

Africa's Political Kingdom and the Albatross of Economic

Bondage

Mogobe B. Ramose

Mogobe B. Ramose (mogobe.ramose@up.ac.za) is extraordinary Professor in the department of Jurisprudence at the University of Pretoria's Faculty of Law. He has taught philosophy at several African and European universities over the past four decades and is author of numerous book chapters and articles on many subjects as well as an award-winning monograph African philosophy through ubuntu considered by many as the standard text on the subject.

MODU WA TABA: Kwame Nkrumah wa Ghana o ile a thekga thuto ya gore ntwala ya Afrika ya tokologo, kgatlanong le mafase a bokoloniale a Bodikela, moo Afrika e neng e lwešwa mo ntweng ya go tlhoka toka, ntwala ye ya tokologo e swanetše go re tlisetša "mmušo wa dipolotiki pele". Tshepo e be e le gore "tše dingwe ka moka di tla latela." Thuto e, e kwana gabotse le seo Mateo 6:33 mo puku-kgethwa e se bolelang, gomme go laetša gore go na le kgokagano ye e raraganego magareng ga bodumedi le dipolitiki, kudukudu dipolitiking tša thutatumelo ka gare ga seemo sa bokriste bja Bodikela. Se, se bohlokwa ka gobane bontši bja baetapele ba pele ba dipolotiki ba Afrika, e be e le bakriste ka kgodišo goba ka boikgethelo. Ka go realo, thuto ya Nkrumah – go sa šetšwe temogo ya gagwe ya gore tokologo ya dipolotiki ga se ya felela ntle le tokologo ya moruo – e ile ya wela mobung wo o nonnogo wa bathobaso ge Afrika ka moka ye e ikemetšego ka dipolotiki, e e amogela le go e phethagatša. Ka lebaka leo, morwalo wa bokgoba bja moruo, o a buša ka gare ga Afrika bjalo ka leswika le tlemilweng molaleng wa motho, leo le ka tshwantšhisago byale ka nonyana ye e hwilego ya lewatle ya Albatrose e e tlameletšego molaleng wa mosesiši wa sekepe, go ya ka Coleridge wa sereti. Go rena, Albatrose ke seswantšhetšo le therešo ya gore lewatle e be e le tsela ya lehu go badudi ba bantši ba setlogo ba ma-Afrika, bao ba ilego ba tumolwa ka matla gore e be makgoba "lefaseng le lefsa" la Amerika. Phokotšo ya palo ya badudi ba Afrika, ke lehu le lengwe gape leo le nyakago, go fedišwa ka ponyo ya leitlho le ka thulaganyo, ka go oketšwa ga palo ya badudi ba Afrika, byalo ka ge Cheikh Anta Diop a šišinya. Kgopolo yeo e thekgwago mo, ke ya gore kganetšo ya thuto ya Nkrumah ke senyakwa sa tšhoganetšo seo se theilwego godimo ga nyakego ya go lefa le go bušetša Afrika lefase, bogoši le boikemedi ba Afrika, le go oketša palo yeo e fokoditšwego ya ma-Afrika. Tšeo ka moka di tla thuša Afrika go tliša le go oketsa morua wa yona. Taba-kgolo ya rena re tla ye lebiša go Afrika Borwa yeo e fentšwego ntweng ya bokoloniale, re latela mmono wa ubu-ntu

Abstract

Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana espoused the doctrine that Africa's struggle for liberation from subjugation by the Western colonial conqueror in its unjust wars of conquest must seek "the political kingdom first". The complement to this is that "the rest would be added thereunto". This implicit reaffirmation of Matthew 6:33 reveals the intricate connection between religion and politics, in our particular point of focus, theological politics in the context of Western christianity. This is important because most of the early political leaders of Africa were either christian by upbringing or conviction. Accordingly, Nkrumah's doctrine—despite his discernment that political independence is incomplete without economic freedom—fell on fertile black soil as the rest of politically independent Africa adopted and implemented it. In consequence, the burden of economic bondage lives on in Africa like the dead Albatross around the neck of Coleridge's Ancient Mariner. For us the Albatross is both the symbol and the reality that the Ocean was the pathway of the death of many indigenous Africans uprooted by

force to become slaves in the “new world”. This depopulation of Africa is yet another death demanding, as argued by Cheikh Anta Diop, the rapid and systematic repopulation of Africa. The thesis defended here is that the repudiation of Nkrumah’s doctrine is an ethical exigency rooted in the demand for reparations to Africa, restoration of sovereign title to territory and its repopulation for emancipation from economic bondage. Conqueror South Africa is our specific focus from the perspective of ubu-ntu.

Keywords: albatross, Africa, political kingdom, economic bondage, emancipation, ubuntu\

Introduction

In his speech on the “Tenth Anniversary of the C.P.P., Accra January 8, 1960”, Kwame Nkrumah declared:

My philosophy, based on two axioms, has been clear from the very beginning, and it is quite simple: “Seek ye first the political kingdom and all things shall be added unto it.” And secondly, we believe that “the independence of Ghana is meaningless, unless it is linked up with the total liberation of the African Continent.”¹

It is significant that the two axioms of Nkrumah’s philosophy are placed in inverted commas. We propose to deal with both seriatim. In the first axiom, there is an undoubted reminiscence of Matthew 6:33 in the Bible. This comes as no surprise given that Nkrumah did study theology. Also, his biography leaves no doubt that he taught in Roman Catholic schools in Ghana before his departure to the United States of America. The Bible was therefore a familiar text to Nkrumah. It is to be noted that the majority of the early or first leaders of politically independent Africa were influenced deeply either by christianity or islam.²

“Seek ye first the political kingdom”

The reference to Matthew above can best be understood if one starts from 30–33. It becomes apparent from this reading that the issue is to exhort the believers to have not just faith but strong faith. They also must have hope. They must believe that their “Father in heaven” shall make sure that they have the wherewithal to live a full life having water, food, and protection from all the life-threatening forces of nature. This belief must encourage them to focus more on seeking their Father’s “kingdom” in heaven than being worried about mundane things such as water-drinking, eating, and the search for protection from all the life-threatening forces of nature. But the promise that the “Father in heaven” shall provide on Earth suggests that “His kingdom” is already begun right here in the world we live in every day. The fixation of the gaze upwards to heaven is the promise that the complete and full realisation of this promise lies in the world to come: “heaven”.

