

## **PRINCIPLES OF A PAN-AFRICAN ECONOMIC IDEOLOGY**

*Tetteh A. Kofi*

The need for a Pan-African ideology has been voiced over the years by Pan-Africanists, including Blyden, DuBois, Nkrumah, and Padmore. Padmore, commenting on the need for an African socialism, said in part that “just as various schools of European socialism aspire to bring about on earth the good life . . . we must evolve our own form of African Socialism, suited to our own conditions and historical background . . . In other words, we must not follow blindly the socialist lines of approach which have occurred either in Western Europe or in Soviet Russia . . . Lenin, the architect of the first socialist state and his party did not blindly follow Marxism in creating the instruments best suited to Russian condition.”<sup>1</sup> To this we must add that Mao Tse-Tung also adapted the theories of both Marx and Lenin to carry out his brand of socialist revolution in China. In the same vein the Pan-African world need not follow blindly capitalist strategy of development although it has been organically linked to Western capitalism since A.D. 1500. In fact, it is the uneven development of the Black World that has resulted from the association which has called for alternative strategies of development over the centuries.

The evolution of the present market economy has progressed from the mercantilism of the city states through free trade liberalism or imperialism, at the height of the industrial revolution, to its present stage of international monopoly capitalism. The evolution of the world market economy centered in Western Europe had a powerful influence in the rest of the world and in many ways a single world social system or order was created. The evolution of the market economy has many things to its credit such as impressive growth rates in the metropolises; but the darker side is equally disturbing—slavery, colonialism, and uneven development in the colonies or in the periphery. In fact, the contemporary economic history of the Third

World is, in large part, a history of the consequences of European capitalist expansionism. See, for example, books by Griffin<sup>2</sup> and Rodney.<sup>3</sup>

Of all the Third World countries, Africa is the continent which felt the impact most thoroughly and carried the brunt of Western mercantilist expansion and hence the evolution of international monopoly capitalism. It may be argued that the Black World, unlike other societies and in many ways, is an organic part of Western capitalism. This therefore poses a set of problems for the Black World which is uniquely different from evaluation of socialist economies like the U.S.S.R. and China who have extricated themselves or escaped being an organic part of monopoly capitalism. The evidence of the differences at times surfaced in the various interactions between Pan-Africanists and Soviet revolutionaries and leaders in the first half of this century.

The challenge for the Pan-African world is a difficult one. How can Pan-African societies achieve independence and self-determination, create viable independent economies given their entrenched dependent and organic association with western monopoly capitalism?

The purpose of this paper is threefold. First, an attempt is made to explain the process of uneven development of the Black World under the simultaneous development of the world market economy. Secondly, the past difficulties encountered by Pan-African theoreticians in charting out an economic ideology is examined by analyzing the differences between Pan-Africanists and Marxist-Leninists in the first half of this century. Thirdly, the process of contemporary underdevelopment in the Pan-African world is examined, and the principles of an indigenous theory of Pan-African development is presented by using examples.

### THEORIES OF CAPITALIST EXPANSIONISM

Several books have been written to explain and examine the development process of the Western and the Black Worlds. Two books may be identified which deal with the rise of the Western World—John Hicks' *Theory of Economic History*<sup>4</sup> and North and Thomas' *The Rise of the Western World*.<sup>5</sup> Hicks, the Nobel Laureate in economics, claims that his theory has a more scientific appeal: "My 'theory of history' . . . will be a good deal nearer to the kind of thing that was attempted by Marx, who did take from his economics some general ideas which he applied to history, so that the pattern he saw from history had some extra-historical support."<sup>6</sup> North and Thomas point out that their book offers "a comprehensive analytical framework to examine and explain the rise of the Western World; a framework consistent and complementary to standard neoclassical eco-

conomic theory.''<sup>7</sup> Such a formal neoclassical or Marxian economic analysis of the evolution of the market economy has not been attempted for the Black World. However, such work has been done from the historical point of view indirectly by Eric Williams<sup>8</sup> and directly by Walter Rodney.<sup>9</sup> A new school of thought has developed in Latin America and the Caribbean to explain the economics of Third World dependency on Western capitalism. This school of thought developed out of articles by Raul Prebisch<sup>10, 11</sup> which explained how one country (center) develops at the expense of another country (periphery). This school uses both neoclassical and Marxian tools for analysis. Such a combination of tools will be used in this paper.

### The Hicksian Theory of Economic History

Hicks essentially develops a theory to explain capitalist expansionism. The first phase of the Mercantile economy is sketched by examining the economic theory of the "city-state." The city-state is recognized as a body of specialized traders engaged in external trade. The Mercantile economy goes through several stages over the years, strengthening production and social relations in the process.

The Mercantile traders, in the process of finding ways and means to reduce costs, increase surplus and diminish risks, specialize and develop institutions to facilitate and achieve their economically desirable goals. These evolutionary changes call for rearrangements of production and thereby social relations between the city-states and external partners. Trading posts, colonies, or settlements are established; wars are invariably waged in the process. Hicks uses such simple economic analysis to explain Western capitalist expansionism:

Settlers may come in, or may be introduced, not simply in order to support themselves as cultivators, but in order that the things which they produce should be objects of trade . . . The previous inhabitants are too few to exploit resources, or are refractory to the attempts of the traders to persuade them to produce the tradeable goods they might be producing; the answer (the obvious mercantile answer) is to bring labor in from elsewhere. The labor might be brought in as a slave labor, or as wage labor, to work on 'plantations'.<sup>12</sup>

Out of this economic-history process evolved the worldwide market economy which created the Black World diaspora—Africa, the Caribbean, and the Americas.

