlying such initiatives was the demand for a ‘cultural revolution’, influenced by events in China but more so by Malcolm X who had spoken of the need for a ‘cultural, psychological, philosophical migration back to Africa’. After his assassination, Malcolm X became an iconic figure for the Black Arts Movement.

A significant feature of the movement was the tension between ‘cultural nationalism’ and ‘revolutionary nationalism’ over the question of what kind of culture and cultural revolution was required, culminating in some of its leading figures, such as Baraka, embracing forms of Marxism. Nevertheless, the ‘cultural nationalists’, especially Maulana Karenga (1941–), an opponent of the BPP, exerted a significant influence especially with the adoption of the East African inspired Kawaida philosophy and Kwanzaa annual holiday celebrations in 1966. Kwanzaa has now been established not only as a significant African American holiday but is acknowledged by many throughout the African diaspora. For the BPP and others there was a need for ‘revolutionary culture’ and they often looked to the national liberation struggles in Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde, Angola, Mozambique, Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa for inspiration. The annual 25 May celebration of Africa Liberation Day provided a focus for Pan-African political and cultural concerns as well as highlighting the differences that existed amongst Pan-Africanists in Africa and in the diaspora. During the late 1960s and 1970s Pan-African concerns were sometimes coupled with a new identification with the so-called Third World and its challenges, as well as a growing interest in countries that were struggling to liberate themselves and build new people-centred societies such as Cuba, Vietnam, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, China and Albania.

As the movement developed it encompassed not just literature, but also other forms of artistic production, including painting and sculpture encouraged by the Visual Arts Workshop of the Organisation of Black American Culture (OBAC), Afri-Cobra (the African Commune of Bad, Relevant Artists), the Black Emergency Cultural Coalition and many other bodies. A notable feature of the Black Arts Movement was the development of a multimedia approach to counter Eurocentrism and to contribute to political and ideological change. Influential artists included Betye Saar (1926–), Elizabeth Catlett (1915–2012), Jeff Donaldson (1932–2004) and Benny Andrews (1930–2006). Also influential was the artwork used
in *Soulbook*, the RAM publication specifically dedicated to the ‘Peoples of Afroamerica, Africa and to all the Peoples of the World’, by the ‘sons and daughters of Africa’ who produced it. Perhaps even more influential was the artwork of Emory Douglas, M. Gayle Dickson and Matilaba in the BPP’s *The Black Panther*.70 These and other publications, including the widely-circulated *Negro Digest/Black World*, also featured regular discussions and debates on cultural questions in Africa and the diaspora, as well as the work of key literary and political figures such as Fanon and Cabral.71

The Black Arts Movement with all its contradictions had an influence outside the borders of the United States but perhaps even more influential was the popular music of the period and the compositions and recordings of such African American artistes as James Brown, The Impressions, Nina Simone, Abbey Lincoln, Max Roach, Archie Shepp and others, some of whom performed in the major Pan-African cultural festivals. Simone’s *Young, Gifted and Black* (1970) and Brown’s *Say It Loud, I’m Black and I’m Proud* (1968), for example, spoke for and to a generation and had a global Pan-African significance, while African musicians such as Miriam Makeba, Hugh Masekela and Fela Kuti also contributed to new Pan-African popular culture which identified with political themes. In the late 1960s and 1970s the music, fashion and Afros, or natural hairstyles of African Americans, which celebrated pride in African culture, were often adopted in Africa and throughout the diaspora.

**The Rastafarian movement**

Perhaps the most important Pan-African cultural movement to emerge on a global scale during the period of the Cold War was the Rastafarian movement, which was first established in Jamaica in the 1930s. In brief the Rastafarian movement is a religious or spiritual one based on belief in the divinity of the former Ethiopian emperor Haile Selassie, who before his coronation in 1930 was known as Ras Tafari. The Rastafarians, Rastafari or Rastas, as they are often known, draw on the philosophy and teaching of Marcus Garvey and the UNIA, the Bible, an extensive tradition of Ethiopianism and Pan-Africanism as well as various Jamaican traditional beliefs to fashion their creed. They yearn for the destruction of Babylon, a term also used by the BPP to refer to the capital-centred world, seek a return to Zion, or Africa in general and especially to Ethiopia. Although ostensibly rejecting involvement in politics, the very existence of the Rastas and their doctrine can be viewed as an expression of anti-colonialism and opposition to Eurocentrism. They have exercised a particularly important influence on Reggae, the popular Jamaican music that emerged as a significant genre globally from the 1960s onwards. Many of the most popular Jamaican musicians of the 1960s and 1970s identified with the Rastafari, such as Bob Andy, Dennis Brown (1957–1999), Joseph Hill (1949–2006), The Wailers,
Burning Spear and the Abyssinians. Through Reggae, Rasta and Jamaican music and culture, as well as Garveyism, have reached a global audience and have been particularly significant in Africa and the diaspora. It was, for example, the Rastafarian and Reggae superstar Bob Marley (1945–1981) who was chosen to headline the celebrations to mark the independence of Zimbabwe in 1980.72

The Rasta doctrine was based around not just the historical importance of Ethiopia as a symbol of African independence but also the fact that the emperor had himself become a symbol of that struggle during the 1930s. In addition, however, the legitimating myths of the Ethiopian monarchy linked the emperor to Solomon, the Ark of the Covenant and biblical Israel. These myths, in the view of the Rastas, linked them and all those of African/Ethiopian heritage to an Ethiopian Zion, as God’s chosen people temporarily exiled in Babylon. This empowering narrative was significantly strengthened by the view that there was a living god who was an African. The Rasta therefore reversed the entire colonial and Eurocentric worldview which denigrated Africa and Africans, whether through their appearance, cultural practices, language or lifestyle. During the colonial period they were viewed as subversive but this view continued even after the end of formal colonial rule, since the Rastas also refused to accept the post-independence regimes, sometimes supported the Cuban revolution, maintained their allegiance to Ethiopia and Haile Selassie and asserted their right to repatriate or ‘forward to Zion’.73 They also often advocated the smoking of marijuana as a sacrament, vegetarianism and ‘ital’ food, and grew their hair in the now famous dreadlocks, a hairstyle which has become globally popular. In short, they fashioned a doctrine and lifestyle that had relevance and attraction for many young people, especially as it was often expounded and disseminated through popular music. Moreover, Rastafarianism produced its own aesthetic, evident in the art of Daniel Heartman and the film The Harder They Come and as well as through music, fashion and hairstyle that stressed the unity and liberation of Africans. By the mid-1970s the Rastafarian movement had a global significance as a culture of resistance, initially amongst those in the Caribbean, the African continent and the African diaspora, but subsequently even more widely. Its significance led Walter Rodney to declare that for a period the Rastafari represented a leading force in the ‘expression of black consciousness’.74