Since Ghana had attained only political independence, which “Father” would add all things unto its earthly “political kingdom”? Nkrumah did not look up to the “Father in heaven” to add all things. Nor did he consider it prudent to appeal to the self-made and self-imposed earthly “father” being the Western colonial conqueror who conquered the indigenous African peoples in the unjust wars of colonisation. Instead, he fixed his gaze in the belief and hope for “African unity” as the best way to add all things, especially economic freedom. This would render the independence of Ghana meaningful. He put it thus: “We have won the political battle and have now plunged ourselves into the fight for economic and social reconstruction of our country. And I wish to make it quite clear that this fight is tougher and far more difficult than many of us do realise.”³ He went on in the same speech to elaborate the nature of this war arguing that it would consist of battles on multiple fronts. He

argued that imperialism and colonialism were stubborn beasts which continually reformed themselves in pursuit of their aims of domination. He warned that Africans be on constant and vigilant guard against any subtle forms of domination bearing in mind also that even many of the comrades, dedicated patriots as they may have been “would hesitate to fight on our side in this battle for economic freedom and reconstruction” because of their lack of understanding of the nature of the struggle.⁴

By this speech Nkrumah laid the solid foundation for the fight for economic freedom, not only for Ghana but for the rest of Africa. On this basis, the party of Economic Freedom Fighters in conqueror South Africa was born long before its birth ten years ago. The “battle” for economic freedom is an historic ethical imperative for the rest of Africa. Economic Freedom Fighters ought to be political parties across the length and breadth of Africa. Nkrumah repeats the substance of the above citation in his speech “To the people of Ireland, Dublin, May 18, 1960” and in his address, “Africa’s challenge, Parliament House, Accra, August 6, 1960” he emphasised the point thus:

The new colonialism creates client states, independent in name, but in point of fact pawns of the colonial power that is supposed to have given them independence. . . . Political freedom is essential in order to win economic freedom, but political freedom is meaningless unless it is of a nature which enables the country which has obtained it to maintain economic freedom.⁵

The above citations show that Nkrumah held firmly to his belief of “seek ye the political kingdom first”. However, it is also plainly clear that for him the “political kingdom” was merely a means to an end. It was a tactical platform from which to pursue the strategic goal of economic freedom and the development of the cultures of the indigenous peoples conquered in the unjust wars of Western colonisation. Nkrumah took a realistic view, as we have already seen, about the potential as well as the actual difficulties pertaining to the pursuit of this strategic goal.⁶ In this context, he speaks the language of “revolution” and not “transformation”:

The revolution to end social and economic exploitation and oppression involves confrontation not simply with a single foreign colonial power, but with the powerful international empires of monopoly finance and with an indigenous fifth column prepared to sell out for money and position.⁷

He went on to elaborate this saying that in the national liberation struggle the enemy was visible and easily isolated but that “in the socialist revolutionary struggle the enemy is all around and within, exercising insidious, undercover pressures of all kinds”, the basic aims of which is the frustration of any measures which threaten the fundamental pillars which support capitalist growth. The difficulty with attacking such any enemy, he maintained, was its wide dispersal and deep entrenchment both in the fabric of the formerly colonised societies, and in the minds of its populations.⁸

The “revolution” envisaged by Nkrumah must take as its point of departure the actual living condition of the indigenous African peoples; the peoples conquered in the unjust wars of Western colonisation. This is the standpoint from which the “social revolution” must depart. Nkrumah names this “consciencism” by which he means:

the map in intellectual terms of the disposition of forces which will enable African society to digest the Western and the Islamic and the Euro-Christian elements in Africa and develop them in such a way that they fit into the African personality. The African personality is itself defined by the cluster of humanist principles which underlie the traditional African society. Philosophical consciencism is that philosophical standpoint which, taking its start from the

present content of the African experience, indicates the way in which progress is forged out of the conflict in that conscience.⁹

Nkrumah's adoption of Marxism-Leninism as the road to "socialism" goes hand in hand with his consciencism. Given that he is Ghanaian, it seems best to assume that the "cluster of humanist principles" he refers to is actually what his compatriot, Kwasi Wiredu, sums up in the Akan proverb, *obra ye nnoboa*—life is mutual aid.¹⁰ This is more than closest to the philosophy of *ubu-ntu*¹¹ captured in part in the proverbs, *motho ke motho ka batho*, (I am related, therefore, we are)¹²; *feta kgomo o tshware motho*, (if and when it becomes necessary to choose between continued accumulation and the preservation of life, especially human life, then one ought to choose for the preservation of human life); *bana ba motho ba ngoathogana hlogoana ya tjie*, (children of the same family [read, the human race] ought to share the head of the locust even if it is the smallest part of its body); *lebitla la tlala ga le tsebjwe* (death from hunger in the absence of natural disasters is unknown in indigenous African culture). Reading Nkrumah's consciencism in this way together with his adoption of Marxism-Leninism seems to affirm the observation made by one of his biographers Basil Davidson who wrote of him after establishing his study and adoption of many ideas from non-denominational Christianity and Marxism (he self-described as both Christian and Marxist in in 1957) as well as many other philosophies with which he dabbled that he remained above all:

a pragmatist, a man who will act according to opportunities, leaving great principles to save themselves by the sheer force of their own logic. It will be his strength as well as his weakness.¹³

In conqueror South Africa, we find the Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF) political party expressly acknowledging that it is the continuator of the long history of struggle for economic freedom within the country. It goes further, in its criticism that the African National Congress (ANC) of conqueror South Africa believes—together with many more who share this faith—the new political dispensation of 1994 is the terminal point of the struggle for freedom. This belief means that "A Luta Dis-Continua!" Contrary to this, the EFF holds, "as Kwame Nkrumah, the founding father of Africa's emancipation, said, 'political freedom without economic freedom is meaningless' ".¹⁴ This direct and express recognition of Nkrumah suggests that the EFF subscribes also to the doctrine of "seek ye the political kingdom first". The following confirms this observation.

The South African government whose executive authority is at the Union Building is where political power resides. The attainment of political power meant that it should be deliberately and decisively utilised to redress the imbalances of the past, build a democratic developmental state, and ensure sustainable political, social and economic emancipation of those oppressed, excluded, exploited and subjugated by colonial and apartheid white supremacy. Together with Parliament, the Executive carries power and weight to radically transform society for the better.¹⁵

The above is an echo of parts of Nkrumah's speech, "Ghana republic is born", Accra, July 1, 1960. He said, "as we look on the revolution which has just ended yesterday. Today, we have entered upon a new life and a new revolution: the national revolution for economic and social reconstruction, and the national effort to build Ghana into a beautiful and prosperous nation."¹⁶ In the same speech Nkrumah elaborates what is meant by economic and social emancipation, explaining that it means "the development of our potential wealth" as well as the cultivation of social relations in a manner that will bring an end to "the causes of poverty, squalor, degradation unemployment, depression and want" and raise the living standards of the population ensuring their economic and social security.¹⁷

Here we discern a coincidence, indeed the historical continuity of insights between Nkrumah and the EFF. In particular, the insights are the adoption of the belief in “seek ye the political kingdom first” and the hope that the rest shall be added onto it through “revolution”. The EFF, acknowledging inspiration from the “Cuban revolution,” uses “revolution” and “transformation” interchangeably. The problem is that these concepts are not synonyms.