This Hicksian analysis explains the evolutionary process in too much a universalist manner. The methodology fails to capture the social relations

of production between the “advanced” city-states and the colony, and the ensuing uneven development, the dynamic process of capitalist accumulation, expropriation, and patterns of reinvestment; the destruction of the colonial indigenous economies are not fully explained.

North and Thomas’ book, compared to Hicks’, has even less to explain on the above issues which we are interested in.

#### North/Thomas and the Rise of the Western World

North and Thomas use a neoclassical model to explain the economic development of Western Europe between A.D. 900 and 1700. The book may be summarized as follows: Feudalism created law and order in medieval Europe and permitted population growth in the tenth century, increasing the labor to land ratio and thereby institutionalized property rights in favor of owners of scarce resources. By the fifteenth century efficient military forces had evolved and the exchange economy took over as production became commercialized and soldiers were paid wages for their services. The feudal sources of princes’ revenues declined but exchange economy revenue sources expanded as princes, with their efficient armies, decentralized feudal production methods and bargained for protection and rights over private property in return for taxing the private sector. Better armies and protection at times expanded the private sector, while states which generated more private enterprise grew faster. This led to differential economic growth among Western European countries. Thus, in the North and Thomas model, a central role is given to institutions as being responsible for economic growth.

North and Thomas, like Hicks, fail to bring into their analysis the social relations of production between the city-states or the nation-states and the colonies within or outside the European mainland. Thus there is not a great deal in the North-Thomas theory for analyzing the evolution of the dependency of the Black World on European capitalism. We may now turn to Marxian interpretations of world development and underdevelopment.

#### Marxian Interpretation of Capitalist Evolution and the Black World

The neoclassical orthodoxy explains the underdevelopment and the inability of the Third World to gain from trade by emphasizing the lack of reallocative ability—failure to reallocate resources and supply commodities in response to changing prices and effective international demand.

Marx, however, constructed a model of capitalist development which relied on forces internal to the system. Marx affords us a key to understanding history by explicitly introducing the Third World as a key variable in

the evolution of modern capitalism when he gave the following vivid description of the process of capitalist primary accumulation:

The discoveries of gold and silver in America; the extirpation of the indigents in some instances, their enslavement or their entombment in the mines; the beginnings of the conquest and looting of the East Indies; the transformation of Africa into a precinct for the supply of the negroes who were the raw materials of the slave trade—these were the incidents that characterised the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production. These were the idyllic processes that formed the chief factors of primary accumulation.<sup>13</sup>

Behind the above rather biting description of the capitalist process of accumulation lies a scientific reasoning. Joan Robinson has pointed out that “it is a great merit of Marx’s method that it lends itself to historical interpretation, unlike the mechanical equilibrium theory of the academics.”<sup>14</sup> Otto Eckstein has also pointed out that “the contribution of Marxian economics . . . is to integrate economic theory with political theory into a coherent whole. No one has successfully tackled the problem since Marx; . . . neoclassical (conventional) economics simply does not integrate political science and economic structure into a coherent whole.”<sup>15</sup> The Hicksian and especially the North/Thomas models fail to integrate political science and economic structure into analyzing the social relations of production.

In the process of creation of the world market economy, some nations became worse off with trade. Zimmerman has shown that after one or two centuries of international exchange some nations were relatively worse off in 1960 than in 1860.<sup>16</sup> The Third World and especially the Black World, which was integrated organically with Western capitalism, came out worse off in the unequal trading exchange. Baran, using Marxian economics, explains the process thus:

In all areas of Western penetration, commercial agriculture to a considerable extent displaced traditional subsistence farming, and manufactured commodities invaded the market of the indigenous craftsman and artisan . . . Whatever market for manufactured goods emerged in the colonial and dependent countries did not become the ‘internal market’ of these countries. Thrown wide open by colonization and by unequal treaties, it became an appendage of the ‘internal market’ of Western capitalism.<sup>17</sup>

For a neoclassical exposition and empirical investigation of the above theory, see Hymer and Resnick, and Morgan.<sup>18, 19, 20</sup>

Empirical evidence on the scene of the above analysis was given by a sensitive and observing European traveler who reported on conditions in Ghana (Gold Coast) to a select committee on British Establishments in West Africa in 1965, thus:

If we come to the interior, six days' journey, people make iron and make their own clothes, but nobody thinks, along the coast, of making iron or clothes; native industry disappears so far as the European trade is going.<sup>21</sup>

It may be pointed out that three-quarters of a century earlier, in 1790, Alexander Hamilton, anticipating the law of increasing returns in industry, had presented a Report on Manufacturers to the United States Congress, pointing out that "The substitution of foreign for domestic manufacturers is a transfer to foreign nations of the advantages accruing from the employment of machinery."<sup>22</sup> Thus, while politically independent countries salvaged their "internal markets," the colonies could not, and became underdeveloped.

The above Marxian analysis of the evolution of the market economy and consequent backwash effects in the colonies will later be formalized in this paper into a theory of underdevelopment.

Marx had pointed out that capitalism is based on exploitation and is racked by contradictions and, by virtue of its internal laws, moves inexorably towards its dissolution. Yet the Pan-African world which has had the most thorough interaction with Western capitalism, and has been racked with the inherent contradictions, has failed to carry out for good or bad reasons a socialist revolution. In fact, most Pan-African leaders and theoreticians had differences with international communism. An attempt will be made to explain the ideological differences; and also why a Pan-African ideology is needed to carry out the Black economic revolution.