Afrocentrism

One of the key features of the Pan-African movement at the end of the twentieth century was the tension between differing approaches to the problems facing Africa and its diaspora. Amongst some it was evident that various forms of the Marxist worldview were influential, as they had been from the early part of the century. However, it was also evident that there
were other influential currents that drew on an even older tradition of what is often referred to as Black Nationalism. In the early twentieth century this tradition was most significantly developed by Marcus Garvey and approaches which relied heavily on elements of neo-Garveyism remained influential. In the last two decades of the century these were reinvigorated by the re-emergence of Afrocentrism as a major ideological trend and the publication in 1980 of *Afrocentricity: The Theory of Social Change* by Molefi Asante, an African American academic.75

According to Asante:

Afrocentricity is a paradigm based on the idea that African people should reassert a sense of agency in order to achieve sanity. During the 1960s a group of African American intellectuals in the newly-formed Black Studies departments in universities began to formulate novel ways of analysing information. In some cases, these new ways were called looking at information from a ‘black perspective’ as opposed to what was considered the ‘white perspective’ of most information in the American academy.76

Asante adds that his approach is connected with that of ‘contemporary philosophers’ such as Maulana Karenga, and what some have termed the ‘Africanization’ of the Black Power movement. The most well-known aspect of this ‘Africanization’ has been the creation of the Kwanzaa celebrations that are observed during the Christmas period.77 It is clear that what has been referred to as a new ‘Pan-African scholarship’ emerged with particular force during the 1960s in both Africa and the diaspora, but principally in North America, where it challenged many manifestations of Eurocentrism in academia and demanded both the creation of ‘Black Studies’ courses and that African Studies should be reconstructed ‘along Afrocentric lines’ and from a ‘Pan-African perspective’. Such a perspective, it was suggested, ‘defines that all Black peoples are African peoples’.78

In one sense, therefore, modern Afrocentrism is a response to Eurocentrism, to a perspective which has for so long marginalized Africa and Africans, especially in the United States but also throughout the world. It therefore draws on the work of earlier thinkers such as Edward Blyden, J. E. Casely Hayford, W. E. B. Du Bois and others. Du Bois specifically mentions the term Afro-centric when describing the plans for the *Encyclopaedia Africana* project then recommencing in Ghana in the early 1960s.79 The need for African-centred studies and institutions was also uppermost in the mind of Kwame Nkrumah when in 1963 he spoke of the need for a study of the history, culture and institutions, languages and arts of Ghana and Africa ‘in new African-centred ways – in entire freedom from the propositions and presuppositions of the colonial epoch’.80

As the title of Asante’s book suggests, however, he and other adherents are not just concerned with analysing information or providing an alternative
to Eurocentrism. He also claims that Afrocentricity is a ‘revolutionary idea’, because once African people understand the central importance of their own centrality and agency ‘we must be prepared to act upon our interpretation of what is in the best interests of black people, that is black people as an historically oppressed population’. Asante has argued that ‘Afrocentric ideology’ can play a key role in contemporary Pan-Africanism, especially in the struggle to establish a United States of Africa and forge one African people from many African peoples, including those in the African diaspora. He argues that ‘we must engage in a persistent and consistent propagation of the value of Pan-Africanism as a viable strategy in defence of Afrocentric solidarity … To say “I am a Pan Africanist” and not to work in the interests of the agency of Africans is to abuse the term Pan African.’ Although according to Asante, ‘just to be African should be sufficient to capture the essence of Afrocentric Pan-Africanism’.81

Afrocentricity as a method of analysis or a ‘revolutionary idea’ may have had a limited impact; its adherents are mainly in the United States and other Anglophone countries where diasporic Africans reside. However, Afrocentrism in its widest sense, or what Asante and others have labelled ‘Africology’ the ‘Afrocentric study of African phenomenon’, which is ‘primarily pan Africanist in its treatment of the creative, political and geographic of our collective will to liberty’, has had a significant impact on the study of the history of Africa and Africans, including Asante’s own volume The History of Africa.82 This approach has also drawn on earlier scholarship by African Americans such as Carter Woodson, William H. Ferris, George M. James and John Henrik Clarke, or those based in the United States such as the Jamaican J. A. Rogers and the Guyanese scholar Ivan van Sertima, as well as continental Africans such as Théophile Obenga and Cheikh Anta Diop.83 The latter has become adopted as a seminal figure and icon for those who associate themselves with Afrocentrism, most notably for his views on the ‘African origin of civilisation’ and the African nature of Ancient Egypt. However, as others have indicated, a Pan-African historiography with a not dissimilar focus can be dated back to the early nineteenth century and beyond and includes such writers as David Walker, Hosea Eaton, James Pennington and James Africanus Horton, who refuted Eurocentric approaches and highlighted the importance of African civilizations including that of Ancient Egypt. Walker’s Appeal to the Colored Citizens of the World, first published in 1829 extolled the glorious past of Ancient Egypt, explained that the Egyptians were ‘African or coloured people, such as we are’, and argued that amongst them ‘learning originated and was carried thence to Greece’.84 Such views were widespread amongst diasporic African intellectuals in the nineteenth century, who often drew on biblical references, and were a vital part of the refutation of racist and Eurocentric views at the time. The publication in 1885 of the Haitian Anténor Firmin’s defence of ancient Egypt and ‘Ethiopia’ in his The Equality of the Human Races also shows that these views were not confined to the Anglophone world.85
By the latter part of the twentieth century many of the earlier Eurocentric views about Africa’s place in history had been discredited, so even prominent non-African historians, such as Basil Davidson and Martin Bernal, would subscribe to what might once have been considered aspects of the broader Afrocentric approach to the history of ancient Egypt.\textsuperscript{86} Bernal’s books focusing on the notion of a ‘Black Athena’, the idea that Ancient Greek civilization learnt and borrowed from Ancient Egypt, were embraced by Asante and others, provoked controversy in the academic world and brought Afrocentrism more fully into mainstream debate. It had already emerged as a key ideology impacting on some parts of the education system in North America, a fact that led to a hostile reaction by some of its fiercest critics.\textsuperscript{87} At the end of the twentieth century it was evident that although Eurocentric views concerning the history of Africa and Africans no longer held the dominant position they had in the nineteenth century, Afrocentric approaches were also open to criticism. Critics pointed out that Asante and other adherents of Afrocentricity tend to present Africa and the experiences of Africans as if they were monolithic and homogeneous, and that therefore their essentialist approach is flawed, while critics of Afrocentric history argue that some of its claims are not supported by evidence.\textsuperscript{88}