Like Nkrumah, the EFF adopted ‘socialism’ drawing “inspiration from broad Marxist-Leninist tradition and Fanonian schools of thought in their analyses of the state, imperialism, culture and class contradictions in every society.”¹⁸ The EFF is indeed not the first political party to opt for socialism in conqueror South Africa. Even outside the framework of political parties, socialism has been identified as the preferred option.¹⁹

Barney Mthombothi is my favourite newspaper commentator for many years. Indeed, I have a stack of his commentaries in the Sunday Times dates as far back as 2014.²⁰ I admire his reasoned argument and the insights he brings to the fore. This does not mean I agree with him all the time. I also like his courage to tackle even delicate subjects with candour. Against this background I pose a challenge to the EFF from my reading of Mthombothi who writes, “We are told that socialism and communism may have worked much better for us, but—and this is not meant to carry water for any particular system—they can’t point to a single communist country that’s been able to raise its people’s standard of living.” He goes on to respond to those who might raise the examples of China, Russia, and Cuba arguing that China “is to all intents and purposes a capitalist system with a ruthless oligarchy on top.” Writing about Russia he is even more unflattering, maintaining that “the erstwhile standard bearer, the Soviet Union, was nothing but a kleptocracy. Even Vladimir Putin, their beloved mass murderer, is a fervent anti-communist. He and his oligarchs partake with relish in the delights of the capitalism system.” He continues by stating that Lenin’s statues have tumbled everywhere and that even Leningrad has become St Petersburg before finally describing Cuba as a place which people visit “to watch in amusement as ancient American limousines cruise the streets of Havana—harking back to a bygone era”.²¹

We add to this challenge that during the 2008 “World economic crisis” even avowed communists and socialists rescued a dying capitalism from its death bed. Perhaps this speaks either to the precariousness of claims to eternal truths or the abuse of truth to pursue untruthfulness. It takes a lot more than self-description to uphold one’s moral conviction. Translation of moral conviction into practice is the realisation of truthfulness to oneself and others.

The African National Congress—originally, the South African Native National Congress—had abandoned the struggle for economic freedom even before the establishment of the “Union of South Africa” in 1910. This is reflected in the many and respective petitions from the four provinces at the time addressed to the British Royal head of state. For example, the “Resolution of the South African Native Convention, March 24–26, 1909 (Published by *Izwi Labantu* [Voice of the People]) number 1 “recognises the principle of Union amongst all His Majesty’s subjects in the South African colonies to be essential, necessary, and inevitable, the ultimate object of which seeks to promote the future progress and welfare of all”.²² It is significant that the Natives conquered in the unjust wars of Western colonisation consider themselves as “His Majesty’s subjects”. They have become subjected through conquest in an unjust war. Yet, they do not plead for the return to themselves of the land of their forebears from time immemorial. But the loss of land is virtually the loss of life because “land is life” as Fanon argued in his famous *The Wretched of the Earth*.²³ What the land provides demands action to use the resources for the protection and promotion of life primarily the lives of human beings. And so, economics is linked directly to a relationship with the land from where the necessities of survival

are available. To concede forcible expropriation of land is to renounce the right to life and economic freedom.

The opening sentence of the Freedom Charter, “South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white” is yet another concession to conquest in the unjust wars of Western colonisation resulting in the loss of title to territory and sovereignty over it.²⁴ “Land is life” was obliterated by this statement despite the problem in logic that it implies that sometimes “all” means some. If this be false, then why does the “all” fail to identify all the other population groups like the Coloureds and the Indians.²⁵ Why should “white” be left intact despite its everyday appearance as Afrikaner, English, Greek, Irish, Italian, Jewish, Portuguese and Spanish, to name but a few white ethnic groups that were well settled in conqueror South Africa by the time the Freedom Charter was adopted? A land acquired through conquest in an unjust war and subsequently named South Africa does not “belong to all who live in it” to date. Yet, the black majority living in it has the burden of the heavy chains of economic bondage.

As though this were not enough, the Brenthurst Initiative became the conduit through which the ANC would concede living under economic captivity even after 27 April 1994. Patrick Bond described the new political dispensation as an “elite transition”. He was undoubtedly correct in this.²⁶

In his book, *Lost in Transformation*, Sampie Terreblanche underlines the point made by Bond with incisive boldness and undisguised disclosure.²⁷ The crucial question here is, why does Terreblanche, having been privy to some of the secret meetings pertaining to the transition to the “new” South Africa, disclose the content and, indeed some of the effects, of the secret talks eighteen years after the inauguration of the “new” South Africa? The rationale for this question is that the secrecy of intelligence operations—let alone their effects—remains conventionally undisclosed. Disclosure may be cautiously countenanced perhaps after thirty years or in accordance with the law of a particular country. It may also be permissible to release parts of the information even before the expiry of thirty years if a compelling state interest demands. This, however, is not a direct answer to the question why Terreblanche ultimately decided to disclose some of what he knew about the secret talks in which he participated.

His book is about the politics of conqueror South Africa. It is about the economy of the country. On this topic, the focus is pointedly on the deliberate and inhuman systemic and systematic unilateral racial accumulation of wealth at the expense of the indigenous peoples conquered in the unjust wars of Western colonisation. It is an elucidation of why and how the economy of conqueror South Africa is linked to the dominant global capitalist economic system. With unwavering courage and clarity of expression, Terreblanche emphasised the point made by Bond in these terms:

The ideological shifts that took place in the ANC’s economic views from 1990 until 1996 can only be described as breathtaking and even revolutionary. The ideological shifts from an explicitly socialist and redistributive approach towards embracing the American ideologies of neoliberal globalism and market fundamentalism were so radical that all kinds of “unholinesses” must have taken place behind the scenes during those six years.²⁸

He writes that beginning in 1990 Nelson Mandela and Harry Oppenheimer (then chairman of the Anglo-American Corporation and De Beers Consolidated Mines) met regularly for lunch or dinner. From the early 1990s the Minerals Energy Complex (MEC) met with leadership core of the ANC at Little Brenthurst, Oppenheimer’s estate on a regular basis. Other corporate leaders were to join these secret negotiations concerning the future of the economic policy of South Africa at which stage the meetings were moved to the Development Bank of Southern Africa, where the meetings were to take place during the night. It was during these secret meetings that an “elite compromise” gradually arose

between what Terreblanche calls the “White Triple Alliance” (under the leadership of the MEC), a leadership core of the ANC, and American and British pressure groups.²⁹ According to Terreblanche, the secret negotiations reached their apogee in November 1993 when the Transnational Executive Council (TEC) (an interim governing body consisting of 16 members, 8 from the National Party (NP) government and 8 from the ANC’s leadership core) decided that South Africa needed an \$850 million loan from the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The purpose of the loan was to assist the country to resolve its balance of payment of difficulties but before the loan was granted the IMF requested the TEC to sign a document concerning the economic policy of the future government. This document bound the TEC to the ideologies of neoliberalism and market fundamentalism. It was according to Terreblanche in this context that a “historic compromise” which he describes as “an elite compromise” in November 1993—a compromise which was to become the foundation on which the new South Africa would be based from 1994 until the present.³⁰