### MARX AND THE COLONIAL QUESTION

Pan-African nationalism antedates the Communist Manifesto and the Russian liberation movements. What the Pan-African movement lacked was a theoretical articulation of the black problem so that it could be harnessed into a political liberation movement. Most of the early literate African scholars argued within the framework of Western philosophy. For example, in 1633, while teaching philosophy in German universities, Wilhelm Amo, a Ghanaian, wrote a legal treatise against the slave trade based on Western legal theories. But nobody developed a theory within which to analyze what was happening to Pan-Africa—slave trade, colonization, and

the rape of the continent—until Marx and Engels presented a thesis of capitalist mode of production and reproduction.

There is relatively not much theory in Marxism, as a theory for social action, for liberating the colonized in the Third World as contrasted with the discourse on industrial proletariat revolution. It has been argued that the socialist revolution as applied to Western Europe was a family revolution; for Marx and Engels demanded liberation of the metropolitan proletariat workers but not of the colonized. Perhaps it is right to say that the full theoretical extension and integration of Marxist and Pan-Africanist ideologies have yet to be attempted in the way that Lenin and Mao extended Marxism theoretically for social action. Not until Lenin wrote *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*<sup>23</sup> in 1916, did Marxism per se become interested in the Third World colonial problem. But even in this case it was for reasons of political strategy. For it may be argued that the theoretical implication of *Imperialism: the Highest Stage of Capitalism* was to tie in the liberation of the colonial areas with the family revolution liberation of the metropolitan proletariat, via Hobson's economic analysis of imperialism.

The Leninist imperialism theory did not lead to an organic theory of social action for immediate worldwide universal proletarian revolution. The basic problem was that the laws for the theory were developed fully on one side of the equation, as far as the Third World was concerned.

The above point becomes clearer when we examine Leninism in action in the 1920s and 1930s. The Russian revolution did not set in motion worldwide simultaneous proletarian or peasant uprisings. By 1928 the Russians, by official policy, had abandoned "world revolution" and began to concentrate on "Socialism in One Country" against the doom of the regime which Trotsky and his comrades predicted if "world revolution" were not achieved.

Although the Russian communists surrendered their revolutionary heritage and opted for the non-Marxist doctrine of "Socialism in One Country," they did not abandon the Leninist Programme on the National and Colonial Question. The Third International (Comintern) accepted the Leninist Programme. Attempts to enforce the Programme led to ideological clashes between the Stalinists and the Pan-Africanists in the early part of this century. C.L.R. James, clinging to Marxist principles, perceived that Socialism in One Country had abandoned the Third World and so he became a Trotskyite. George Padmore eventually resigned from the Comintern and the Communist Party in 1935, after he became convinced that he was being used to serve Russian interests only and not Pan-African re-

volutionary interests. This was because when "The Franco-Soviet Pact was signed in 1935, the Comintern instructed its African Bureau, where Padmore worked, to 'go easy' on French Colonialism," to which Padmore replied in his resignation, "The Russians, like the British ruling class, have no permanent friends, nor enemies, but only permanent interests—namely, the survival of the Soviet Union."<sup>24</sup> Aime Cesaire resigned from the Communist Party twenty-five years later, making a similar remark.

The above episodes should not be passed off easily as "bureaucratic deformation of the Russian Revolution."<sup>25</sup> After all, one could argue that the young, vulnerable Soviet state faced hostile capitalist countries and had to play subtle diplomacy to survive. The problem lies in the evolution of Marxist-Leninist theories which were biased toward analyzing the contradictions in the capitalist system in the metropole with passing interest in the colonial question.

So far as Marx did not integrate the colonies into his theory of proletarian emancipation directly, and as long as the Leninist Programme on National and Colonial Question was dependent on "world revolution" it was not necessary to scientifically examine the preparedness of the colonies for the "world revolution." Why is it that all the Third World societies were treated as a group and as nation-states? The racial minorities in the metropole (Blacks in the Americas) or in the colonies (Black majorities in South Africa and in the Caribbean) faced special problems of racism which were not still easily analyzed in class terms. Leninism in practice proved a failure, at least in Black America. The call for self-determination by an unarmed racial minority to establish an autonomous self-governing "Black Belt State" in the South within the Republic of the United States did not seem sensible to the Garvey movement nor to the Blacks who were dogmatic communists. Secondly, the preparedness of Africa for the world revolution was not examined nor theorized about. Yet colonial revolutions were advocated.

Why is it that Pan-African leaders joined the mainstream of Marxist thinking without extending the theories as Lenin, and Mao Tse-Tung after him, did? Is it that the Balkanization and disintegration of Black Africa was so total and decisive that Pan-Africanist intellectuals saw themselves as an integral part of the "World Revolution"? Have the separate successful socialist revolutions in China and recently in Cuba given us any ideas about how to develop Pan-African Socialism paralleling Marxist-Leninism or Marxist-Maoism? The enormity of the problem has defied an easy integrative all-encompassing theoretical model or theory for social action.



An attempt will be made later in this paper to examine the principles for such a theory. This is a difficult task because the Pan-African world covers Africa, the Caribbean, and the Americas. The common denominators are that the peoples are of African origin, the societies have been organic parts of international monopoly capitalism, and have experienced the "contradictions" in the capitalist system. The theory for action has yet to be worked out.