The many cultural manifestations of Pan-Africanism in the Cold War era reflect both a striving for unity between all those of African descent and a need to oppose the hegemony and effects of Eurocentrism. The most far-sighted recognized that culture was an important weapon to be employed in the transformation of society and that in this context culture must serve the interests of the majority. This realization, often connected with the struggles waged for national liberation in Africa during the period, also acknowledged that such struggles were part of a wider global struggle for popular empowerment and in opposition to Eurocentrism that was not limited to those of African heritage.
Pan-Africanism in the late twentieth century

The last two decades of the twentieth century brought about an upsurge in Pan-African activity as well as much reflection on what forms Pan-Africanism should take as a new century and new millennium appeared on the horizon. The period was largely defined by the end of the bi-polar division of the world and the onset of the new era of globalization. This era highlighted still further the fact that the African continent remained vulnerable to external intervention of various kinds, but also that global inequalities and racism, as well as the capital-centred system that gave rise to them, continued to have a devastating effect on diasporic African populations in Europe, North and South America, the Caribbean and elsewhere. It was also a period when new victories against colonialism, and especially the legacy of settler colonialism, were achieved in Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa. These victories called into question the main raison d’être of the OAU, since its primary mission, the liberating of the continent from the yoke of colonialism, could be said to have been concluded with the fall of the apartheid regime and the introduction of ‘majority rule’ in South Africa in 1994. However, the end of the twentieth century also produced the genocide in Rwanda and the major conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo, which served as a reminder of the OAU’s inability to respond to major crises and the need to redefine its approach to external intervention. There was a continuing tension between the official Pan-Africanism of the member states of the OAU and a more popular Pan-Africanism which united the opponents of neo-colonialism in Africa and the diaspora. There were also continuing debates around whether Pan-Africanism was mainly confined to the African continent and regarding who could be considered ‘African’, a phenomenon that barely existed before Pan-Africanism’s ‘return’ to the African continent in the post-1945 era.
The last years of the century saw renewed concern with the question of reparations for the impact of slavery and colonial rule on Africans. The century culminated with the convening of the First Pan-African Conference on Reparations in Abuja, Nigeria, in 1993, the Seventh Pan-African Congress held in Kampala, Uganda, in 1994 and the founding of the African Union (AU) in 2002, following the 1999 Sirte Declaration by African heads of state and government at an OAU summit meeting in Libya. The AU replaced the OAU as the organization of African states but declared that it also encompassed the entire African diaspora. The Sirte Declaration itself declared that African leaders were ‘inspired by the ideals which guided the Founding Fathers of our Organization and Generations of Pan-Africanists in their resolve to forge unity, solidarity and cohesion, as well as co-operation between African peoples and among African States’. It is in this context that some commentators have referred to a ‘third phase of the institutionalisation’ of Pan-Africanism being created by a body that claims to represent not just the African continent but also the African diaspora.

**The Seventh Pan-African Congress**

Preparations for the 7th PAC began in the 1980s but these were preceded and partly inspired by the call that C. L. R. James had made in Dakar in 1976. In a famous speech ‘Towards the 7th PAC’, he called for the convening of a congress in which the majority of people, and especially women, would play a key role. He concluded:

I believe that it is not only Africans who would be able to understand that tremendous move forward there posed, but people all over the world and in the advanced countries would understand, with our repudiation of the national state, our repudiation of the elite, our respect for the great mass of the population and the dominant role that it would play in the reconstruction of society, our recognition that our elitism is morally responsible for what is happening to the ordinary man, our recognition of the capacity they have in them, our recognition of the need to release the enormous energies of the mass of people, in particular in women and the peasants, such a congress could be the Seventh for Pan-Africanism but, for that very reason, the First of a new world-wide social advance.

This call was widely seen as a criticism of the domination of the 6th PAC by African and Caribbean governments and a plea that the 7th PAC should re-establish the approach undertaken by the Manchester congress in 1945, which based itself on delegates representing mainly farmers’ and workers’ organizations. The call was initially taken up by a group of activists based in Nigeria, led by Naiwu Osahon (1937–), who were also critical of government domination during the 6th PAC but in addition had criticisms
of the 5th PAC, Padmore and Nkrumah, for ‘diluting the spirit of Pan-Africanism’. Osahon’s stated main aim was to return Pan-Africanism to the ‘grassroots’. He claimed that he had begun preparatory work for the 7th PAC in 1982, including building a venue for it in Nigeria, and hoped to convene the congress in 1985. No such event took place but Osahon developed, or further elaborated, a brand of Pan-Africanism that was not only against the domination of ‘reactionary’ governments and for a Pan-Africanism of ‘civil society’ but also vehemently opposed to the involvement of what he referred to as the ‘Arab occupiers of Northern Africa’. For Osahon, the 7th PAC should be in the hands of the ‘grassroots Black world’, and he saw the congress ‘institutionalizing the Pan African Movement as a vibrant civil society complement or challenge to the lame-duck OAU’. In addition, Osahon and his supporters wished to establish a platform around which to unite what they entitled the ‘Black Agenda’. Osahon contacted C. L. R. James and received some support for his initiative to convene a 7th PAC in Africa but the governments of Egypt, Ghana, Nigeria, Angola and Zimbabwe that were approached, or considered, either did not respond or were unable to act as hosts.

Eventually in 1988, following renewed interest from the Nigerian government, an International Secretariat was established in Nigeria, as well as a Coordinating Committee chaired by Osahon and including Professor Kwesi Prah, a Ghanaian academic based in Lesotho, and B. F. Bankie, a West African lawyer by training, then based in London. In addition, an International Steering Committee was established, which included Prah, Bankie, Boutros Boutros Ghali (1922–2016), Chinweizu (1943–), Roosevelt Brown, Professor Mary Frances Berry (1938–), and others. At the same time, ‘National Committees’ were established in Britain, the United States, Ghana, France, Mali and Jamaica and plans laid for a congress in 1990. It is evident that some of the National Committees, such as the one in Britain, played a key role in preparations and deliberations but also that from an early period there were diverse views about the nature and political orientation of the proposed congress.

