

Pan-Africanism: A Historiographical Analysis

Tesema Ta'a¹*Abstract*

Tesema Ta'a. (2014). Pan-Africanism: A historiographical analysis. *EJSSLS*, 1 (1), 63-77.

The aim of this paper was to analyze some of the existing historiography on Pan-Africanism, its attachment to the continent and immense contributions to the birth of OAU/AU in the wake of the 50th anniversary of the latter for better understanding of the issues involved. Secondary sources on the subject were reviewed and analyzed critically. The analysis revealed that African historiography has suffered from several drawbacks and constraints including heavy dependence on western academia and methodological poverty. Writers on the subject depicted the origin of Pan-Africanism, its growth, and development from their own perspectives. Many of them also seem to disagree concerning the definition of the concept, the Pan-African Congresses, the exact period when it began, the conflict between Garvey and Du Bois, African Federation, Pan-Africanism in Africa, conceptual relations between Pan-Africanism and the philosophy of Negritude and the regional groupings of independent African states. Despite some competitive, contrastive, and controversial views on the subject among writers, it is interesting to note that they gave more consideration to the “Negroes” of the New World and the leading Pan-African personalities. Further, almost all the scholars appreciated the positive contributions of Pan-Africanism to African independence, and its becoming a brainchild of African Unity. The review concluded that it is very likely that Pan-Africanism will assist the fulfillment of the mission and vision of African Unity and will remain a cornerstone of African peoples’ pride for generations to come in a sustainable manner. However, the attitudes of Blacks in different parts of the world towards Pan-African Movement were not studied properly.

Keywords: Africa / African Unity / Europe / Pan-Africanism / United States / West Indies

1. Introduction

1.1 Background to the Review

Numerous studies were produced on Pan-Africanism since the birth of the movement in the nineteenth century. According to these works, long standing intellectual debates and arguments around the origins and visions of the concept as an ideology as well as its attachment to the African continent and the Organization of African Unity

¹ Professor, at the Department of History, AAU.

(OAU) have been undertaken. Defining exactly Pan-Africanism and setting its ultimate objectives and visions were among the major concerns of the scholars. Besides, significant numbers of scholars have dealt with the rise and development of Pan-African movement, the founding fathers of African descent in the Diaspora, African intellectuals and statesmen behind the ideology. This historiographical analysis and narrative mainly attempts to address these questions: Who formulated the ideology? Where, when and why was it formulated? What were its aims and objectives? How was it defined? What were the successes and failures of the movement? In what ways was it associated with Africa and the black race all over the world? In addition, it will treat the scholarly debates and other issues related to Pan-Africanism.

1.2 Rationale

One of the recent scholarly works in connection with the critical analysis and evaluation of African Historiography is the book published by Jaques Depelchin titled, *Silences in African History: Between the Syndromes of Discovery and Abolition* (2005). Though Depelchin's work does not directly deal with the topic of this discourse, it is insightful in that (1) it clearly explains and expresses that African history is not free from colonial influences, and (2) it is part of the relations of domination which characterized the history of contacts between Africa, Europe, and the rest of the Western World for several years in the past. The author has also revealed that any selection of themes, periods, problems or controversies to be examined has been subject to political, social, economic and ideological reasons (Depelchin, 2005, pp. 1-50). According to Michael Janis, another Africanist writer of the recent period, "Pan-Africanism acts as an umbrella term for a range of intellectual and political practices that seek to address the cultural issues of – and to unify politically—Africa and the diasporas, including 'African Personality', Negritude, the Pan-African Congresses, Afro/Africenterism, and Africana cultural/ theory" (Janis, 2008, p. 33).

With this reality in mind, this paper attempts to analyze, carefully examine and evaluate some of the pertinent literature on Pan-Africanism. Owing to the nature of the topic the narrative and the analysis of the paper heavily depends on secondary sources on the subject. The works produced by historians, sociologists, anthropologists, lawyers, journalists, politicians and diplomats have treated Pan-Africanism from different perspectives. Although many of the authors have tried to be as objective as possible, it appears that some are not free from political bias, nationalistic fervor, and ideological prejudice which need to be carefully investigated. The purpose of the paper is therefore, to review the existing literature and evaluate the historiography on Pan-Africanism critically. It is significant to underscore that Pan-Africanism as an ideology and movement tends to encourage the solidarity of Africans worldwide even to this day. It is envisioned that unity should be based on purpose and action which are vital to social, economic, cultural and political progress. At first it was an expression of a sense of unity and solidarity among the uprooted Africans in the Diaspora since they felt 'homelessness' and were subjected to alien cultures. But gradually it had greatly influenced and attracted the attention of African students abroad in the early 20th century.

2. Origin, Definition, and the Movement of Pan-Africanism

This paper is organized under three sub-topics: the origin and definition of Pan-Africanism, Pan-African movement in the West Indies, the United States and Europe, and finally Pan-Africanism in Africa. The first one deals with the origin, definition and approach of the scholars to the event, the authenticity and objectivity of their works. The second treats the interpretation and description of Pan-African Congresses from 1900 to 1945, conflict of ideas between M. Garvey and W.E.B Du Bois, the impact of Pan-Africanism on African Nationalists and the role of Pan-African Federation. The third deals with the views of the authors on Pan-African Movement in Africa and the waning of influence of African—American and West Indies intellectuals on Pan-African Movement and the concurrent rise of African personality. At the end a short concluding remark is given.