### **PAN-AFRICANISM—TOWARDS ECONOMIC FREEDOM**

The Pan-African world consists of nation-states all of which have evolved out of the development of the world market economy. These countries cover Black Africa, the Caribbean, and the Americas. In the Americas the Blacks are in a minority and may be characterized as "internal colonies." These economies have been transformed consequential to the evolution of the world market economy and therefore the history and social evolution of these countries entail and exhibit the capitalist laws of reproduction and social relations from its crudest forms of primary accumulation to the present forms of monopoly capitalism.

Pan-Africanists have kept a critical eye on such an evolution and at times tried to change the evolutionary course. These attempts were made by men of action like M.R. Delany<sup>26</sup> who tried to get African chiefs to engage in cotton production to undersell the U.S.A. and hence pull the rug out from under slavery in the U.S.A. and in Africa; Marcus Garvey who tried to create a viable Black World capitalism; and Pan-African theoreticians like DuBois, Nkrumah, C.L.R. James, and Padmore who laid down the ideological foundations of Pan-Africanism specifically to free the Black World from colonial rule. Up to date the efforts of the Pan-African Congresses have paid off because they played a meaningful role in the liberation of most of Africa.

The next stage of Pan-Africanism is to lay down the theoretical foundations for self-determination and economic emancipation. George Padmore identified three stages of the African revolution. "First, there is the struggle for national independence. The second is the social revolution, which follows the achievement of independence and self-determination. And third, Africans are seeking some form of regional unity as the forerunner of a United States of Africa."<sup>27</sup> The first stage of "pure" political independence has almost been achieved in many parts of Africa, the Caribbean, and the Americas. However, very little theoretical work has

been done to be used as a theory for action to unify the Pan-African world into a self-governing and viable economic unit.

Four streams of thought have been apparent in Pan-African ideology—Back to Africa movement and African Self-determination, African Unity, Worldwide Black Nationalism, and Socialism. These streams of thought have arisen out of the social, political, and economic conditions that face Black people. DuBois and Padmore became active politically and helped develop the Pan-African movement because of the race issue and specifically because Blacks were marginal members of the white society. They sought for a solution in democratic socialism. Pan-Africanism was also formulated as an antiimperialist ideology by Henry Sylvester-Williams at a Pan-African conference in 1900. Thus the Pan-African ideology has had strong political overtones; its economic angle was not explored because it was difficult to see the production relations between the class struggle à la Marx and the race issue, given the sociology of American racism against the black man. The issue was a difficult one, for Marxism did not incorporate the black problem into the theory of capitalist reproduction. DuBois, being a sensitive sociologist, could not find any use of the class struggle, at least in the short run, when institutionally the white worker hates the black worker. Dorothy Nelkin<sup>28</sup> quoted DuBois' article entitled "Marxism and the Negro Factor" (*Crisis*, May 1933) to make the above point clear: "While Negro labor in America suffers from . . . the capitalist system, the most fatal degree of its suffering comes . . . from (its) fellow white workers." Thus DuBois saw clearly that the revolt of the white proletariat would not resolve the black problem, given institutionalized racism. DuBois therefore saw economic emancipation of Blacks in an alliance between black labor and black capital. This therefore formed the Pan-African ideological angle of colonial liberation as opposed to the Leninist angle of achieving "world revolution" via the revolutionary theory of the National and the Colonial Question. It is doubtful if "world revolution" would have been achieved had Pan-African leaders sided with the Leninist theories.

The upshot of Pan-African ideological development and practice up to 1945 has been to help solve the problem of political independence, but as yet not economic independence. For the alliance between black labor and black capital has not materialized because the Black World controls very little capital of the world's monopoly capital. Hence Pan-Africanism needs an economic ideology as an arm of social action for economic independence. For there is more to Pan-Africanism than the colonial question. Pan-Africans who were the most exploited group in the capitalist evolution

need to construct a theory for economic emancipation rooted in the market evolution and racism—the historical experience of the Black World.

The methodology to be used here is both Marxian and Hicksian (more Marxian, but see Hicks, *A Theory of Economic History*) in that I am taking from economics some ideas which will apply to the black historical experience and deduce from them theoretical principles for social action.

#### Social Relations of Production: Theoretical Implications of the Black Experience

European economic expansion is the most important factor which critically transformed the African, Caribbean, and American societies. In all these societies the indigenous economies were destroyed—artisan handicraft production declined; civil conflicts, slavery, and colonial domination followed in the wake of the process of capitalist primary or primitive accumulation.

Although race is not a necessary condition for primary accumulation of capital, Negro slavery played an important role in accelerating the accumulation of the capital necessary for rapid evolution of the world market economy. This point may be brought home by analyzing the British classical economists—the Colonial Reform Movement and the implementation of the Principles of Systematic Colonization.<sup>29</sup> E.G. Wakefield, who led the Colonial Reform Movement, was the theoretician behind using colonization as a remedy for domestic economic stagnation. It was Karl Marx who first made this observation and devoted an entire chapter in *Das Kapital* to analyzing the economics of Wakefield. Wakefield's theories and their implementation had far reaching effects for the Black World but have not been analyzed fully in this connection.