Some differences had emerged amongst those who had taken on the task of convening a 7th PAC as early as 1989, when the influential British committee was arbitrarily and temporarily disbanded by Osahon who also appointed Roosevelt Brown aka Pauulu Kamarakafego (1932–2007) as ‘World Coordinator for the 7th Pan-African Congress’. However, the British committee refused to accept such arbitrariness and styling itself the UK Steering Committee for the 7th PAC (UKSC) continued to play a leading role in coordinating efforts to convene the congress with others in Jamaica, France and Zimbabwe. In 1993 Osahon issued a global press statement that claimed that ‘the principal philosophy behind the new spirit of Pan-Africanism’ was that ‘Arabs are not Pan-Africanists’ and this assertion had clearly become a dividing line amongst all those interested in convening a Pan-African congress. It was an issue of contention that had already
surfaced amongst the influential UKSC and the French Steering Committee. It was also of concern for some of the leading organizers, such as Kwesi Prah, who wrote of the ‘problem’ of the so-called ‘Afro-Arab borderlands’, he seems to have had Sudan and Mauritania particularly in mind, and the need for the congress to define ‘who is an African’ to create the conditions for African unity.14

Osahon was also opposed to what he perceived as the socialist or Marxist leanings of many of those who had been involved with the previous congress, some of whom continued to be interested in the 7th PAC. The issue of the relevance of socialism for Pan-Africanism was another contentious issue amongst Pan-Africanists.15 However, even in 1993 Osahon and his supporters appear to have been no closer to finding a venue for the congress, even though branches of what he referred to as the ‘Pan-African Movement’ had been established first in Britain and then in many other countries in Africa, the Caribbean and elsewhere and preparatory meetings for the 7th PAC had been held in Bermuda (1990), Barbados (1991), the United States (1992), Trinidad and Canada (1993).16 According to Osahon’s expressed view, it was still possible that a congress would be held in Nigeria, Ghana or South Africa in 1995.17

There were others who criticized what they referred to as the ‘black nationalist bourgeois position’ of Osahon and his close supporters and a new organizing group was established following a meeting of a group of ‘Africans representing liberation movements and progressive governments or progressive parties both from Africa and the diaspora’, which took place in Libya in 1990.18 It appears that Abdulrahman Mohamed Babu (1924–1996), a veteran revolutionary from Zanzibar living in exile in London, was one of the key figures in this new initiative, as was Colonel Kahinda Otafire (1950–), a former National Political Commissar in Uganda’s National Resistance Army. In the early 1990s Otafire acted as director general of Uganda’s External Security Organisation and convened the first meetings of the new 7th PAC organizing committee in Kampala in 1992. At first there was some attempt by Babu and this new group to work with Osahon and his Pan-African movement and they initially proposed to convene an ‘All-African Peoples’ conference. However, when they began to style themselves a 7th PAC Organising Committee, Osahon expressed his disquiet. Subsequently it appears that agreement was reached between the two sides but then battle lines were again drawn and Osahon began to condemn those connected with the Libya meeting, such as Kwame Ture, for carrying out what he perceived to be the work of the Libyan government. He made similar allegations against the representatives of the Ugandan government who became involved, accusing them of being in the pay of Libya as well as carrying out plans for the aggrandizement of Uganda’s President Museveni.19 This new ‘Kampala Initiative’ subsequently side-lined Osahon, who would later refer to himself as ‘leader of the World Pan-African Movement’, and Otafire and others then became the main organizing group for the 7th PAC which finally
convened in Kampala in 1994. Those associated with the Kampala Initiative were also in contact with other Pan-Africanists, including the UKSC, and some of the leading figures associated with Osahon continued to be involved with the preparations for the 7th PAC.²⁰

The preparations for the 7th PAC were led by an International Preparatory Committee (IPC) which initially consisted of Kahinda Otafire (Uganda), who acted as chairman, A. M. Babu (Zanzibar/Tanzania), Abdul Alkalimat and David Du Bois (the United States), Eusi Kwayana (Guyana), Akidi Ocan (Britain), Faliou Diallo (Senegal), Horace Campbell (based in Zimbabwe), Gorkeh Nkrumah (Egypt), Jean-Claude Njem (Sweden), Jose Van Dunen (Angola), Karrim Essack (Tanzania), Kwame Ture of the AAPRP, Mohammed Akbar of the Nation of Islam, Victor Sabelo-Phama of the PAC/APLA, Yvonne King (an African American academic based in Nigeria) and Perezi Kamunawire (Uganda’s ambassador to the UN). Du Bois and Kwayana were unable to participate but others, including more women, were subsequently added.²¹ Both B. F. Bankie and Kwesi Prah, formerly associated with Osahon, also subsequently became members of the new IPC which established a secretariat based in Uganda headed by the Nigerian Pan-Africanist Tajudeen Abdul-Raheem (1961–2009), the founding editor of the British-based Africa Research and Information Bureau’s Africa World Review.

The Kampala initiative adopted a different approach to that of Osahon and his supporters. It was decided to convene a congress as soon as possible and to invite governments from Africa and the Caribbean as well as activists of all political persuasions. Osahon and those connected with the Lagos initiative were therefore also invited and some, although not Osahon himself, subsequently participated and recorded their dissatisfaction with the nature of the proceedings.²² All organizations including governments were to be accorded equal representation. At the congress, government delegations were outnumbered by non-governmental ones, including several opponents of existing governments. The new IPC also opposed the views of Osahon and others on the question of what it referred to as ‘reactionary blackism’. All citizens of all African countries were invited to participate, as well as all those of African descent in the diaspora. The organizers took the view that ‘being African alone (including being black) does not make one a Pan-Africanist’.²³ However, although this was the view of the IPC it was a contested one and was certainly not adopted by all the participants. Similarly, many continued to be wary of the invitations to African governments, and the leading role of the government of Uganda in particular, and would have questioned the view expressed by some figures in the IPC that the 6th PAC had declared that henceforth Pan-Africanism was informed by ‘the class struggle internationally’.²⁴

The 7th PAC was originally scheduled to take place in December 1993 but had to be delayed until April 1994 because of the difficulties involved in transporting delegates, especially those from the Americas and the Pacific regions.²⁵ The congress theme was ‘Africa: Facing the Future in Unity, Social
Progress and Democracy’ but only fifteen African governments participated: Algeria, Egypt, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Ghana, Kenya, Libya, Mauritius, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zaire and Zimbabwe, in addition to an official delegation from Cuba. There were, however, representatives of many African political organizations, including the Sudanese People’s Liberation Movement and the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania. In all there were 800 delegates and over 2,000 participants from forty-seven countries in Africa and the diaspora. The largest African delegations were from Sudan and Uganda and the largest overall that representing North America.

The stated aim of the congress was to ‘articulate a vision of the 21st century and a programme of action for the Pan-African Movement’, and although there were notable successes – the prominence given to the oppression of women, for example – there were also significant problems and the gathering was overshadowed by the unfolding genocide in Rwanda. Many of the major ideological questions which had divided those who sought to convene the 7th PAC resurfaced at the congress. The opening speech by Uganda’s president Museveni attempted to provide a definition of who might be considered an African. However, although he presented an inclusive definition that included both those who had settled in Africa and all in the diaspora, the question was not resolved and re-emerged in the subsequent discussions on Sudan and on South Africa. Other divisions emerged during the discussion on reparations, one of the most important new issues debated by the congress in the wake of the 1993 Pan-African Conference on Reparations, held in Abuja, Nigeria.