2.1 The Origin and Definition of Pan-Africanism

Several books, articles and monographs on Pan-Africanism were the works of Pan-African leaders, nationalists, political scientists, anthropologists, sociologists, journalists and historians. Many of these writers interpreted the Pan- African Movement from their perspectives and field of interest instead of analyzing the issue historically. Some of the scholars attempted to find the roots of Pan-Africanism and still others were preoccupied with its growth, development, effects and protagonist role. A closer examination of the secondary literature reflects that there was excessive reliance on the European colonial records and the publications of Pan-African leaders and Pan-Africanists. Moreover, the sources on the subject are mainly characterized by repetitions, assertions and reinterpretations of previously written materials.

It is difficult if not impossible to provide a clear cut and precise definition to Pan-Africanism. Nevertheless, for the readers' general understanding, it is important to consider the definitions given by some scholars. C. Legum, a journalist, defined Pan-Africanism as an expression of a sense of unity and solidarity among the up-rooted Africans in the Diaspora since they felt 'homeless' and were subjected to alien cultures (Legum, 1962, pp. 5-14). According to G. Padmore (1956, pp.10-30), Pan-Africanism was a reaction against the oppression of the black people and the racial doctrines since the period of slavery and the slave trade. For him it began from a movement for self-assertion and resistance to enslavement. His definition in fact refers to the origin of the ideas and the earliest movement beyond the year 1900 which is often referred to as a turning point for the beginning of an organized Pan-African movement.

Another writer, P.O. Esedebe strongly criticized scholars who defined Pan-Africanism as an irrational concept, emotional and depicted it as a racial movement. He remarked that there has not been universally accepted definition of Pan-Africanism. He also underscored that the term Pan-Africanism was not coined when the movement began. It was rather named after it had established itself like a child that is named after birth. Consequently, he defined Pan-Africanism as a political and cultural phenomenon

that regard Africans and African descendants abroad as a unit. He asserted that the movement glorified the African past and indicated pride in African values. He argued that the desire for unity and African pride did not change from the beginning (Esedebe, 1982, pp. 5-21). Esedebe has also provided useful remarks of various motivations of Pan- Africanism: “Africa as a homeland of Africans and persons of African origin, solidarity among men of African descent, belief in a distinct African culture, African personality, rehabilitation of Africa’s past, pride in African culture, Africa for Africans in church and state, the hope for a united and glorious future Africa” (p. 3).

One of the earliest works is the *Rise of Pan-Africanism*, an article written by C. Drake, a sociologist. He interpreted Pan-Africanism in terms of a racial movement and underscored social causes of the movement. His article provides little information on the origin of the movement and it describes the contributions of George Padmore, one of the early Pan-Africanists (Drake, 1958, pp. 7-10).

In the year 1960, G. Shepperson described the influence of African-Americans on the emergence of African nationalism with invaluable information on the beginning of Black Nationalism in America and its long-term impact on African nationalism (Shepperson, 1960, p. 30). Though he put emphasis on the significant contributions of black nationalists, he did not, however, define the concept of Pan-Africanism in his otherwise well documented work. Another writer, K. Madhu Panikkar, who published his book in 1961, indicated that Pan-Africanism came into existence in 1900 by the blacks of African descent in the West Indies and the United States. He portrayed Pan-Africanism as African-American movement for social equality and the need to look for the land of their forefathers. Panikkar provided detailed information on the origin of Pan-African movement and had also compared and contrasted Pan-Africanism with the Jewish Zionism (Panikkar, 1961, pp. 104-105).

Legum, a prominent journalist who has already been mentioned earlier, wrote a book on Pan-Africanism in 1962. He provided a fairly complete description on the origin, development, and the long-term consequences of the movement on Africa. He traced the roots of Pan-Africanism to the black settlers in the New World, and like Panikkar (1961) he compared it with Zionism based on their formation in the Diaspora (Legum, 1962, p. 14). In the same year, *Pan-Africanism Reconsidered*, a book edited by the American Society of African Culture, contributed a detailed historical account on the subject. The work dealt with the roots of the movement and its growth in the United States, Europe and later in Africa. Moreover, it underlined that W.S. Williams of the West Indies and W.E.B. Du Bois of the USA were the pioneers of the Pan-African movement (American Society of Culture, 1962, p. 37).

In 1963, Kwame Nkrumah published a book titled, *Africa Must Unite*, which mainly dealt with OAU under the umbrella of Pan-Africanism putting more emphasis on its political aspect of meaningful unity than on its historic roots. He had, however, properly acknowledged both Williams and Du Bois as the founding fathers of Pan-Africanism (Nkrumah, 1963, p. 132). Two years later, Joseph S. Nye wrote a book on Pan-Africanism and East African integration in which he studied the similarities and differences between Pan-Africanism and Nationalism. He compared it with Pan-Slavism (Nye, 1965, p. 10-11). But he paid little or no attention to the origin and definition of Pan-Africanism in contrast to the others.