In Terreblanche’s (2012) assessment: as the power and privileges of the black elite created through these negotiations was consolidated in the near two decades since the transition, the impoverished black majority was not merely neglected but ultimately betrayed by the ANC’s leadership core. He argues that the “great prize” for the MEC and the rest of South Africa’s corporate sector was its exoneration of the large apartheid debt that they had accumulated on their accounts as they relentlessly exploited black labour during a period of over a century. His assessment is that the ANC was outmanoeuvred through a clever deal-making in which they were able to metamorphose themselves from debt-ridden apartheid corporations into debt free trans-national corporations free from the grasps of those South Africans who insisted they settle the score of historical justice through the imposition of wealth-taxes.³¹

It is politically significant that Terreblanche is known never to have been challenged either by the ANC or other participants in the secret talks, on the veracity of his disclosure. He appears also not to have been questioned on the timing of the disclosure.³² What Terreblanche defines as the “actual betrayal of the poor” can hardly be seen as a “breakthrough” in ethical terms. It is trespass against the bounds of gullibility to claim a “breakthrough” on deals designed to intensify and multiply the ethically unjustified deadly violence of the historical-structural pauperisation of the already economically and intellectually poor for the selfish benefit of the few. In view of this, it is over stretching creativity and veracity to read that Harry Oppenheimer “thought Ramaphosa had ‘outplayed’ the Nats during the negotiations”.³³ But from the point of view of the successors in title to the Western colonial conquest in unjust wars together with the volunteers to the defence of the “actual betrayal of the poor”, this outcome may be seen as a “breakthrough”.³⁴

A constitutional dispensation that affirms and endorses what Terreblanche defines as the “actual betrayal” of the poor, that is, the poor manufactured by a his-story protecting and sustaining structural, systemic, and systematic deadly poverty for the benefit of the plutocrats is thoroughly devoid of ethical legitimacy.³⁵ When the welfare of the people ceases to be the supreme law—*salus populi est suprema lex*—then necessity overcomes law; it laughs at the claims of law—*necessitas vincit legem; legum vincula irridet*. Such is the wisdom of the maxims of Western legal philosophy.

Living in Epistemological Captivity

It is well-known that Nkrumah, like many other African and African-American (Black) leaders were soaked and influenced by Western education or epistemology.³⁶ Nkrumah did not hide his admiration for the Westminster system. This brought him in conflict with the chiefs in Ghana.³⁷ Nkrumah’s epistemic subservience to the Westminster system is described with stinging sarcasm thus:

Dr. Kwame Nkrumah had uncomplimentary things to say of the alien nature of the Constitution that Britain had “thrust upon” the country on giving it independence, and clearly wished to reshape it from top to bottom to give it an “African” twist. . . . The Constituent Assembly gathered its legislative powers from the Constituent Assembly and Plebiscite Act, 1960, which was assented to by the Governor-General; and so the new Ghana Constitution is traceable back to British origins. Nationalist sentiments were apparently satisfied with a document that on the face of it contained no trace of foreign antecedents.³⁸

Our citation from the EFF earlier was drawn from the sub-section entitled: *Memorandum to the Executive at the Union Buildings—28 October 2011*. We note the discrepancy between “Union Buildings” in the sub-title and “Union Building” in the body of the citation. At page 43, the reference is to “Union Buildings”. The latter is the result of the exercise of the ethically unjustifiable “right of conquest”. The Union of South Africa was built upon this “right”.

So, by the right of conquest, entrenched in legislation, the principle of legal differentiation on racial grounds was the legacy upon which the Union of South Africa was constructed.³⁹

The 1961, 1983, 1993 and 1996 constitutions are successors in title to the Union of South Africa. They are heirs to a construction based upon “the right of conquest”. Unlike the Biblical “thou art Peter and upon this rock, I shall build my church” they are, “thou art conquest in an unjust war and upon this sand I shall build my state—feed the conqueror, starve and subjugate the conquered”. In the light of this, it is somewhat odd that the EFF accords symbolic recognition of this ethically questionable right precisely by virtue of its silence on the politico-ethical meaning of the Union Buildings. The silence is explained by its real and active participation in a “Parliament” of a country constructed upon this ethically questionable “right”. By so doing, the EFF accepts the elusive title of Van Zyl Slabbert’s book, *The Last White Parliament*.⁴⁰ Considering the 1983 constitution and the dominant Western epistemology underlying it and recognising the almost spontaneous tendency to think in terms of skin colour in the context of human relations, Slabbert was correct in terms of the increase of skin colours since the 1994 constitutional dispensation. He was, however, wrong in epistemological terms. The dominant epistemology underlying the 1996 constitution is that of the Western colonial conqueror. On this reasoning, it is quite an issue to sustain the EFF hope that it can conduct “revolution” within the framework of the current constitution especially in the light of the Western colonial conqueror’s tactical move to substitute the long-standing constitutional principle of parliamentary sovereignty with constitutional supremacy. Apart from this problem, there is no doubt that like Nkrumah, the EFF is an ardent admirer of the Westminster system, regardless of how it is modified by the Western colonial conqueror.

Furthermore, the EFF does not call for the return to parliamentary sovereignty. Nor does it seem to be disturbed by the fact that *ubu-ntu*, the philopraxis of the majority indigenous peoples conquered in the unjust wars of Western colonisation is completely and totally absent from the 1996 constitution.⁴¹ In the light of this, it is difficult to see how the EFF relates to Nkrumah’s thesis that “the African experience” must be the starting point for charting the way to freedom.

An Ethical Questioning of the Doctrine of “Seek Ye First the Political Kingdom”

We will revert to an extended critique already begun here in the relevant section below. For the present we note with emphasis that the option for “seek ye the political kingdom first” is tantamount to a voluntary imprisonment into economic bondage. Why was economic freedom postponed when there is no doubt that the Western coloniser pursued the path of unjust enrichment for centuries at the expense of the indigenous peoples?⁴² This enduring economic bondage is like the Albatross of

Coleridge's *The rime of the Ancient Mariner*. In the case of the Mariner, the dead Albatross around his neck was punishment for the killing he committed. Prayer was the way out for the Mariner to receive expiation for the killing. This was his prayer, a lesson to others at the same time.

Farewell, farewell! but this I tell
To thee, thou Wedding-Guest!
He prayeth well, who loveth well
Both man and bird and beast.