Those who have reflected on, or provided analyses of, the congress have been divided over its significance and level of success. Some have hailed the fact that the congress occurred ‘despite the internal and external contradictions’ facing the movement; that the secretariat that was established to convene the congress was made permanent and Abdul-Raheem appointed general-secretary of the Global Pan-African Movement. Some pointed to the prominent role of women, the fact that a two day ‘Pre-Congress Meeting for Women’ with some 300 participants and key speakers including Graca Machel (1945–) and Betty Shabazz (1934–1997) was held, and that a Pan African Women’s Liberation Organisation (PAWLO) was formed in order to help implement the ‘Pan African Women’s Plan of Action’ agreed at the congress. Others were more critical of organizational weaknesses overall, or of the tensions that existed within their own delegations. The large US delegation was clearly one of those hampered by internal conflicts as well as other problems that made it difficult for it to speak with one voice. Kwame Ture launched an attack on Abdul Alkalimat, a fellow IPC member from the United States, during the congress and then subsequently wrote a critical report of the entire proceedings. It was evident that many of the divergent views held by those connected with the event before the congress remained firmly entrenched. One of the major complaints of Kwame Ture, for example, was that the main organizers of the congress were associated
with the London-based *Africa World Review*, edited by Abdul-Raheem and ‘all of them are Marxist Leninists, enemies of Pan-Africanism’.\(^{30}\)

In retrospect one of the key organizers has even referred to the 7th PAC as the ‘old brand of top-down, male-centred and state-centred Pan-Africanism’.\(^{31}\) Another referred to it as a ‘huge jamboree of Pan-African church men and women coming to a shrine to swear allegiance to a faith … We had a great deal of “fine speeches” name dropping and stage management. There was an inability to advance the cause of the emancipation of people of African descent in any sensible or theoretically enlightening way.’\(^{32}\) The most critical were those who found fundamental flaws in the organization and political orientation of the congress and little time for discussion, or were concerned by its Anglophone bias.\(^{33}\) Nevertheless, it seems that even those who were most critical could to some extent agree with those who were most positive that such a congress successfully brought together diverse organizations and individuals from Africa and the diaspora. It afforded them a chance to meet and exchange experiences and for many from the diaspora gave them the opportunity to visit Africa for the first time.\(^{34}\)

The 7th PAC passed many significant resolutions including those on Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Haiti, Cuba, Brazil, South Africa, Angola, the genocide in Rwanda, on the Caribbean, on asylum seekers in Britain, on Palestine, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and other matters, but apart from the resolution on establishing the PAWLO it is difficult to see how, where or by whom these have been implemented.\(^{35}\) Certainly, the resolution calling for an 8th PAC in Libya in 1997 was not implemented and it was not until the second decade of the twenty-first century that two rival 8th PACs were held reflecting the divisions that existed at the time of the 7th PAC. One was hosted by the government of Ghana, was closely connected with the Kampala Initiative and presented itself as the official congress, while another was held in Johannesburg, South Africa, under the leadership of Kwesi Prah and Bankie F. Bankie. It excluded African governments but was criticized for also excluding participants from North Africa.\(^{36}\)

The African Union

The most significant *fin de cercle* event was the creation of a new continental, Pan-African body, the African Union (AU) which was first established with the signing of the Sirte Declaration by African heads of state and government at an extraordinary assembly of the OAU in Sirte, Libya in September 1999. Although the formation of such a body had been under discussion for some time, the location for the historic declaration was not accidental, as the Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi had been a key figure, urging fellow African leaders to create such a new organization. Indeed, at Sirte, Libya presented a ‘Draft Act for the Establishment of a United States of Africa’, which would have established ‘a United Sovereign Independent
Nation embracing all African States based on principles of equality’. At the previous OAU Summit, Gaddafi had made clear that what were needed were ‘ways and means of making the OAU effective so as to keep pace with the political and economic developments taking place within the world and the preparation required of Africa within the context of globalization, so as to preserve its socio-economic and political potentials’. At Sirte the leaders rejected the demand for a United States of Africa, and any erosion of individual state sovereignty, but declared that they sought ‘ways and means of strengthening our continental Organisation to make it more effective so as to keep pace with the political, economic and social developments taking place within and outside our continent’. In other words, the creation of the AU was a consequence of the end of the bi-polar division of the world and the onset of what is usually referred to as a new era of neo-liberal globalization but like the OAU it was a compromise between contending views. At the same time, the leaders also made clear that they ‘were inspired by the ideals which guided the Founding Fathers of our Organization and Generations of Pan-Africanists in their resolve to forge unity, solidarity and cohesion, as well as co-operation between African peoples and among African States’.

The AU was then formally created following the Lomé Summit of 2000, which adopted the Constitutive Act of the African Union, the Lusaka Summit of 2001, which elaborated some of the principles underlying the new body, and the Durban Summit of 2002 where the new organization was formally launched. What is significant is that the AU at least recognized the historical importance of Pan-Africanism and, in some ways, went further than its predecessor in acknowledging and incorporating within its structures the African diaspora. However, it must be stressed that even here the diaspora was very much an afterthought not incorporated into the machinery of the AU until a 2003 amendment to its Constitutive Act to ‘invite and encourage the full participation of the African Diaspora as an important part of our Continent, in the building of the African Union’. The first AU Global African Summit was not held until 2012. Moreover, the AU while respecting the sovereignty and borders of its member states, unlike the OAU, permitted collective intervention in ‘grave circumstances’, and therefore enshrined the controversial principle of the so-called ‘right to protect’. The fact that the AU combined a continental organization of states with the entire African diaspora has led some to refer to its founding as the ‘Third Phase of the institutionalising of Pan-Africanism’, the first phase being the convening of Pan-African conferences and congresses at the end of the nineteenth century and the second phase being the creation of the OAU.

The creation of the AU was both a response to post-cold war realities in Africa and the rest of the world that had been highlighted by Muammar Gaddafi and others, and the outcome of a long process initiated by the OAU for more African economic integration. The latter was considerably
enhanced by the signing of the Abuja Treaty by African leaders in 1991, which led to the development of the African Economic Community (AEC). The Abuja Treaty was itself the culmination of previous efforts and treaties, such as the Lagos Plan of Action in 1980, going back to the 1960s and the creation of the OAU. The aims of the AEC included the ‘integration of African economies in order to increase economic self-reliance and promote an endogenous and self-sustained development’.