Bernard Magubane, who wrote his PhD dissertation in Sociology in 1967, critically dealt with the definition and the origin of Pan-Africanism. He considered the year 1900 as the genesis of Pan Africanism and Williams as its initiator (Magubane, 1967, p. 242). A year later, E.M. Rudwick produced an in-depth study and a scholarly work on the origin of Pan-Africanism. Although Rudwick demonstrated the inauguration of Pan-Africanism by Williams in 1900, he argued that Du Bois had already conceived the notion of Pan-Africanism as far back as the 1890s. He also explained that Du Bois endeavored to organize “Negroes” before 1900 (Rudwick, 1968, p. 208).

Adekunle Ajala and Ayodele Langley published their works in 1973. Ajala, an African nationalist discussed the Pan- African movement from an insider point of view. His description of the origin of Pan-Africanism was comprehensive and coherent. Ajala considered 1900 as the beginning of Pan-Africanism and Williams as its founder. According to him, the participants of the first Conference were only African descendants from the United States and the West Indies. Unlike Rudwick before him, however, Ajala did not mention Du Bois’ place at the beginning of the movement (Ajala, 1973, p. 4). Langley is also another African scholar whose book is an important source on the history of Pan-Africanism. Contrary to Ajala’s assertion, Lngley traced the origin of Pan-Africanism back to the period of the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade, which in turn led to the great African Diaspora. According to him, members of the Black Diaspora in the New World endeavored to form informal organizations between 1500-1900 A.D. He therefore concluded that Pan-Africanism informally existed before 1900. Like many other writers, however, he considered that the first Pan-African conference was organized by Williams (Langley, 1973, pp. 17-18).

In 1975, Rodney Carlisle published his book: *The Roots of Black Nationalism*, which discussed the root of Pan-Africanism as well. He declared that the achievement of Pan-African Conference of 1900 was more social than political. Moreover, Carlisle praised the work of Du Bois and ignored the role of Williams concerning the origin of Pan-Africanism (Carlisle, 1975, p. 118), which is quite controversial. One year later, Stephen Adebajji Akintoye, a Nigerian historian at the University of Ife, published an interesting book on African history. He provided a fairly complete and detailed description on the origin of Pan-Africanism. He underscored that Pan-Africanism was a movement organized by black African descendants in the New World and in Africa itself by African nationalist concurrently; he also gave credit to the latter. Akintoye further indicated 1900 as both the beginning of Pan-African Conference in London and as the commencement of a Pan-African movement in Africa (Akintoye,1976, pp. 98-99).

Robert W. Adams, a historian, and Ken C. Kotecha, a lawyer, published a book on African history in 1981. These writers explained the origin and development of Pan-Africanism from a political perspective. They claimed that European colonization and the African resistance to colonial rule led to the rise of Pan-African awareness among African nationalist scholars without acknowledging the contributions of educated African descendants in the West Indies and the USA to the rise and development of Pan-Africanism (Adams & Kotecha, 1981, p.151). But these writers should have acknowledged the works of the early contributors to the movement. In the same year, Sylvia M.Jacobs argued that Pan-africanism lay on the conviction that the entire peoples of African descent shared a common cultural origin and therefore had to cooperate to enjoy their freedom. According to this writer, Williams convened some preliminary

meetings that enabled him to rally African-American intellectuals behind him at the Pan-African Conference of 1900. The Conference was also aimed at rallying African descendants to launch a movement to get their rights (Jacobs, 1981, p. 55). This notion, however, limited the horizon of Pan-Africanism to the United States and the West Indies which should not have been the case.

In 1982, Elenka M'buyinga, a socialist oriented African nationalist produced his valuable work on: *Pan-Africanism or Neocolonialism? The Bankruptcy of the OAU*. He showed a special interest to analyze Pan-Africanism from the contemporary perspective. In his description, he defined Pan-Africanism as a unity of Africans and African descendants. But he considered this definition obsolete owing to political change. Consequently, he defined Pan-Africanism as a collection of political beliefs claiming that Africa is an integrated continent that has to be united. M'buyinga regarded the 1900 Pan-African Conference as the brainchild of Sylvester Williams to fight against the British imperialists and argued that the movement came into being to struggle against imperialism all over the world in general and against the western powers in particular. Furthermore, he discredited those writers who compared Zionism with Pan-Africanism for their misinterpretation and misunderstanding (M'buyinga, 1982, p. 28).

Other scholars including Ajala, Esedebe and M.R. Ofoegbu wrote articles on different aspects of Pan-African movement. Akaka assessed the contributions of students in Europe (Ajala, 1982, pp. 4-5). Esedebe critically analyzed the writings on Pan-African movement and published an article focusing on the origin and meanings of Pan-Africanism in detail (Esedebe, 1982, pp.3-8). Ofoegbu defined and discussed the Pan-African concepts like African personality, African socialism and others (Ofoegbu, 1982, pp. 2-10). Another writer, Richard Olaniyan edited an interesting work: *African History and Culture*. Like Langley, Olaniyan traced the origin of Pan-Africanism back to Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade. He argued that Pan-Africanism was the result of the combination of Trans- Atlantic Slave Trade, colonization and the concomitant color consciousness that influenced the black race both in Africa and abroad to organize themselves to get their freedom and independence. With regard to the place of origin, Olaniyan indicated that Pan-Africanism started outside Africa by socially segregated and politically forgotten black African descendants. Although he recognized the existence of growing Pan-African trends in the forms of poems and songs before the dawn of the twentieth century, Olaniyan identified 1900 as a watershed in the history of Pan-Africanism (Olaniyan, 1982, p. 127).