He prayeth best, who loveth best
All things both great and small;
For the dear God who loveth us,
He made and loveth all.⁴³

If it is true that “the dear God who loveth us, He made and loveth all”, why was conquest in an unjust war the best way to show the love? The innocence of the indigenous peoples conquered in the unjust wars of Western colonisation calls for reparations and not morally repugnant gratitude for the exercise of unjust enrichment by the Western coloniser. A prayer to the Western coloniser promising patience in the name of “revolution” to attain what rightfully belongs to the innocent indigenous peoples is an affront to the human right to life; the right to live a life worthy of human dignity now in the everyday present than in an elusive future. It is indeed for good reason that in his *Towards Pax Africana*, Ali Mazrui described the victory of independence in Africa as “a transition from slavery by coercion to slavery by consent”.⁴⁴

Reparations and compensation to the indigenous peoples conquered in the unjust wars of Western colonisation are the ethical exigencies to be met in favour of the conquered. Yet, at decolonisation conceding political independence to Africa, the Western coloniser invoked government succession as the legal mode of transition to a new political dispensation.⁴⁵ The result was and, still is, the Albatross of economic bondage hanging round the neck of politically independent Africa. Arguing from the perspective of International Law, Makonnen made the same point thus:

Kenya paid compensation for land reacquired from the “alien” land holders. . . . The British Government provided Kenya with loans from its own sources and also from the World Bank, in order to finance the compensation for the transferred alien property, which amounted to in fact to outright repurchasing of Kenya by the Kenyans.⁴⁶

In the negotiations for the independence of Tanganyika, Julius Nyerere argued for state succession in the name of justice: the justice of reparations. He resisted government succession precisely on the logic that where there is an injury—the injury of conquest in an unjust war—there must be a remedy. His was the argument for “a clean slate” but the Western coloniser rejected the solid morality of this submission. And so Nyerere was defeated on the “clean slate” doctrine—sometimes referred to as the Nyerere doctrine in the context of African politics. Tanganyika consequently attained political independence only on the basis of government succession.

And Lead Us not Into Temptation—*et ne nos inducas in tentatione*

Following Nkrumah's slant towards christian theology, we borrow the above sub-title from the famous christian prayer, "Our Father", the "Lord's prayer".⁴⁷ Here we want to focus primarily on the complete sentence: "And lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil—*et ne nos inducas in tentatione sed libera nos a malo.*" We do this aware that Nkrumah abandoned "God" metaphorically and actually decided to focus upon Mother Africa as the fertile black humus soil for the attainment of economic freedom.

It is somewhat odd to plead with "God" not to "lead us into temptation" directed towards "evil" and then ask "Him" to "deliver us from evil". Is leading others into temptation not the job of the devil? Perhaps "God" can "lead us into temptation". Is "He" not the one who planted the tree of 'the knowledge of good and evil' in the garden of Eden? Why plant the tree at all since "He" could have allowed Adam and Eve to live blissfully in the garden without the gift of freedom of the will?

We do not intend here to enter into debate on any of the questions posed in the preceding paragraph. Suffice it to state, therefore, the gift of the freedom of the will is associated with the problem of free will and determinism, be it the "hard" or "soft" version. It is also connected to the problem of predestination. Nkrumah voluntarily chose "the political kingdom" first. He need not have lived in fear of "hell" after death. The existential conditions of the indigenous peoples of Africa were a constant and vibrant threat to life itself. They still are. What "hell" did he or these peoples have to fear since their lives were already "an evil" not of their own creation? They had to deliver themselves by their own efforts out of this human-imposed "evil". It was not "God" who imposed the "evil" on them and so it was unnecessary to appeal to "God" to "deliver us from evil".

Deliverance from "evil" on Earth is indeed difficult and problematical. But even more problematic is pursuing heaven on Earth. It is not sure if heaven—the abode of "Our Father"—is a place at all. If it is, then it seems to be a location with immeasurable distance. The more one ascends, the further the unfolding distance. Who knows? Perhaps the resurrected Jesus Christ is still on the ascent? Another problematic aspect of heaven is that placing it in contrast to hell returns the question whether or not "God" created hell—even if as we have been taught, it was to have it as a place of punishment for Lucifer the fallen angel. According to Hyriewicz,

Revelation as a whole can hardly be reconciled with the doctrine on Hell understood as an eternal reality opposed to the Kingdom of God. Hell is not a work of God. Hell is created by man, for himself and others. God does not create Hell for anyone. If I had thought so I would have insulted my Creator. I would have belittled him and made him look like the punishing and revengeful man. The faith in eternal Hell is in fact the faith in the power of evil, a sign of disbelief in Christ's power of salvation although he is praised at the same time for his victory over death, Hell and Satan. One of the greatest contradictions of Christian theology lies in this.⁴⁸

It certainly is not our intention to even try to resolve this "greatest" contradiction. We refer to it to emphasise the point that an Earthbound gaze can help solve the problems on Earth. But a look fixed on heaven is likely to remain an elusive hope. On this basis, it seems Nkrumah was prudent in fixing his gaze on Mother Earth.

For Nkrumah, the key weapon to fight against this "evil" was "African unity". He died as the intellectual and passionate defender of the urgent move to attain "African unity" in practice. He emphasised this point in many of his speeches including "The African Genius" which he gave during the opening of the Institute for African Studies in 1963. He insisted in the speech on the necessity for diversity among the student body but stated that while the institute was glad to welcome students from Asia, Europe, and

the Americas it had a special interest in development a centre where students from all over the African continent would meet and learn together from one another. He felt this would deal practically with the urgent need of breaking down what he understood as artificial colonial divisions between so-called Anglophone, Francophone, and Lusophone Africa.⁴⁹

There is no doubt that Nkrumah is among the founding fathers of the Organisation of African Unity: a unity feared, disfigured, and disrupted even by the many powerful states in the world. The primary reason for this was, according to Wallerstein writing in the late 60s, that the movement towards African unity demanded “the attainment of equality with the rest of the world in terms of economy, political power, and cultural recognition”. As Wallerstein sees it a continental government was not the goal but a symbolic rallying point and strategy the actual goal of which was “far more revolutionary”. This is so since the “attainment of continental equality would in fact mean a basic transformation of African society and thereby of world society”. He continues: “If the movement succeeds in winning equality, or brings Africa closer to winning it, the movement will have attained its goals, even though it may not have attained the formal objective of a continental union government”.⁵⁰

Wallerstein insists that the movement toward African unity did enjoy such freedom in the period 1957–1965, but began declining towards the end of that period with the coup d’état against Nkrumah marking its effective end at least at the time of his writing.⁵¹

The Julius Nyerere Challenge

The founding President of Tanganyika, Julius Nyerere, was among the leaders of Africa who placed a very high premium on African unity. For him, “the attainment of African unity depends on the complete freedom of our continent.” A united African continent can pool resources together to fight against “poverty, disease and ignorance”.⁵² He held further that “Only with unity can we be sure that Africa really governs Africa. Only with unity can we ensure that African resources will be used for the benefit of Africa. Our goal must remain firm, and nothing short of a United States of Africa should be accepted as our ultimate destiny.”⁵³ It is against this background that Nyerere posed a challenge to the “new states of Africa”.