Wakefield's ideas on primary capital accumulation may be gleaned first from his comments on Robert Owen's egalitarian "Home Colonization" schemes and his solution to the initial failure of the colonization effort of the Swan River Colony in Western Australia. Wakefield's comment to Owen's scheme was as follows: "Divide and pauperize; divide and stupefy; separate mankind enough, and they will be, all alike, poor, ignorant, torpid and pusillanimous."<sup>30</sup> In Wakefield's "A Letter from Sydney" which deals with the failure of the Swan River colonization effort, the necessity of wage or slave labor as a precondition to primary accumulation via colonization is presented empirically. Donald Winch paraphrases the contents of the letter thus: "Wakefield's imaginary colonist describes his difficulty in hiring labor and transporting goods to the market. The capital which he had emigrated had been dissipated in his

search for hired labor. Convicts proved unsuitable, and imported labourers soon grasped the opportunity to become landowners themselves. 'The once indentured laborer obtains six shillings a day, saves half his earnings, obtains a grant of land; and becomes an employer of labor, and a competitor with his late master in the market of industry' . . . the settlers became widely separated, and since the indentured labor became landowners there was no combination of labor or opportunity for putting capital to work. The colony soon came to grief and the settlers left Swan River for Tasmania.'

Karl Marx in the last chapter of *Das Kapital* entitled "The Modern Theory of Colonization" commented on Wakefield's theories thus:

The development of the social productive power of labor, cooperation, division of labor, use of machinery on a large scale, etc., are impossible without the expropriation of the labourers, and the corresponding transformation of their means of production into capital. It is the great merit of E.G. Wakefield to have discovered, not anything new about the Colonies, but to have discovered in the Colonies the truth as to the conditions of capitalist production in the mother-country.<sup>31</sup>

Wakefield's analysis and its implementation by the colonial powers is important to our paper because it explains to us the genesis of what Marx titled The Modern Theory of Colonialism of which the Black World was already a part by exporting slaves and awaiting formal colonization after the Berlin Conference of 1884-85. Marx, continuing his discourse on Wakefield, says: "The impulse to self-expropriation, on the part of laboring humanity, for the glory of capital, exists so little, that slavery, according to Wakefield himself, is the sole natural basis of colonial wealth. Marx then quotes Wakefield: "The first Spanish settlers in Saint Domingo did not obtain labourers from Spain. But without labourers their capital must have perished" Here was a perfect chance for Marx to incorporate the Black World supply of labor into his analysis of primitive accumulation of capital, but he did not. He was more concerned about universal scientific socialism and capitalist "contradictions" in Europe. However, Wakefield did recognize the importance of black labor in his theory. According to Winch, Wakefield's "interpretation of American economic history was as a story of expedients designed to overcome the problems of dispersion and labor shortage. Early settlements like Virginia had only become prosperous with the advent of slavery; without slavery the staple export products of this region could not have been produced." Winch continues by making an observation which is important for our analysis that "Black men have

always found it difficult to rise above the conditions of labourers for hire.”<sup>32</sup>

It is evident from the above analysis that confiscation of labor services was an important factor in primary accumulation—that it was far easier a process if the laborer was Black. The alternative strategy in primary accumulation was Wakefield’s scheme of systematic colonization in which it would be necessary to raise the price of land and at the same time encourage British immigration. This would have been very hard to do because it would be difficult to artificially set the optimal prices for land in order to create an army of wage earners; also, since the immigration would be exogenously determined by decisions of free men, it is not at all clear if this type of colonization would have worked in the Americas and in the Caribbean. Thus, without black labor it would have been difficult to expropriate large amounts of capital which were necessary to spark capitalist development as we witnessed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Theoretical and empirical analyses of the contribution of black labor to the evolution of the market economy are scarce. As pointed out, Marx ignored the issue—it was outside his frame of reference. In fact, he ended *Das Kapital*, while discussing capitalist production and the modern theory of colonization, by stating that “we are not concerned here with the condition of the colonies. The only thing that interests us is the secret discovered in the New World by the political economy of the Old World (Europe), and proclaimed on the house-tops: that the capitalist mode of production and accumulation, and therefore capitalist private property, have for their fundamental condition the annihilation of self-earned private property; in other words, the expropriation of the labourer.”<sup>33</sup>

Marx stopped short of identifying the expropriated labor. What was so secret about the modern form of colonialism? Certainly it was not slavery. Was black labor, per se, a critical factor? If so, why? Was the geographical location of West Africa critical, given the navigational advantage and technology at the time? What were the variables which made “the expropriation of the laborer possible”? These questions need to be answered before Pan-African economic ideology can be critically articulated. For example, we need to analyze the social relations in production with regard to class and race. The elimination of the race issue from theoretical Marxian analysis has retarded Pan-African ideological development. The empirical evidence seems to show that it is incorrect to ignore “racial exploitation” in the theory of primitive accumulation of capital and in modern forms of capitalist exploitation. Fanon once remarked:

When you examine at close quarters the colonial context, it is evident that what parcels out the world is to begin with the fact of belonging to or not belonging to a given race, a given species. In the colonies the economic substructure is also a superstructure. The case is the consequence; you are rich because you are white, you are white because you are rich. This is why Marxist analysis should always be slightly stretched every time we have to do with the colonial problem.<sup>34</sup>

The poverty and misery in the Black World is approaching untenable levels. There is poverty in the industrial and urban slums and in the proletarianized and nonproletarianized rural areas. The Black World has benefited relatively less from the industrial revolution and integration of world economy.