2.2 The Pan-African Movement in Europe, the USA and the West Indies

Many of the literature the reviewer has tried to assess and analyze so far clearly acknowledged the year 1900 as the beginning of Pan-African Congress in Europe and Williams as the initiator and organizer of the first conference in London. According to Legum, the conference announced the ill-treatment of Africans in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia (today's Zimbabwe) to Queen Victoria of Britain. Moreover, he asserted that Du Bois was able to show the problem of racial discrimination as the chronic problem of the 20th century (Legum, 1962, pp. 24-25). The American Society of African Culture argued that the conference demanded Queen Victoria to consider the policy of racial segregation in South Africa among others (America Society of African

Culture, 1962, p. 38). Ajala stressed establishing solidarity among African descendants, combating colonial powers, and working for the equality of Africans throughout the world as major objectives of the conference. Ajala also claimed that the Pan-African movement began to decline soon after the first conference owing to the outbreak of the First W.W. (1914-1918) and the death of Williams (Ajala, 1973, p. 4).

There are some scholars who have mixed feelings about the Pan-African conference. For instance Olaniyan criticized the conference for its failure to demand self-determination for the black Africans. Carlisle on his part blamed the conference for its weakness to raise the issue of African independence (Carlisle, 1975, p.129). But M. Crowder stated that the conference was able to demand the involvement of Africans in social, political and economic affairs of the colonial administration. He had also underlined the contribution of the conference to the Pan-African congresses that followed. Crowder's description of the 1900 conference on the issues of Africa was comprehensive and critical (Crowder, 1968, pp. 409-410). Although many writers revealed the significance of the conference, they had also underlined the inactivity and passiveness of pan-African movement between 1900 and 1919. Perhaps, this inactivity could be attributed to the First World War which took place from 1914 to 1918.

Contrary to such views, Langley provided a comprehensive description of the Pan-African movement between 1900 and 1919. He underscored a gradual dissemination of Pan-African feelings inside and outside Africa during this period. Moreover, he emphasized the influence of African-American nationalists on the educated Africans. Langley explained that Casely Hayford and Edward Blyden were distinguished African nationalists who wrote many books and articles on African nationalism (Langley, 1973, pp. 30-31). Similarly, Rudwick claimed that another Pan-African conference was held in 1906 by T. Thomas Fortune and Booker T. Washington (Rudwick, 1968, pp. 209). Not much has been said about this conference since the author was silent about the background of Fortune and Washington, the objective of the conference and its contribution to the Pan-African movement. Ajala also argued that African descendants in the United States organized the Niagara Movement in 1905. He indicated the formation of the National Association for the Advancement of colored people in 1910. He then remarked that both organizations were intended to fight for the rights of African descendants (Ajala, 1973, pp. 4-5). As the reviewer has tried to point out, there were only a few writers who provided scanty information on the situation of Pan-African movement between 1900 and 1919.

Nevertheless, many writers put primary emphasis and strength on the Pan-African Congresses which have taken place, then, since 1919. Nkrumah was one of these scholars. He paid much attention to the 1919 Pan-African Congress. He was a dedicated socialist oriented African nationalist (Nkrumah, 1963, pp. 133). Concerning the achievements of the 1919 Pan-African Congress, scholars have divergent opinions. M'buying argued that the congress demanded the right to possess land, abolition of exploitation, and the transfer of former German colonies in Africa to the League of Nations (Mbuyinga, 1982, p. 31). Langley agreed with M'buyinga and discussed the significance of the resolutions of the Congress (Langley, 1973, pp. 63-64). Similarly, Rudwick and Carlisle gave much attention to the achievements of the congress (Rudwick, 1968, p. 213; Carlisle, 1975, p. 118). Magubane opposed the views of these authors and claimed that the congress had not a clear-cut program and there were marked

differences between its members. In agreement with Magubane, Ajala understated the achievements of the congress (Magubane, 1967, p. 274; Ajala, 1973, p. 7). Legum, on the other hand, considered the 1919 congress as the Second Pan-African Congress and acknowledged its achievements (Legum, 1962, pp. 28-29). Nevertheless, the 1919 conference was one of the four series of conferences organized by Du Bois, who was often called the “Father of Pan-Africanism”. This conference coincided with Paris Peace Conference and the Treaty of Versailles that ended the First World War, which might had overshadowed its achievements.

In 1921, a second Pan- African congress was held by Du Bois in two sessions— one in London and the other in Brussels— and in 1923 the third was held in two sessions: in London and Lisbon. The fourth Congress was held in New York in 1927. The second session of this conference was to be held in Tunis for the first time on African soil, but it was obstructed by the French colonial authorities. For Nkrumah, the objectives of these congresses were similar in that they were demanding African participation in policy making and political administration of the continent (Nkrumah, 1963, pp. 133-134). Langley, however, interpreted the second congress organized by Du Bois as the most fundamental of all the congresses. He argued that it condemned colonial policy and therefore paid greater attention to the significance of the second congress (Panikkar, 1961, pp. 113; M’buyinga, 1982, p. 32).