On 13th March 1985, Nyerere delivered a speech—yet to be published according to the knowledge of the present writer—at the Institute of Social Studies at The Hague in The Netherlands.⁵⁴ He gave an overview of problems relating to Tanzania’s and other African countries repayment of foreign debt. He also noted that borrowing from either the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund was not necessarily in the best interests of the borrowing country. It could also have adverse social and political effects upon the country. He then threw the challenge to Africa in these terms:

It is time we asked ourselves, and the world, some questions. Should we really pay our debt to the rich before providing food for our people to prevent starvation? Should we really pay our debts to the rich countries rather than maintain our basic education and health provision? Should we really allow our transport system to decline still further so that we can pay the debts? Or should we answer brute Power with the power of the Spirit, and simply say No?⁵⁵

Nyerere then goes on to the realm of strategy following from his questions in this speech by suggesting that the Third World does in fact have power despite all appearances. He suggests that that power requires the unity of purpose and action. Using the Africans as a particular example he said if African states all acted together, they could have some power—at least to gravely inconvenience the developed World. He suggests that this inconvenience would force the developed World to negotiate not only debt repayments but also “about other iniquitous aspects of the present international economic system.”⁵⁶

The somewhat rhetorical questions posed by Nyerere in the above citation speak quite directly to some of the *ubu-ntu* African proverbs we have referred to in the section: “seek ye first the political kingdom”. It is clear from the questions posed that Nyerere would prefer the *ubu-ntu* ethics of *feta kgomo o tshware motho* to the globalised Western practice based on the

logic of “profits über alles”.⁵⁷ Indeed for Nyerere, *lebitla la tlala ga le tsebjwe* in indigenous African culture. This is because *bana ba motho ba ngoathogana hlogwana ya tjie*. And so, Africa’s bondage into ascending debt leading to the Inferno and not to the eternal bliss of “Our Father who art in heaven” can be remedied primarily by a united and solid no. As the title of paragraph 59 of the Encyclical of Pope Francis, *Evangelii Gaudium* states: *No to the inequality* which spawns violence.⁵⁸

Responses to Nyerere’s Challenge

To date there is no united African stand which has declared no to the repayment of the Albatross of foreign debt. Twenty-nine years after Nyerere’s speech, his compatriot, Salim Ahmed Salim, delivered an address on the occasion marking fifty-one years since the establishment of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU). The occasion was also in recognition of the twelve years existence of the African Union, the successor in title to the OAU. Like Nyerere, Salim also posed four questions.

1. Why is it that a continent which is one of the richest, if not the richest, in terms of resources both human and material, continues to have the poorest people?⁵⁹

To this we reply that the fight against ignorance is not yet a solid and reliable success. Also, Africa has not yet arrived at a point of speaking in one united and solid voice.

2. How can we rationally explain the continued, and in some cases escalating, internal conflicts in some parts of our continent with attendant loss of millions of lives, human misery and destruction as well as forcing millions of our people to vote on their feet?⁶⁰

To this we reply that the merchants of war are not yet out of Africa. The private military companies are run on the logic of “profits über alles” for their survival. Many weapons manufacturing industries in the East and West are still operative despite the nuclear weapons umbrella above their heads assuring them of omnicide in defence of their ideologies. The people must “vote on their feet” because as Nyerere put it in his The Hague speech: “It is not surprising that the social price for accepting I. M. F. terms is very often riots, with the police or the Army having to be turned on the people”.⁶¹

3. How do we erase the image of a continent where corruption is considered endemic?⁶²

By taking heed and acting upon the advice and warnings given by Nkrumah and Nyerere respectively, I will draw upon a selection of their speeches towards this end.

Nkrumah advised in numerous writings and speeches the necessity of vigilance against greed, vanity, and selfishness, and appealed to Africans that by hard work they were to eliminate the legacies of colonialism including poverty, hunger, and illiteracy from their societies. His notion of corruption went further than pertaining to wayward officials using public office to enrich themselves but pointed to the very systemic orientation of capitalism. On Ghana Day in 1960, for example, he emphasised this point with the declaration that: “Countrymen, the future ahead of us is full of promise but not the sort of promise which ensures the exploitation of other men’s labour for the enrichment of a few individuals. . . . I personally do not and cannot believe, that all our efforts have been undertaken for the purpose of enabling a few persons to enrich themselves at the expense of the majority.”⁶³

Nyerere also has some advice to offer. In a speech given to the colonial legislative council in 1960 he made a point that there would be no way to wage a war against poverty, disease, and ignorance if

people did not have absolute confidence in their government as the people entrusted with seeing to their welfare. Speaking about the primary challenge to that confidence, namely corruption he used the following words:

I think corruption must be treated with ruthlessness because I believe myself corruption and bribery is a greater enemy to the welfare of a people in peacetime than war. I believe myself corruption in a country should be treated almost the same way as you treat treason. If people cannot have confidence in their own Government, if people feel that justice can be bought[. . .] The only thing they can do is to take up arms and remove that silly Government.⁶⁴

Salim's fourth and final question in the article is:

4. How do we sustain and better utilise the current decade-old achievements of economic growth into a shared prosperity for all?⁶⁵

The answer to this question is "by acknowledging that the dominant global philosophy of money is buttressed by the bank". According to this philosophy, the bank is the friend of the rich and the deadly enemy of the poor.⁶⁶ There is therefore a need to resort to a philosophy of money which takes cognisance of the poor. For this we turn, by way of conclusion to the *ubu-ntu* response to the challenge of Nyerere.

Conclusion—An Ubuntu Response The point of departure for an *ubu-ntu* response to the Nyerere challenge is the principle that life is mutual aid. We have identified the proverbs in Northern Sotho (*Sepedi*) that belong to this principle founding and complementing one another. What we add here is the ancient traditional practice of *letsema*, a veritable exercise in mutual aid. *Seshego*, a building for the storage of food for sharing with the poor as well as sharing with one another in times of need, is an indispensable complement to these principles. It is the bank established for sharing rather than profit-making above all else. Such are the rudiments of an *ubu-ntu*-based conception of banking. In deference to the principle of sharing for mutual care and upliftment *feta kgomo o tshware motho* shall be the practice of indigenous banking philosophy. The bank shall become a veritable *iqolobane ye sizwe, seshego*.

Mogobe B. Ramose

University of Pretoria

Notes

1. Samuel Obeng, *The selected speeches of Dr. Kwame Nkrumah* (Accra: The Advance Press Limited, 1979), 4. For the biography of *Kwame Nkrumah*, see, Panaf Great Lives, *Kwame Nkrumah* (London: Panaf, 1999); Kwame Arhin (ed.), *The life and work of Kwame Nkrumah: Papers of a symposium organized by the Institute of African Studies, University of Ghana, Legon* (Accra: Sedco Publishing Limited, 1991); and Basil Davidson, *Black Star: A view of the life and times of Kwame Nkrumah* (Oxford: James Currey, 2007).

2. Rolf Italiaander, *The new leaders of Africa*, James McGovern (trans.), (London: Prentice-Hall International, 1961); and A. P. J. van Rensburg, *Contemporary Leaders of Africa* (Cape Town: HAUM, 1975); and, A. P. J. van Rensburg, *The Tangled Web Leadership and Change in Southern Africa* (Pretoria: Hollandsch Afrikaansche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1977). We take the view, together with Wole Soyinka, that "the convention that capitalizes this [christianity or christian] and other so-called world religions is justified only when the same principle is applied to other religions, among them, the Orisa." *The Burden of Memory, The Muse of Forgiveness* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 32. Accordingly, we will in the main use the small letter "c" for christian/christianity, islam, judaism, including reference to the respective gods of these religions, namely, the "God of Jesus Christ", "Allah" and "Yahweh". By so doing, we achieve our aim to eliminate the implicit hierarchy, and thus the assumed superiority of some religions over the rest.