Hicks sees the issue as one of absorption of the proletariat or the preindustrial class into the world economy rather than redistribution of surplus from international trade. "In Britain," he said, "the absorption of the proletariat into an industrial working class is substantially completed; and in most other advanced countries it is very nearly complete. But in the world as a whole it is not complete; and it often seems that it is not even making progress."<sup>35</sup> Hicks poses a hypothetical answer to the above problem:

I believe it is, in rather a deep sense, a political question. If there were no nations—if everyone could go where he liked, was just as acceptable wherever he went, and was willing to go wherever he wanted—the absorption of the human race into the ranks of the developed would be relatively simple . . . even to the liberal and to the internationally minded, it is perhaps not so very agreeable an assumption after all.

It is, in any case, not an assumption that we are entitled to make; and I, for my part would not want to make it. The attachment to one's own people and to the dwelling-place of one's own people, has far too much that is good and lovely about it for one to wish it to disappear . . . When we examine our aspiration, it is for a development, an absorption, which is consistent with the maintenance of social identity.<sup>36</sup>

One wonders if the problem is whether the Third World or the Black World wants to join the Western monopoly capitalism with all its contradic-

tions, and accept the relatively lower increases in income, since the world gains from international trade are not equitably distributed.

Marx would have criticized Hicks as a bourgeois economist who is under the influence of the ruling ideology rather than by the search for scientific truth. Marx, according to Meek, had argued that "the development of the truly scientific elements in political economy continued up to about 1830 and that thereafter superficiality and apologetics began to predominate."<sup>37</sup> Meek also quotes Lange making a similar comment and claimed that after the death of Ricardo the high tradition of classical political economy was carried on only by Marx; and that "the bourgeoisie lost interest in further development of political economy . . . there developed a tendency to liquidate it as a science studying the economic relations among men and to substitute for it apologetics, i.e., the justification of the capitalist mode of production."<sup>38</sup> There is no doubt that Lange would consider Hicks' comments as justification of the capitalist present and past mode of production.

#### A General Model of Black World Evolution

A generalized model explaining Black World evolution, a consequence of European expansionism, would have to include the following:

1. The precolonial economic situation where growth rates in income and population were modest.
2. Changing land/labor ratio and the development of feudal relations which create order, making agrarian empires possible.
3. Atlantic slave trade and the emergence of industrial revolution in Europe, leading to shifts in factors of production and intensification of export-producing sector, suffocation of import-competing sector, and the agrarian subsistence sector becoming more commercialized.
4. Analysis of social and economic relations of production in the pure plantation economies—the Caribbean and the Americas.
5. Organizing for production under pure colonial situation and under monopoly capitalism.
6. The multinational companies revolution and the new structure of organizing for production and distribution.

#### The Mechanism of Impoverishment and a Theory for Social Action

We may summarize our discussion thus far as follows:

1. Between 1500 and 1850 the mercantile imperialist expansionism

destroyed the indigenous economies in Africa, the Caribbean, and the Americas.

2. From 1850 to 1930 these societies under colonialism engaged in externally oriented trade under international division of labor. The gains from the international trade were unevenly distributed in favor of international monopoly interests in the Western countries. These multinational companies came to control most of the capital and the means of production. Since 1930 the multinational corporations have been controlling the modern sector of the internal markets of the Third World—the very markets, the import competing sector, which the mercantilist era helped to destroy.

The result of the above economic-history interaction of Africa with Europe has led to a fundamental structural disequilibrium in the Black World economies. The black economies are neither total organic parts of the Western economy nor independent economic units. A culture of dependency has been cultivated—the control of institutions, technology, finance, and capital by multinational firms. We hypothesize that it is this culture of dependency that breeds the structural imbalance in the Third World economies fostering the growing relative impoverishment. It seems that there are two options open to the Black World: (1) continue the present association with Western industrial capitalism, or (2) seek an alternative strategy of development by breaking away from it.

We present the following two formal hypotheses: (1) that the Black World will revolt sooner or later due to the increasing impoverishment, the inability of Western industrial capitalism to absorb the unemployed and the resultant political instability in the black nations; (2) that the Black World will in the long run revolt against the national bourgeoisie who have aligned themselves with monopoly capitalism, reject the culture of dependency, and seek a national and racial identity by controlling its means of production.

Let us examine the above propositions in detail.

#### The Absorption Hypothesis: Hypothesis of the Impossibility

The Absorption hypothesis has been suggested by Hicks. However, Hicks found it unfeasible, not because it was impossible under monopoly capitalism, but because “the attachment to one’s own people, and to the dwelling place of one’s own people, has far too much that is good and lovely about it for one to wish it to disappear.”<sup>39</sup> Nevertheless, international agencies such as the World Bank, the United Nations (ILO), and



private agencies have invested much to solve the “unemployment” problem via the Absorption hypothesis. The answer to unemployment under the Absorption hypothesis is simple—it means “wage employment” in the modern sector. But wage employment under western monopoly capitalism is a consequence of the problem. The modern sector cannot expand fast enough to absorb large amounts of labor. Foreign aid by international agencies like the World Bank has not been of much help (See Theresa Hayter, *Aid as Imperialism*).<sup>40</sup> We may construct a model to show why the above statements hold.

#### A Model of Underdevelopment under the Absorption Hypothesis

First we shall state a set of facts: (1) the governments in power, the national bourgeoisie, normally align themselves with international monopoly capitalism since their interests coincide;<sup>41</sup> (2) the modern sector is recognized, ipso facto, as the leading sector under the psychology of modernization; (3) in many cases the modern sector caters to the consumption patterns of the national bourgeoisie; (4) through the “demonstration effect” the basket of goods in the modern sector has been internationalized and standardized, thus it can be produced cheaper and more efficiently by the multinational corporations; and (5) by definition the multinational companies own the means of production under monopoly capitalism.