The conflict of ideas between Du Bois and Garvey, which was one of the causes for the discontinuity of Pan-African congresses, was another contentious issue of Pan-Africanism. Legum attributed the sources of their conflict to racial prejudice and ideological differences. Garvey was a black Jamaican who used militant speeches to rally the support of the masses behind him. On the contrary, Du Bois belonged to a mixed race and he strongly condemned militancy (Legum, 1962, pp. 24-25). Similarly, T.G.Vincent and Olalekan Oyedeji provided detailed information about the ideological differences between the two personalities (Vincent, 1972, p. 57; Oyedeji, 1974, pp. 31-32). Oyedeji further argued that among the three Pan-African ideologies, Du Bois adopted the intellectual ideology while Garvey applied the demographic and economic ideologies. The intellectual ideology contradicts with the demographic and economic ideologies. According to Oyedeji, Garvey reached a decision to resettle the people of African descent in Africa (Oyedeji, 1974, pp. 32-33). In agreement with this view, Langley asserted that Garvey’s “Back to Africa Movement” faced stiff opposition from his rival Du Bois who held Marxist ideology and favored democratic socialism while Garvey tended towards Utopianism. Langley blamed Garvey for his romantic and Afro-centric views (Langley, 1973, pp. 69-70). Janis acknowledges that Du Bois in his work, *“The World and Africa: An Inquiry into the Part which Africa has played in World history,”* demonstrates the need to recognize African history and culture at a time when Africa is not even considered in the realm of historical concerns, in a Euro- American social climate that thinks only in terms of West and East” (Janis, 2008, p. 32).

Concerning the contributions of Du Bois and Garvey to Pan-Africanism, scholars held different views. For instance, Langley, Vincent and some others appreciated that both Du Bois and Garvey had contributed enormously to Pan-Africanism. Vincent underscored that African nationalists were much influenced by the ideas and philosophies of Du Bois and Garvey. With regard to the Caribbean and the United States of America, however, Garvey’s philosophy became prevalent. On the other hand, for Vincent, both

Du Bois and Garvey were unsuccessful to promulgate their beliefs among the masses (Vincent, 1972, p. 58). The American society of Culture, Crowder, Rudwick, Ajala, and others gave more credit to Garvey's contribution to Pan-Africanism than to that of Du Bois. The American Society of African Culture in particular underlined Garvey's significant influence on African intellectuals like Nkrumah and others (American Society of African Culture, 1962, pp. 45-46). Similarly, Crowder clearly described Garvey's influence on African and African-American nationalists. He concluded that Garvey had greater influence on African nationalists more than Pan-African congresses (Crowder, 1968, p. 412). Rudwick had also argued that Garvey was more successful than his rival Du Bois in winning mass support. According to him, Garvey was the one who formed the "United Negro Improvement Association," the "Black Star Shipping Line," and the "Negro Factories Corporation". Garvey also proclaimed himself the "Provisional President of a Racial Empire in Africa", to achieve his lifelong dream of the success of his "Back to Africa Movement" and to expel the whites from Africa (Rudwick, 1968, p. 214). Ajala also claimed that Garvey's Universal Negro Improvement Association (U.N.I.A.) was formed in 1917 to mitigate the sufferings of African descendants in the United States and the West Indies (Ajala, 1973, p. 5). Ajala, however, had overemphasized Garvey's political career. Nonetheless, by and large, Olaniyan and the majority of scholars have been discussed in this article followed this line of argument (Olaniyan, 1982, p. 128).

There are, however, a few writers who do not accept the above line of argument. M'buyinga is a typical example of such scholars. He regarded out rightly Garvey as a racist and Du Bois as a liberal founder of Pan-Africanism. In fact he attributed the cause of Garvey's failure to his own racist theory. On the other hand, he argued that Du Bois endeavored to bring national self-determination, individual liberty, and democratic socialism, encouraging African descendants to fight for their rights wherever they were instead of going back to Africa. He also indicated Du Bois' opposition to Garvey's philosophy of Utopianism and Africa for Africans (M'buyinga, 1982, pp. 29-31). Here, it is clear that M'buyinga used Marxist perspectives in undermining Garvey's views and exaggerating Du Bois' views.

Another contentious issue of Pan-Africanism was the Pan-African Federation. Nkrumah claimed that the Pan-African Federation was formed in 1937 to unite the peoples of African descent and Africa (Nkrumah, 1963, p.134). Langley, however, traced the origin of Pan- African Federation back to 1936 when the Pan-African movement in the United States, in West Africa, and in Paris began to decline as the result of the rise of fascism and Nazism in Europe. He also indicated that George Padmore, C.I.R. James, Jomo Kenyatta, Emperor Haile Sellassie, and others organized the International Service Bureau which was merged with the Pan-African Federation in 1944 (Langley, 1973, p. 326). The International Africa Service Bureau was formed in 1937 by the leaders of International Friends of Abyssinia Society and other new nationalists. Ajala had rightly interpreted this as a reaction to the fascist Italian invasion of Ethiopia in 1935 (Ajala, 1973, p. 9).

Many writers put emphasis on the role of the Pan-African Federation and the West African Students' Union for the revival of the Pan-African Congress. Ajala, M'buyinga and Legum stressed the Pan-African Federation and the West African Students' Union for the consolidation of Pan-Africanism (Legum, 1962, p. 31; Ajala,

1973, p. 10; M'buyinga, 1982, p. 33). According to Langley, the activities of the Pan-African Federation and the West African Students' Union, apart from the rise of Nkrumah as a Pan-African radical and revolutionary nationalist leader, paved the way for the Fifth Pan-African Congress which was to be held after the First World War (Langley, 1973, p. 349).