Many explanations have been given for Gaddafi’s renewed interest in the OAU and support for the AU. In the former he had often been isolated and once, in 1982, had even been prevented from assuming the chairmanship of that body. However, by the 1990s the disposition of forces within the OAU had changed, not least as a consequence of the end of apartheid in South Africa, as well as a result of the liberation of Namibia and Zimbabwe in the last twenty years of the century. These momentous events also removed one of the main *raison d’être* of the OAU as well as effectively ending the anti-colonial and anti-apartheid struggles which had united its members and brought to prominence Nelson Mandela and other new leaders within the OAU. When United Nations Security Council sanctions were imposed on Libya in 1992, African countries led by South Africa, Ghana and Uganda were instrumental in demanding that they should be lifted and in 1998 encouraging a united African response to such external intervention at the OAU summit in Ouagadougou. It seems that it was this Pan-African support that made Libya realize that African unity was a force to be reckoned with and from that time onward Gaddafi became the leading champion of a United States of Africa and a new African Union as one means to bring it about. It was this new approach which created the conditions for the extraordinary OAU summit at Sirte in 1999.

Another reason for the creation of the AU was the view that the OAU was no longer fit for purpose on the eve of the twenty-first century, it had outlived its usefulness in relation to struggling against ‘all forms of colonialism’, and was widely seen as a ‘club of dictators’. There were many critics of what had become to be seen as a neo-colonial institution, one that had used the provision ‘to defend the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of its member states’, as a justification for turning a blind eye to various forms of dictatorship and oppression. The inability of the OAU to act in a meaningful way was particularly evident in regard to the genocide in Rwanda, but also in relation to conflicts in Somalia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Sierra Leone, Liberia and Sudan. In these circumstances, therefore, the OAU was forced to reflect on earlier Pan-African demands for the total liberation of Africa, for an end to dependency and underdevelopment. It was clear that the peoples of Africa required not just formal political independence, which by the late 1990s had been achieved in most African countries, but also a continental body that took seriously its duty to maintain and sustain the ‘human conditions for peace
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and security’. The OAU had established the African Charter on Human and People’s Rights at Banjul, Gambia in 1981, together with an African Commission on Human and People’s Rights, but its articles were more honoured in the breach than in the observance. The OAU’s defence of human rights appeared to be particularly in contradiction with Article 3 of the OAU Charter which required member states not to interfere in the ‘internal affairs of states’. The other criticism which continued to dog the OAU was its defence of colonial borders, which was not only often in opposition to the principle of self-determination it was supposed to uphold in relation to the Banjul Charter, but also contrary to the declarations of the famous 5th PAC held in Manchester in 1945.

The vision of Nkrumah for a united continent, a United States of Africa, can be seen almost as a spectre continually haunting the OAU, since it was evident that Africa disunited had fared badly in the four decades since the All-African People’s Conference in 1958. Nevertheless, in an important sense the OAU had fulfilled its mission to bring about the liberation of Africa, or at least to remove the more formal vestiges of colonial rule in Africa, although many other forms of what is normally referred to as neo-colonialism remained. There were therefore strong arguments in favour of a new organization and although it can be viewed as more integrative than the OAU, its founding too would be a compromise between those who wished for a United States of Africa and more conservative voices that favoured closer economic integration and the development of common infrastructural projects, but were much more reluctant to lose any political sovereignty.

The AU wished to be seen as more democratic and people-friendly and was even initially presented as a bulwark against neo-liberal globalization. Its critics would argue that in many areas, such as the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), the ‘partnership’ envisaged is essentially a neo-colonial one.

NEPAD was just one of the core institutions of the AU but is often seen, along with the Pan-African Parliament (PAP), as the most significant and controversial new development. Each member state is allowed five PAP representatives but these are chosen from state parliaments not by the electorate and so it is difficult to see how they can fulfil the objective of ensuring ‘the full participation of African peoples in the development and economic integration of the continent’. NEPAD, adopted in 2001, was a plan for the continent’s development and renewal that involved both economic and political commitments by Africa’s governments. It was an amalgamation of two previously separate plans drawn up by the presidents of Senegal, Nigeria, South Africa and Algeria. However, it was seen by its critics as based on the premise that Africa could renew itself by embracing globalization and in partnership with the big powers. It also committed African government to embrace values, such as good governance and democracy, as well as the free market, which many saw as rooted in the Washington consensus and Eurocentrism.
The Reparations movement

The last part of the twentieth century also saw a revival in the global movement for African reparations. There have been many historic demands for reparation for the damage caused by enslavement and colonial conquest and the consequent racist oppression of Africans, both in continental Africa and in the African diaspora. Much of the theoretical underpinning for the modern movement was provided by Walter Rodney’s famous book *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. There are several early examples of demands for reparation even in the eighteenth century, such as the case of Belinda Royall in Massachusetts, or the concerns expressed by Ottobah Cugoano in his writing and notable examples in the earlier part of the twentieth century. A claim for reparations is implicit in the demands made by Du Bois’ Pan-African congresses and those of Garvey to the League of Nations for the creation of a new African state from confiscated German colonies. In the United States, the Nation of Islam presented demands from the 1940s while other notable efforts include the petition launched by the Civil Rights Congress and submitted to the United Nations in 1951 entitled ‘We Charge Genocide: Relief From a Crime of the United States Government Against the Negro People’. A few years later, in 1955, Audley Moore established the Reparations Committee of Descendants of United States Slaves and continued to campaign and educate about the need for reparations for the rest of her life. Over the years there have been many other notable campaigners in the United States including the Black Panther Party. In 1969, former Black Panther and SNCC leader James Forman demanded reparations from churches and synagogues and support for a *Black Manifesto*, and in 2001 Randall Robinson, the founder of TransAfrica, published his influential book *The Debt: What America Owes Blacks*.