Under the above conditions the multinational firms enter these economies to produce goods and services for the “internal markets” with a package of capital intensive techniques of production. This at times is possible because the indigenous entrepreneurs cannot compete with the multinationals for they are given tax holidays, accelerated depreciation concessions, monopoly rights, and much more. All this is done to attract the industries into the country in the first place! But these enterprises cannot employ much labor because of their capital intensive techniques. In fact, the multinational firms may even create more unemployment. Let us assume that a labor saving improvement takes place in the industry and labor is thrown out in that country, and capital is accumulated by the firm. This capital, when reinvested somewhere in the economy, will lead to expansion in demand for labor. But, for a multinational firm, we are not sure if the reinvestment will be in the same country. It may well not be, hence it has displaced labor in the end. In order to close the loop, let us follow on with the model. The multinationals now produce for the internal “modern” sector of the economy. Given that income distribution is skewed to the elites, this biases the structure of demand towards capital intensive elite goods which must be produced by the multinational by definition. Note that import substitution industrialization does not solve the

unemployment issue. In fact, this strategy of development has been found to aggravate the balance of payments problem.<sup>42</sup> Thus unemployment is due to the presence of the alien sector—the modern sector. It is therefore a consequence of multinational firms producing for “internal economies” of the Third World. The Absorption hypothesis fails. It is a “hypothesis of the impossibility.” This brings us to analysis of the second major hypothesis that the Black World will reject the culture of dependency.

#### Black Underdevelopment: A Political Time Bomb

The Chinese or Maoist development strategy is based on “walking on two legs.” The modern sector is introduced in a controlled fashion. Thus, there is no alien modern sector. There is no alignment with international monopoly capital unlike the Black World bourgeoisie. Hence there is no “unemployment.” For an analysis of Maoist economic development see Gurley’s *The New Man in The New China*.<sup>43</sup> In the Black or Third World the bourgeoisie aligns *with monopoly capital* with the resultant strategy of development biased to the modern sector through “industrialization by invitation” impoverishes the indigenous people, as their internal markets are suffocated. This process of impoverishment has been analyzed by Kofi.<sup>44</sup> Underdevelopment in the Black World is therefore a political problem. It is a political problem of no mean proportions for the interest groups who advocate continuation of the present system are well entrenched in alignment with international monopoly capital. But the confrontation is inevitable.

When and how will the confrontation take place? How will it be resolved? We do not anticipate a “Communist Manifesto” type impoverishment and resolution, for impoverishment in the Black World may not increase absolutely. The dogmatic Marxist belief in the growing misery of the working class and the falling rate of profit at the same time has not stood the test of time. It is possible, but not conceivable, that monopoly capitalism can pull the same trick in the industrialized countries, i.e., that the rate of exploitation will be steady and the real wage will be rising normally under the aegis of technical progress raising productivity. Thus, under these “positive” conditions, income in the Black World under monopoly capitalism may increase over time but relative to the developed countries it will be much lower. Hence the need for a revolutionary change arises out of the slowness of improvement in our material condition and the loss of identity.

The culture of dependency may be divided into two categories: structural dependency and cultural dependency. Structural dependency concerns the organizational aspects of political, economic, and technological imba-

lance. This paper has dealt mainly with this aspect of dependency. According to Mazuri, "What has been grossly underestimated has been the phenomenon of cultural dependency... social stratification and motivation... those elites that identify with the dominant developed countries, and reinforce dependency structures, have been captured culturally by the West."<sup>45</sup> So long as dependency is a diminution of identity, these elites will break out of their culturally dependent situation.

What will set the stage for Pan-African economic emancipation is the accelerating continued dependency on the Western monopoly capitalism. The resultant continued impoverishment, diminution and loss of cultural identity, will set in motion a political movement for economic and cultural emancipation. We need to develop the theoretical basis for such a movement, hence the need for a Pan-African economic ideology.

#### Some Examples as Principles of a Theory of Development

The empirical evidence and the theoretical analysis point out that the Black World faces a dim future of continued impoverishment. The black proletariat class cannot be absorbed in time into the Western industrial monopoly capitalism. We may not want such an absorption because of diminution of identity through cultural and structural dependency. What are the alternative options? We either extricate ourselves from Western industrial culture or remain in it and change it to fit our terms. The first alternative is what interests us and it is analyzed further in this paper.

As we have pointed out, the Black World has had the most thorough contact with European expansionism. It is the most Balkanized group in the world—ranging from nation-states in Africa and the Caribbean to "internal" colonies in the Americas. It is a latecomer on the "industrial" scene precisely because it was forced to play a "marginal" role in the Western industrial revolution when its "labor was confiscated." The economic problems are many and varied. The solutions will necessarily be many but a theory to integrate the solutions should not be out of reach. We present some examples and deduce some principles.

#### Balkanization Versus Unity in Development

Unlike the nation-states, the issue of the Black "internal colony" in the Americas has defied class struggle analysis, and perplexed many a Pan-African theoretician. The solutions are not at all clear. Some like to link the solution to the ultimate international victory of the proletariat in the class struggle. Others, like Marcus Garvey, saw the black salvation not in terms of the class struggle but in "Black cooperativism" alliance between black

labor and capital in capitalism, but not necessarily part of Western industrial capitalism. A new version of this thesis has been put forth by Tabb<sup>46</sup> and has been criticized by Harris<sup>47</sup> but within the framework of "world revolution."