Ajala, Panikkar and others argued that the fifth Pan-African Congress, which was convened in October 1945 in Manchester, after its interruption for about 18 years, was chaired by Du Bois and Peter Milliard of Guayana. They had clearly indicated that about 200 delegates including Nkrumah of Ghana, Peter Abrahams of South Africa, Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya and George Padmore of Trinidad actively participated (Ajala, 1973, p. 10; Panikkar, 1961, p. 114). S. Tauval argued that the Manchester Congress gave priority to the problems of Africa and it was the first congress to demand for independence (Tauval, 1972, p. 21). Langley also asserted that the congress strongly demanded for independence and stressed the role of Nkrumah and Padmore than that of Du Bois (Langley, 1973, pp. 349-350). On the other hand, M. Sherwood, Nkrumah, and M'buyinga underscored that it was the first congress in which workers and trade unionists had participated (Nkrumah, 1973, p. 42; M'buyinga, 1982, p. 33 ; Sherwood, 1996, p. 121). Particularly, Nkrumah asserted that students had participated for the first time and most of the delegates had represented the continent of Africa (Nkrumah, 1973, p. 42). Furthermore, M'buyinga argued that the Manchester Congress succeeded in confirming African nationalism and approving Marxist Socialism as its ideology. Blaming Garvey for his racist ideology of Black Nationalism, he indicated the Fifth Pan-African Congress as the beginning of African nationalism (M'buying, 1982, pp. 33-34).

Panikkar quite clearly described that Pan-Africanism was transformed into a full political entity at the Manchester Congress. Unlike M'buyinga, he interpreted the Fifth Congress as a Pan-Negro Congress because of the absence of the Arab countries of Africa (Panikkar, 1961, p. 114). Akintoye more or less agreed with Panikkar but adamantly opposed M'buyinga for overemphasizing the Fifth Pan-African Congress. Akintoye claimed that between 1900 and 1945, Pan-Africanism was able to unite the intellectuals of Africa and African descent (Akintoye, 1976, pp. 99-101). The American Society of African Culture succinctly explained that although the Fifth African Congress passed some new resolutions, the contributions of the other four congresses to the African political awareness were also enormous (American Society of African Culture, 1962, p. 52). According to Ajala, 1945 was the first time when Pan-Africanism and African Nationalism with the same intention called for national liberation struggle, and Pan-Africanism became a movement of Africans for Africa following the Manchester Congress (Ajala, 1982, p. 17). Roland Oliver and Anthony Atmore also confirmed this opinion. As they put it:

African nationalism is like a great forest tree; its trunk is the Pan-African movement, which gives a sense of solidarity to all the different peoples of the continent. Its branches are the independent states of Africa. As the roots of a tree reach deep into the soil, so the origins of African nationalism spread in many directions back into history (Oliver and Atmore, 1972, p. 223).

Generally speaking, many scholars considered the Fifth Pan-African Congress as a land mark in the history of Pan-Africanism; after that Africa became its rightful place. Furthermore, Pan-Africanism paved the way for a closer cooperation among African peoples. In fact it was the Manchester's Congress that inspired decolonization in Africa with hopes and visions for a united continent after independence.

2.3 Pan-Africanism in Africa

After the Fifth Pan-African Congress, no serious organizational development on the international level took place. Apparently, Pan-Africanists did not hold meetings since they were busy mobilizing their people to struggle for independence. The Conference of Independent African States (CIAS), which was held in Accra, Ghana, a year after its independence in 1958, was the first Pan-African Conference on African soil. This was attributed to the successful efforts of Nkrumah and the independence of Ghana (Ajala, 1973, pp. 17-18). The notions of Pan-Africanism, therefore, moved into the realm of practical policies where African states began to work for closer links, solidarity and cooperation. Akintoye revealed the waning of the influence of African-Americans and West Indians with the concurrent rising power of young African politicians. According to him, the aim of the Pan- African Movement itself was changed from racism to African nationalism (Akintoye, 1976, p. 102). Like Akintoye, Panikkar asserted that since the Fifth Pan-African Congress, Padmore, Nkrumah, and Jomo Kenyatta appeared as leading figures of Pan-African Movement (Panikkar, 1961, pp. 114-115). Nkrumah also explained that the 1958 Accra Conference, which was actually held in Africa, was attended by Africans, and it discussed African affairs. He strongly emphasized the issue of African independence and unity (Nkrumah, 1963, pp. 136-137).

Concerning the resolutions of the Accra Conference, Legum argued that strong emphasis was placed on the emancipation of Africa and the struggle against colonialism. He also mentioned that the conference adopted a non-alignment policy regarding the Cold War (Legum, 1962, p. 42). Oliver and Atmore, however, tended to regard the conference as a fruitless attempt (Oliver & Atmore, 1972, p. 282). But M'buyinga claimed the significance of the Accra Conference for passing a resolution to support the Algerian nationalist armed struggle against French colonialism (M'buyinga, 1982, p. 39).