In 1987, a nationwide campaigning organization was formed in the United States, the National Coalition of Blacks for Reparations in America (N’COBRA). Its stated mission is to ‘win full Reparations for Black African Descendants residing in the United States and its territories for the genocidal war against Africans that created the TransAtlantic Slave “Trade” Chattel Slavery, Jim Crow and Chattel Slavery’s continuing vestiges (the Maafa)’. N’COBRA along with other reparations activists, especially those in the diaspora, have adopted the Kiswahili word *Maafa*, meaning great tragedy or disaster, to describe the forced separation of Africans from the African continent as a result of enslavement and its consequences, as well as other ongoing forms of oppression inflicted on Africans and Afro-descendants. The term was first popularized in the 1990s principally in Marimba Ani’s book *Yurugu: An Afrikan-centered Critique of European Cultural Thought and Behavior*. In the wake of the formation of N’COBRA, the NAACP and Nation of Islam also embraced the campaign for reparations and a member of the US Congress, John Conyers, unsuccessfully introduced a Bill to study and investigate the issue of reparations every year from 1989 onwards.
One of the features of the last two decades of the twentieth century, however, was that the question of African reparations, the ‘efforts to repair damage that have been inflicted upon groups of people as a result of historical and contemporary injustice’, was discussed at an international level by the representatives of governments, as well as grassroots activists. These discussions related to Africans in general, on the continent and in the diaspora, rather than focusing on those who were the citizens of any particular country. Indeed, reparations activists began to adopt the Pan-African term ‘Global Africa’, to refer to the African continent and the African diaspora, created by enslavement or colonialism. The First Pan-African Conference on Reparations for Slavery, Colonisation and Neo-Colonisation took place in Abuja, Nigeria in 1993. This Abuja Conference, as it is often known, was sponsored by the OAU and its Reparations Commission, the government of Nigeria and the OAU’s Group of Eminent Persons (GEP). The GEP, established by the OAU summit meeting in Dakar, Senegal, in 1992, was chaired by the Nigerian businessman and politician Chief M. K. O. Abiola (1937–1998) and consisted of eleven others including Graca Machel, Miriam Makeba and Professors Jacob Ajayi, Joseph Ki-Zerbo, M. M’Bow, Ali Mazrui and Samir Amin. The GEP also included those from the diaspora such as the Jamaican lawyer and diplomat Dudley Thompson and Congressman Ron Dellums from the United States. The GEP was especially established ‘for appraising the issue of reparations in relation to the damage done to Africa and its Diaspora by enslavement, colonization and neo-colonialism’. Its existence and the OAU’s commitment had emerged from earlier initiatives launched in Nigeria by Abiola, such as the International Committee for Reparations. Abiola, it appears, had been influenced by amongst other things the reparations movement in the United States. He and others held the view that reparations should be as legally obligatory as the payments on Africa’s debt burden, as he later expressed, ‘It is international law that compels Nigeria to pay her debts to western banks and financial institutions: it is international law which must now demand that the western nations pay us what they have owed us for nearly six centuries.

Even before the Abuja Conference, Abiola had been the key figure in the International Conference on Reparations for Africa and Africans in the Diaspora held in Lagos, Nigeria, in 1990. This conference led to the founding of the International Committee for Reparations which began to engage with the OAU and its members. The Nigerian government was also a key player and General Babangida, then president of Nigeria, declared at the Lagos Conference, ‘we call on all the countries of Europe and the Americas to compensate Africa for the untold hardship and exploitation that the continent had been subjected to in the past’. The following year, as Babangida became the chair of the OAU, he met with the heads of state of Togo and Senegal in Lomé to discuss, amongst many other things, the huge debt burden facing Africa. In this connection, they concluded that this debt
should be written off as part of the reparation for ‘500 years of slavery of Africans in Western Europe and America’. In the same year the Nigerian government raised the issue at the OAU summit meeting held in Abuja, again equating reparations with Africa’s indebtedness and demands for debt relief. The question was therefore popularly seen as being mainly a financial one with a Pan-African focus, reparations for Africa and its diaspora.

The Abuja Proclamation which emerged from the 1993 conference clearly stated that ‘the damage sustained by the African peoples is not a “thing of the past” but is painfully manifest in the damaged lives of contemporary Africans from Harlem to Harare, in the damaged economies of the Black World from Guinea to Guyana, from Somalia to Suriname’, but it also clarified that reparations might include not just ‘capital transfer’ but also ‘other forms of restitution and readjustment of the relationship agreeable to both parties’. In addition, it demanded the restitution of ‘stolen goods, artefacts and other traditional treasures’. One of the most important aspects of the conference was the strengthening of links between Africa and the diaspora, both through the formation of ‘National Committees’ and the demand that the OAU grant observer status to certain organizations from the diaspora so as to ‘facilitate consultations between Africa and its Diaspora on reparations and related issues’. The work of the GEP was subsequently hampered by lack of funding and the imprisonment and subsequent death of Abiola, who was elected president of Nigeria but prevented from assuming office by the military rulers of that country. However, its initiative gave rise to other significant bodies such as the Afrikan World Reparations and Repatriation Truth Commission based in Ghana. This body held a major international conference in 1999, issued the Accra Declaration on Reparations and Repatriation, and declared that Africans were owed $777 trillion in compensation for slavery and colonialism. In addition, there were important national initiatives such as the creation in 1993 of the African Reparations Movement in Britain led, until his death, by Member of Parliament, Bernie Grant (1944–2000), which amongst other things also demanded the repatriation of Africa’s stolen cultural treasures.

The Abuja Conference then created the conditions for lobbying by African, Caribbean and Asian governments, human rights and reparations activists which culminated in convening of the World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance (WCAR) by the UN in Durban in 2001. In the preparations for the Durban Conference a key role was played by the African and African Descendants Caucus (AADC) representing activists and organizations from Africa, Europe, Canada and the United States, Latin America, Central America and the Caribbean. The AADC called for ten key demands to be included in the conference declaration including demands for: ‘the recognition that the Slave Trade, Slavery and Colonialism are crimes against humanity’; ‘the recognition of Reparations for Africans and African Descendants as essential to ending the inequality derived from the Slave Trade, Slavery and Colonialism’; and ‘the recognition
of the economic basis of racism as a continuation of the economic basis of the Slave Trade, Slavery and Colonialism’. In addition, the AADC called for global legal reforms, demanded specific gender sensitive policies, especially educative polices, as well as mechanisms ‘to combat the interconnection of race and poverty’.68 Representatives of African governments meeting in preparatory conference in Dakar in 2001 made not dissimilar demands, and also considered that the slave trade, colonialism and apartheid were violations of human rights that merited an apology from the governments of former colonial powers and reparation to both states and individuals. What was significant was that African governments demands were made not just on behalf of the African continent but also the African diaspora.69 However, although there was strong representation made for reparations at Durban, these demands were contested by the governments of the former colonial powers and no apologies or reparations were offered. The representatives of some countries, such as Britain, even denied that slave trade was a crime against humanity, while the United States refused to attend.70 Despite such intransigence demands for reparations have continued into the twenty-first century. In 2013, the governments of the many Caribbean countries represented in CARICOM have now added their voices to those of African governments and activists throughout ‘Global Africa’.71 At the start of the twenty-first century it is therefore evident that Pan-Africanism, in its different and varying manifestations, remains as significant and relevant as in previous centuries.
Conclusion

In the introduction to his famous work *The Pan-African Movement*, written in the 1960s, the German historian Imanuel Geiss wrote that ‘It is still difficult, perhaps even impossible, to provide a clear and precise definition of Pan-Africanism.’ Although he did attempt to provide a lengthy working definition he concluded, ‘Pan-Africanism has hardly ever been a clearly defined, precise or rational concept. On the contrary, it has been (and still is) a matter of hazy vague emotions – a vision or a dream.’ The readers of this volume will hopefully be able to draw their own conclusions about the haziness or vagueness of the varying manifestations of Pan-Africanism that have existed and continue to exist in the world. What is clear is that Pan-Africanism – the striving for the unity and liberation of Africa and Africans – still has some relevance because many consider that Africa and Africans are still not completely free or united. To put it another way, the problems confronting Africa and its diaspora; racism, Eurocentrism, the consequences of enslavement, colonialism and its legacies, a capital-centred world, and imperialism are as evident today as they were in 1897 when Henry Sylvester Williams and Alice Kinloch formed the African Association in London. Of course, much has changed. Colonial rule as it existed at the dawn of the twentieth century has been eliminated in much of Africa and most of the Caribbean. Nevertheless, many still feel the need for all those of African descent to unite, to speak and act as one in order to change the world in the interests of Africa and all those of African heritage.