3. Obeng, *The selected speeches*, 4.

4. Obeng, *The selected speeches*, 4.

5. In his speech "To the people of Ireland" he declared that: "Small and economically non-viable states are largely the result of maintaining the frontiers established under colonialism. Indeed, one of the aftermaths of colonialism is that the whole of the African continent is at present divided by frontiers which have little ethnic or economic justification. . . . Social and economic development in Africa is not possible unless these artificial frontiers can be eliminated, and the partitions which artificially divide people of the same ethnic groups are brought to an end". Obeng, *The selected speeches*, 134. We read that "Around 30 percent of Africa's population lives in landlocked, resource-scarce countries. A reasonable case can be made that such places never should have become countries. However, the deed is done: these countries exist and will continue to do so". Paul Collier, *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries are Failing and What can be done about it* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 57. This author's view coincides with Nkrumah's on the point that some countries should not have attained the formal status of a state. But they differ in their solutions. The author is tolerant of the continued existence of such states whereas Nkrumah holds the directly opposite view. The irony here is that both the Organisation of African Unity Charter and that of its successor in title, the African Union uphold the inviolability of the boundaries within Africa erected arbitrarily to suit the wishes of Western colonial powers.

6. For a critique of this strategic goal see, Mogobe B. Ramose, "Philosophy and Africa's struggle for economic independence," *Politeia* 25, no. 1 (2006): 6–11.

7. Kwame Nkrumah, *Revolutionary Path* (London: Panaf Books, 1973), 152–53. It is necessary to study the excerpt cited in relation to this: "While there is no hard and fast dogma for socialist revolution, and specific circumstances at a definite historical period will determine the precise form it will take, there can be no compromise over socialist goals. The principles of scientific socialism are universal and abiding and involve the genuine socialization of productive and distributive processes. Those who for political reasons pay lip service to socialism, while aiding and abetting imperialism and neocolonialism, serve bourgeois class interests. Workers and peasants may be misled for a time, but as class consciousness develops the bogus socialists are exposed, and genuine socialist revolution is made possible". Kwame Nkrumah, *Class Struggle in Africa* (London: Panaf, 1970), 26. One wonders what Nkrumah would have said about contemporary China and Russia especially after their decision to rescue a dying capitalism during the "World economic crisis" of 2008. Is it compatible with "scientific socialism" that one may be socialist by declaration but capitalist in practice? It seems plain that even without resort to "scientific socialism", "Change is going to have to come from within the societies of the bottom billion . . .". Collier, *The Bottom Billion*, 12.

8. Nkrumah, *Revolutionary Path*, 152–53.

9. Kwame Nkrumah, *Consciencism, Philosophy and ideology for decolonization* (London: Panaf Books, 1970), 78–79.

10. Kwasi Wiredu, "The moral foundations of an African culture," in *The African Philosophy Reader*, eds. P. H Coetzee and A. P. J Roux (London: Routledge, 2002), 293.

11. The difference between ubuntu and ubu-ntu is that the former refers to everyday usage and the latter to the philosophical meaning of the concept. For details see, Ramose, M B, 2005. *African philosophy through ubuntu*, Mond Books Publishers, Harare p. 35–38.

12. Bénézet Bujo, *Foundations of an African ethic: Beyond the Universal Claims of Western Morality* (New York: Crosswood Publishing company, 2001), 22. For an extensive exposition of the philosophy of ubu-ntu see Mogobe B. Ramose, *African Philosophy through ubuntu* (Harare: Mond Books, 1999), which in addition to providing an extensive philosophical exegesis of ubu-ntu and its implications for ontology, epistemology, ethics, politics, law and religion also establishes its Pan-African character and relevance.

13. Davidson, *Black Star*, 43.

14. Floyd Shivambu (ed.), *The Coming Revolution* (Johannesburg: Jacana Media, 2014).

15. Shivambu, *The Coming Revolution*, 38. The substance of this citation is repeated at page 43.
16. Obeng, *The selected speeches*, 92–93.
17. Obeng, *The selected speeches*, 92–93.
18. Shivambu, *The Coming Revolution*, 70–71. The substance of this citation is repeated at page 77.
19. See for example Cosmas Desmond, *Christians or Capitalists? Christianity and Politics in South Africa* (London: Bowerdean Press, 1978), 156–57, who writes “There is no question of substituting socialism for Christianity; socialism is the indispensable means of giving practical effect to a Christian concern for one’s neighbour. . . . The radical change which is demanded by Christianity and which is given political expression in socialism is in fact in the interests of Whites as well as of Blacks”.
20. “Cowering behind the orcs in parliament is SA’s own Gollum,” *Sunday Times* November 23, 2014: 7.
21. Barney Mthombothi, “The champagne socialists claiming to lead SA’s poor still wedded to discredited dogma,” *Sunday Times*, August 28, 2022, 19.
22. Thomas G. Karis and Gwendolyn M. Carter, G. M., (eds.) *From Protest to Challenge A Documentary History of African Politics in South Africa 1882–1964, Volume 1 Protest and Hope 1892–1934*, Sheridan Johns ed., III, (Stanford CA: Hoover Institute Press, 1982), 53.
23. Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Richard Philcox (New York: Grove Press, 2004).
24. *The Freedom Charter* (New Delhi: Asian Mission of the African National Congress of South Africa, 1965).
25. One of my critiques of the concept, “Coloured” is to be found in Mogobe B. Ramose, “In memoriam Sovereignty and the ‘new’ South Africa,” *Griffith Law Review* 16, no. 2 (2007), 316–17.
26. Patrick Bond, *Elite transition: From apartheid to neoliberalism in South Africa*, (Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2005).
27. Sampie Terreblanche, *Lost in transformation: South Africa’s search for a new future since 1986* (Johannesburg: KMM Review Publishing Company, 2012).
28. Terreblanche, *Lost in transformation*, 63.
29. Terreblanche, *Lost in transformation*, 63. According to Terreblanche, “a White Triple Alliance (WTA) was forged between the two white corporate sectors” and the National Party Government at the Carlton and Good Hope Conferences in 1979 and 1981, 56.
30. Terreblanche, *Lost in transformation*, 63–4.
31. Terreblanche, *Lost in transformation*, 71–2.
32. This observation on the veracity and the timing of the disclosure applies also to the books of two other insiders to the “secret talks” on the transition to the “new” South Africa. The books are: Willie Esterhuysen, *Geheime gesprekke en die einde van Apartheid, Eindstryd* (Kapaastad: Tafelberg, 2012) in Afrikaans, later translated into English as *Endgame Secret talks and the end of Apartheid* (Cape Town: Tafelberg, 2012) and Niël Barnard as told to Tobue Wiese, *Secret revolution Memoirs of a spy boss* (Cape Town: Tafelberg, 2015). The author of this latter book was closest to the “secret talks”, particularly with regard to their organisation. It is politically significant that the threesome of truth, namely, Sampie Terreblanche, Willie Esterhuysen, and Niël Barnard all belong to the Afrikaner tribe among the white tribes of conqueror South Africa. It looks like more than a happy coincidence that the books of Terreblanche and Esterhuysen were published in the same year, 2012.