In December 1958, all African Peoples Conference (A.A.P.C.) was held in Accra. As it was more inclusive, it created a wider forum for those nationalists in the non-independent countries that declared liberation struggle against the colonialists. According to Nkrumah, it contributed a lot to the final liberation and the unity of Africa (Nkrumah, 1963, p. 139). The conference passed a strong resolution in support of the unity of African states (Legum, 1962, p. 43). Also, Nye asserted that the conference agreed to achieve African Unity through the formation of regional unities (Nye, 1965, p. 15). Nkrumah and others, however, did not mention regional unity as an agenda of All African People's Conference. Nkrumah rather showed the formation of regional union between Ghana and Guinea (later joined by Mali) in the same year as a corner stone of his vision for the United States of Africa (U.S.A) (Nkrumah, 1963, pp. 141-142). Similarly, a year later, Legum indicated the formalization of the union which was called Conakry Declaration. He also explained that W.Tubman, Nkrumah, and Sekou Toure met at Sanniquelle, Liberia, in July 1959, and they agreed to collaborate in achieving the

community of African Independent states (Legum, 1962, p. 45). Panikkar, however, considered the cooperation as an anti-French coalition (Panikkar, 1961, p. 132).

The second Conference of Independent African States (C.I.A.S.) was held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in 1960. Ajala's description of the war in Algeria "Apartheid" and the issue of African Unity were the major topics of the conference. According to him, although the delegates accepted the union unanimously, there were marked differences with regard to the time-limit for unification. While Ghana and Guinea favored immediate political union, Nigeria and others opposed it trying to buy time (Ajala, 1973, pp. 26-27). Legum attributed the source of this division to the Sanniquelle Declaration proposed by Ghana and Guinea (Legum, 1962, p. 45).

As Ajala stated, the enthusiasm for Pan-Africanism caused independent African states to form regional unities. The Brazzaville Conference of December 1960 was a typical example (Ajala, 1973, p. 28). The Brazzaville or the Neutral group included Congo Brazzaville, Ivory Coast, Mauritania, Upper Volta (Burkina Faso), Niger, Dahomey, Chad, Gabon, the Central African Republic, Cameroon, Madagascar, and all French ex-colonies (Legum, 1962, p. 50). N.J. Padelford and R. Emerson rightly commented that this group was more regional than continental (Padelford & Emerson, 1963, p. 18).

On the other hand, Nye considered the Brazzaville group as a precursor to the Casablanca or the Radical and Monrovia or the Moderate groups (Nye, 1965, p. 15). In January 1961, Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Libya, Egypt, and Morocco held a conference at Casablanca (Nkrumah, 1963, p. 143). Ajala asserted that the Casablanca group was formed as a response to the Brazzaville group. As opposed to Ajala's assertion, A. Mazrui claimed that Nkrumah's enthusiastic support for the Algerian National Liberation Front detached him from the French speaking African states, and therefore the latter formed the Brazzaville group (Mazrui, 1967, p. 64). The formation of the Casablanca group was followed by the formation of the Monrovia group in the same year. Members of the group included Liberia, Nigeria, Somalia, Sierra Leone, Togo, Ethiopia, and the Brazzaville group. Apparently, the formation of the Brazzaville, the Monrovia, and the Casablanca groups posed a great problem for the Pan-African movement (Legum, 1962, pp. 52-53). J. Hatch claimed that the Casablanca group aspired for immediate political union of African states whereas the Monrovia group favored deliberate and time-consuming union (Hatch, 1967, p. 129). However, Legum did not mention the differences between the Monrovia and Casablanca groups.

Many writers stressed the divisive factors between the Monrovia and the Casablanca groups. Nkrumah himself admitted this ideological division without revealing the causes of the division (Nkrumah, 1963, p. 145). Padelford and Emerson, however, argued that some leaders of the Monrovia group interpreted the immediate political union as the surrender of their power to a potential leader of the union (Padelford & Emerson, 1963, p. 20). Oliver and Atmore also stated that African political leaders who were under colonial rule had accepted Nkrumah's call for political union. However, when they became leaders of independent states, mainly for fear of losing their sovereignty, they preferred strengthening their power and ignoring Nkrumah's demand for unity (Oliver & Atmore, 1972, pp. 282). Even today, this fear is one of the significant factors that militate against the strength and full consolidation of African Unity.

D. Pellow and Naomi Chazan considered the goals of Pan-Africanism as a means to promote the dignity of Africa, to consolidate its influence on world politics, and to establish a strong African personality. They underlined the success of the Pan-African movement in that it brought together the Monrovia and the Casablanca groups (Pellow & Naomi, 1986, p. 184). Furthermore, after having settled the problem of regional division, Hatch claimed that African leaders succeeded in forming O.A.U. in 1963 in Addis Ababa. He regarded the establishment of the O.A.U., which provided an institutional forum that facilitated mutual understanding among the African member states, as the zenith of Pan-Africanism (Hatch, 1967, p. 129). By and large, the Pan-African movement, which was conceived and initiated by African-Americans outside Africa to bring together Africa and African descendants, succeeded in uniting Africans in the continent (Akintoye, 1976, p. 102). These states are still holding together for the betterment of Africa and Africans in this era of rapid globalization.