What has become evident over the course of the twentieth century is that although there might be common agreement as to the need for change, there are many differing views as to the nature of this change and how it might be brought about. At the start of the century much more emphasis was placed on the need to bring pressure to bear on the governments of the major powers, Britain, France, the United States which, it might be said, were responsible for most of the problems confronting Africa and Africans. Not just Sylvester Williams and the African Association but also Du Bois and Garvey adopted aspects of this approach. Even those attending the famous
Manchester Pan-African Congress addressed some of their remarks to the colonial powers, although at the same time making it clear that those in the colonies, especially in Africa, had the power to determine their own future by force if necessary.

Undoubtedly it is these differences of approach and interpretation that produce so many differing manifestations of Pan-Africanism, some of which appear to be in contradiction with each other. However, it must also be recognized that differing responses to what are generally perceived as common problems have emerged in various geographical locations and time periods. In the twenty-first century it might be wondered, for example if the Black Lives Matter Global Network should be considered part of the global Pan-African movement, or whether it sees itself in this way? The Black Lives Matter Network states ‘Our intention from the very beginning was to connect Black people from all over the world who have a shared desire for justice to act together in their communities.’ Does this mark the beginnings of a twenty-first-century Pan-Africanism, or does the absence of a central concern with Africa suggest that Black Lives Matter is a manifestation of something altogether different?

Pan-Africanism during the early twentieth century and before was dominated by concerns with the impact and consequences of colonialism and enslavement and the need for African unity. However, by the end of the twentieth century the problems facing Africa and Africans posed themselves rather differently. In the period before 1945 Pan-Africanism was mainly a phenomenon emerging from the diaspora, most of its main developments occurring in Europe, the Caribbean and the American continent. After 1945, it can be said that Pan-Africanism returned home to the African continent. After 1945, in the sense that its focus was much more directed to the liberation and unification of the African continent. In this more recent period north African countries such as Algeria, Libya and Egypt assumed a much greater political importance. Egypt always had a great cultural and historical significance, and this was also greatly enhanced in the period after 1945, not least because of the pioneering work of Cheikh Anta Diop and other scholars. Moreover, the struggle for the independence of Algeria, the important role of Frantz Fanon, as well as the contribution of independent Algeria to the liberation of Africa played a significant role in changing the nature of Pan-Africanism to one which truly embraced the entire African continent. Similar claims might also be made for the significant roles played by the governments and people of Egypt, especially during the presidency of Nasser, and Libya under the leadership of Gaddafi.

The development of Pan-Africanism to include all those who lived in the African continent created difficulties for some Pan-Africanists who raised objections to such inclusivity on various grounds and considered that measures should be taken to make Pan-Africanism more exclusive. In short, they became preoccupied with the question of who should be considered African. In this regard, it is interesting to note that the Haitian Revolution,
which has played such a significant role in the development of Pan-Africanism, offered its own Pan-African solution to a not dissimilar problem concerning the nature of citizenship in post-revolutionary Haiti. In its 1805 constitution it declared that although Haitians clearly had various origins, and even included Europeans, ‘Haytians shall henceforth be known by the generic appellation of blacks [sic].’ Perhaps learning lessons from history can help to provide solutions for the contemporary Pan-African movement?

Similar disputes have arisen around the question of whether Pan-African gatherings should include African and Caribbean governments, and their organizations such as the AU and CARICOM, seen by some to be more a manifestation of the neo-colonial problems facing Africa and its diaspora than they are part of any Pan-African solutions. This is particularly the case regarding governments that have taken repressive measures against individual Pan-Africanists and their organizations. These and other problems have bedevilled organized Pan-Africanism in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries but for early Pan-Africanists seem to have posed less of a problem in relation to Haiti, Liberia and Ethiopia.

It is interesting that almost all who consider themselves Pan-Africanists, or within the tradition of Pan-Africanism, hark back or draw inspiration from the Fifth Pan-African Congress held in Manchester in 1945. Yet it is sometimes difficult to see what conclusions are drawn from this important event. Its main significance was that it occurred at a key moment at the end of the Second World War when the world was undergoing an historic change. However, it was also significant for the fact that it based itself on the experience gained by the entire Pan-African movement throughout the inter-war period. One important conclusion drawn was that the struggles of Africans, whether from the continent or diaspora, were part of the global struggles of all oppressed and exploited peoples. This approach is evident in the slogans of the congress and in some of its important declarations which stressed the common struggles of those of African and Asian descent, but also the unity of struggle between those in the colonies and the ‘imperialist countries’. As Peter Abrahams, the South African publicity secretary of the Manchester congress wrote at the time, their struggle was ‘not chauvinistic, narrow or racial’. It recognized the importance of the anti-colonial struggle which, it was explained in the language of the time, ‘must be fought and won before we can establish the Century of the Common Man’. Twenty years later Malcolm X expressed a not dissimilar sentiment when he argued in one of his last speeches that ‘the Black people in the West’, are ‘part of the oppressed masses of people all over the world today who are crying out for action against the common oppressor’.

Many other conclusions could be drawn from the proceedings of the Manchester congress. There was strong opposition to the borders imposed on African countries by colonial rule, as well as the ‘alien’ political institutions and capital-centred economies. However, perhaps one of the most important is the fact that the congress made a summation of the experience of the
Pan-African, anti-colonial and workers’ movements in the preceding years and attempted to learn some of the lessons of that history. Another key feature was that the Pan-African Federation was able to build such unity both before and after the congress amongst a diverse range of organizations, many of them representing the masses of the people, in Britain, the United States, the Caribbean and many parts of Africa.

Much has happened since 1945 to highlight both the strengths and the weaknesses of the deliberation of the Manchester congress. Nevertheless, Pan-Africanism has remained of some significance, especially in relation to the African continent. History suggests therefore that Pan-Africanism has been not so much a dream, or simply a vision, but a many-faceted approach designed to address common problems faced by Africa and Africans.
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