Equally interesting is the fact that the books of Esterhuysen and Barnard—three years between them—were published by the same publisher.

33. Michael Cardo, “Harry Oppenheimer and the road to BEE,” *Sunday Times*, 2 April 2023, 14.

34. Mac Mahara and Z. Pallo Jordan, *Breakthrough: The Struggles and Secret Talks that Brought Apartheid South Africa to the Negotiating Table* (Cape Town: Penguin Books, 2021).

35. “His-story” is intended as a criticism of “history”. Three specific points of criticism are: (i) that the discipline dominated by males in the West for centuries nonetheless claimed universality in the sense of embracing the story even of females. This claim is untenable since it is actually not her story as well. (ii) that the discipline’s claim to “objectivity” is consequently defective. (iii) during the period of Western colonization and its endurance in the colonized territories, the colonized were voiceless since they were deemed to have no “history”. On this reasoning, “history” is only the male story but not that of the female and the colonized. In recent times it does reflect an advance to her story as well as that of the colonized. Over time it will become “our story” and recognize the need to change its name in deference to the new reality.

36. Rayford W. Logan, “The historical aspects of Pan-Africanism, 1900–1945,” in *Pan-Africanism Reconsidered*, American Society of African Culture ed., (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962), 44–49, where we read, for example, that “Blaise Diagne, black Deputy from Senegal . . . declared: ‘I am a Frenchman and a Negro afterward.’” [44] “On the eve of World War II, Azikiwe expressed his ‘love’ for British institutions.” [p47].

37. Ezekiel Mkhwanazi, “Nkrumah and the Chiefs: Contending Epistemologies of Democracy,” *Journal of African Philosophy* 4 (2012), 18–28.

38. Ellison Kahn, *The New Constitution: Being a Supplement to South Africa: The Development of its Laws and Constitution* (London and Cape Town: Stevens & Sons, Ltd.—Juta & Co., Ltd, 1962), 8 and 12.

39. Hepple, B. A., “Economic and racial legislation” in HR Hahlo & Ellison Kahn (eds) 1960. *The Union of South Africa: The development of its laws and constitution*, p.795 [page range, 760–813].

40. Slabbert, vZ., 1985. *The Last White Parliament: The Struggle for South Africa by the Leader of the White Opposition*. Jonathan Ball Publishers. Johannesburg.

41. For more on this see Ramose MB. 2001. “An African Perspective on Justice and Race” (especially section 14–25) in <https://them.polylog.org/3/frm-en.htm>.

42. Sampie Terreblanche, *A History of Inequality in South Africa 1652–2002* (Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2002).

43. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, “The Rime of the Ancient Mariner,” 1834 <https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poems/43997/the-rime-of-the-ancient-mariner-text-of-1834>.

44. Ali Al’Amin Mazrui, *Towards a Pax Africana: A Study of Ideology and Ambition* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1967).

45. For an extended discussion of the distinction between government and state succession see, Mogobe B. Ramose, “I conquer, therefore, I am the sovereign: reflections upon sovereignty, constitutionalism, and democracy in Zimbabwe and South Africa,” in *The African Philosophy Reader*, eds. P. H. Coetzee, and A. P. J. Roux,

A. (London: Routledge, 2003), 556–8.

46. Yilma Makonnen, *International Law and the New States of Africa: A Study of the International Legal Problems of State Succession in the Newly Independent States of Eastern Africa* (Addis Ababa: UNESCO, 1983), 363–4.

47. Ernst Von Dobshütz, “The Lord’s Prayer,” *Harvard Theological Review* 7, no. 3 (July 1914), 293–321.

48. Waclaw Hryniewicz, "Can non-believers be redeemed?" *Dialogue and Universalism* VIII, no. 1–2 (1998), 70.
49. Kwame Nkrumah, "The African genius," in *Reclaiming the Human Sciences and Humanities through African Perspectives*, Volume II, eds. Helen Lauer and Kofi Anyidoho, (Accra: Sub-Saharan Publishers, 2012), 917.
50. Immanuel Wallerstein, *Africa: The politics of unity* (New York: Vingate Books, 1969), 253.
51. Wallerstein, *Africa*, 236.
52. Julius K. Nyerere, *Freedom and Unity Uhuru na Umoja* (Nairobi: Oxford University Press, 1966), 153.
53. Nyerere, *Freedom and Unity*, 190.
54. Unpublished Speech by the President, Mwalimu Julius K. "Is Africa Responsible?" Nyerere at the Institute of Social Studies, The Hague 13th March 1985.
Typewritten copy in author's possession.
55. Nyerere, "Is Africa Responsible?"
56. Nyerere, "Is Africa Responsible?"
57. For a critique of globalized Western practice see, Mogobe B. Ramose, "Toward the betterment of human relations," *Dialogue and Universalism* no. 4 (2016), 75–6. For a discussion of "profits über alles" see Noam Chomsky and Marv Waterstone, *Consequences of Capitalism: Manufacturing Discontent and Resistance*, (Great Britain: Hamish Hamilton, 2021), 339.
58. Pope Francis, *Evangelii Gaudium*, (Rome, Vatican Press, 2013).
59. Salim Ahmed Salim, "A leadership paradigm for a new Africa," *Sunday Independent*, Independent Dispatches, (25 May 2014), 13.
60. Ibid.
61. Nyerere, "Is Africa Responsible?"
62. Salim Ahmed Salim, "A leadership paradigm for a new Africa," *Sunday Independent*, Independent Dispatches, (25 May 2014), 13.
63. Obeng, *The selected speeches*, 89. Kwame Nkrumah, "Ghana Is Born" Speech given in Accra 1960 July 1.
64. Julius K. Nyerere, "Corruption as an Enemy of the People" speech given on 17 May 1960 in *Freedom and Unity: A Selection from Writings and Speeches 1952–65* (London: Oxford University Press, 1960), 81–5.
65. Salim Ahmed Salim, "A leadership paradigm for a new Africa," *Sunday Independent*, Independent Dispatches, (25 May 2014), 13.
66. Muhammad Yunus, *Banker to the poor: Micro-lending and the battle against world poverty* (London: Penguin Books, 2007). At page 79, Yunus writes: "It was clear from my many discussions with bankers in the past few days that I was not up against the Janata Bank per se, but against the whole banking system." He writes later at page 234: "Economics has contributed enormously to creating the kind of world we live in today. It can definitely be faulted as a social science. The elegant structures of economic theory that have built up over the years may have been useful in understanding the forces that make up our economy, but theory simply abandons the poor, and walks out on the subject of poverty alleviation."