3. Some Concluding Remarks

The contributions of any scholarly works to the body of knowledge are evaluated from different angles. When such works are analyzed and examined they should necessarily include the merits and demerits of the works. In an attempt to decolonize African historiography, Africans and Africanist writers have contributed a number of books and articles particularly since the 1960s. Nevertheless, as the brief discussion concerning the works on Pan-Africanism has depicted, African historiography has suffered from several drawbacks and constraints including heavy dependence on western academia, and methodological poverty. This is mainly why Depelchin advocated to strengthen “resistance historiography” and introduced new questions, new paradigm in the study as well as reconstruction of African history (Depelchin, 2005, pp. 4-15).

Analyzing historiography on a given topic which involves a large number of scholars with different backgrounds and ideologies is a daunting task. Nonetheless, it is not only important and interesting but it is also academically rewarding. The writers who have been referred to in this review have provided ample information on Pan-Africanism. They have depicted its origin, its growth and development from their own perspectives. But many of them also seem to disagree concerning the definition of the concept, the Pan-African Congresses, its relations with the philosophy of Negritude, the conflict between Garvey and Du Bois, African Federation, Pan-Africanism in Africa and the regional groupings of independent African states.

Pan-Africanism evolved from a movement of self-assertion and resistance to slavery into an organized force with cultural and political aspirations. After 1945, Pan-Africanism came to advocate African Unity. The scholars had thoroughly treated its development from 1900 to the formation of O.A.U. Emphasis was given to the series of conferences held and their resolutions. Nevertheless, one can observe that there was still no agreement among scholars on the meaning of the term Pan-Africanism and the exact period when it began. The “Negroes” of the New World and the leading Pan-African personalities were given more consideration by the authors. The attitudes of Blacks in different parts of the world towards Pan-African Movement were not studied properly. Besides, Garvey’s contribution and Garveyism were not the main concerns of the scholars who wrote on the subject. Many authors mentioned only the conferences and

the careers of Du Bois in their Pan-African studies. The later generations who transplanted Pan-Africanism in Africa and implemented its ideas were highly influenced by Garvey's opinions and philosophy. Yet, others blamed Garvey for being a racist.

Despite some competitive, contrastive, and controversial views on the subject among writers, it is interesting to note that almost all the scholars appreciated the positive contributions of Pan-Africanism to African independence, and its becoming a brainchild of African Unity. It is also very likely that Pan-Africanism will assist the fulfillment of the mission and vision of African Unity and will remain a cornerstone of African peoples' pride for generations to come in a sustainable manner.

References

- Ajala, A. (1973). *Pan-Africanism: Evolution, progress and prospects*. London: Andre Deutsch Ltd.
- Akintoye, S.A. (1976). *Emerging African states: Topics in twentieth century African history*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- American Society of African Culture (ed). *Pan-Africanism reconsidered*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962.
- Carlisle, R. (1975). *The roots of black nationalism*. Washington, N.Y., London: Kennikat Press.
- Crowder, M. (1976). *West Africa under colonial rule*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Depelchin, J. (2005). *Silences in African history: Between the syndromes of discovery and abolition*. Dares Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers.
- Jacobs, S. M. (1981). *The African nexus: Black American perspectives on European partitioning of Africa, 1880-1920*. London: Greenwood Pres.
- Kotecha K. C. & Adams R. W. (1981). *African politics, the corruption of power*. University Press of America, Inc.
- Langley, J. A. (1973). *Pan-Africanism and nationalism in West Africa, 1900-1945. A study in ideology and social classes*. London: Oxford University, Press.
- Legum, C. (1962). *Pan-Africanism: A short political guide*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger.
- Magubane, B. (1967). *The American Negro's conception of Africa: A Study in the ideology of pride and prejudice*. Los Angeles: University California.
- Mazrui, A. A. (1967). *Towards pax Africana: A study of ideology and ambition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- M'buyinga, E. (1982). *Pa-Africanism or neocolonialism: The bankruptcy of the O.A.U*. London: U.P.C. and Zed Press.
- Janis, M.(2008). *Africa After Modernism: Transition in Literature, Media and Phylosophy*. Tylor and Francis Group, LLC.
- Nkrumah, K. (1963). *Africa must unite*. London: Heinemann.
- _____. (1982). *Revolutionary path*. London: Panaf Books Ltd.
- Nye, J. S. (1965). *Pan-Africanism and East African integration*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Oyedeji, O. (1974). "Intellectual origins of Pan-Africanism and black studies as a crucial step towards its realization." *Pan-African Journal* 7(1).
- Olaniyana, R. (1982). *African history and culture*. Legos: Longman Ltd.

- Oliver, R. & Atmore, A. (1972). *Africa since 1800*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Padelford, N. J. & Emerson, R. (1993). *Africa and world order*. New York, London: Frederick A. Praeger Publisher.
- Padmore, G. (1961). *Pan_Africanism or communism? The struggle for Africa*. London.
- Panikkar, K. (1961). *Revolution in Africa*. Bombay: New York.
- Pellow, D. & Naomi, C. (1986). *Ghana coping with uncertainty*. Colorado Westview Press, Inc.
- Rudwick, E.M. (1968). *Propagandist of Negro protest*. New York: Atheneum Press.
- Sherwood, M. (1996). *The years abroad (1935-1947)*. Legon: Freedom Publication.
- Tauval, S.(1972). *The boundary politics of independent Africa*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Vincent, T. G. (1972). *Black power and the Garvey movement*. San Francisco: Ramparts Press.