Nkrumah, on the other hand, advocates a worldwide "Black Revolution" but cleverly omits the "internal colony" question head on. He ties in indirectly with the international socialist revolution:

African revolutionary struggle is not an isolated one. It only forms part of the world socialist revolution, but must be seen in the context of the Black Revolution as a whole. In the U.S.A., the Caribbean, and wherever Africans are oppressed, liberation struggles are being fought. In these areas, the Black man is in a condition of domestic colonialism, and suffers both on the grounds of class and colour. The core of the Black Revolution is in Africa, and until Africa is united under a socialist government, the Black man through the world lacks a national home . . . The notion that in order to have a nation it is necessary for there to be a common language, a common territory and a common culture, has failed to stand the test of time or the scrutiny of scientific definition of objective reality . . . Africans recognize themselves as potentially one nation, whose dominion is the entire African continent.<sup>48</sup>

A United States of Africa is a realistic and useful goal to aim at. It is a precondition for the creation of viable independent economies in Africa. The "spread effects" of a strong Africa will help to resolve both political and economic exploitation of "Africans": Africa can bargain or pressure the Americans to eliminate exploitation and oppression against people of color; an economically independent socialist Africa will be able to weaken the exploitative power of monopoly capitalism and seek for equitable distribution of gains from international trade. This is possible because the forces which institutionalized racism and subsequent economic exploitation of black people were, as Wakefield observed, "not moral but economical circumstances; they relate not to vice and virtue, but to production."<sup>49</sup> Thus the solution lies, in all probability, in economic power confrontation with monopoly capitalism under a United Socialist Africa rather than cooperation under capitalism.

As pointed out, Lenin, in developing his theory, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism," tied in the colonial question and the black question with the class struggle by way of Hobson's theory of imperialism. One of Hobson's key ideas which Lenin used was that in Western

capitalism: "There is . . . the habit of economic parasitism, by which the ruling state has used its provinces, colonies, and dependencies in order to enrich its ruling class and to bribe its lower classes into acquiescence."<sup>50</sup> Thus, if the colonies could be made to revolt, then the lower class in the metropolises would recognize the "class struggle" and carry out the socialist revolution. But this shifted the "burden" to the colonial people, which should not be the case. The Black World is the most important member of the Third World which "patronizes" monopoly capitalism. Russia and China (Asia) have extricated themselves; Africa must remove herself under theories based on her historical experience—racism and the confiscation of her labor and means of production. Pan-African economic ideology as a theory for economic emancipation must therefore be built on the above facts of life. Africa united is a necessary precondition for economic emancipation of the Black World. We therefore present a concluding example—a case study analysis of Balkanization and underdevelopment versus integration and development.

#### Sahel Drought and Famine: A Pan-African Unity Case Study

The drought in West Africa and the subsequent famine in six of the world's poorest countries—Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, and Upper Volta—has been blamed on several factors ranging from population explosion to a permanent ecological change in this area. In our judgement, it is in the failure to cope with the drought, temporarily, that we must seek to analyze for the causes of the famine, for drought does not necessarily lead to famine, at least in the short-run. Drought is not new to this area. Recorded evidence goes well beyond the sixteenth century.<sup>51</sup> Other civilizations in the area have been able to cope with the rather frequent droughts.

It is argued here that the most important factor responsible for the famines in the area after a temporary climatic change has caused a drought is an endemic organization disorder arising from various internal and external forces. Given the fragile economic balance and its rather frequent climatic changes, an economic organizational disorder exogenously or endogenously generated may lead to decreased economic activity—cultivation—and hence decreased stocks of economic surplus.

It is believed that the golden age of the trans-Saharan trade ended in the sixteenth century with the overthrow of the Songhai empire by the Moroccan army in 1591, and the arrival of the Portuguese on the West African coast which ushered in the rerouting of the trade routes and reorientation of economic activity and the pattern of development.<sup>52</sup> More important factors which contributed to the collapse of the Saharan trade and the collapse

of economic development in the area were the political instability and organizational disorder which resulted in economic decay and underdevelopment.

The instability caused by the Arab military invasion from the north was increased by the subsequent internal disorders caused by the Atlantic trade. The Atlantic trade under the aegis of cheap transportation transformed the trading patterns and reoriented economic activity in the area. Colonization (colonial wars) and the creation of nation-states cut the hitherto natural trade routes. The pattern of the Atlantic slave trade and later trade in commodities demanded by Europe in the era of Western capitalist expansion and industrial revolution heavily favored the coastal regions and the forest belt, relative to the Sahel region. The Sahel did not benefit, relatively, from the reorientation of trading patterns and routes and fell into economic decay.

The scramble for markets in West Africa by the colonial powers was concentrated on the coast. The doctrine of effective control agreed at the Berlin Conference of 1884-85, and the abandonment of the Sahara by the British to the imperial design of Napoleon led to a haphazard lateral division of the territories into nation-states under different imperial governments. Thus the natural vertical, longitudinal trading routes were effectively disrupted, along with the specific organization networks that had developed around the caravan trade—mode of organizing for production, methods of agriculture, exchange systems, market periodicity, product specialization, and marketing channels.

The above factors, together with the chaos brought about in the interior of Africa as a result of the Atlantic slave trade which was more intense than the Saharan slave trade, resulted in a total collapse of the power and order in the Sahel region. The present nation-states are all land-locked, with meager economic resources, and a delicate ecological balance.

The inability of the Sahel region nations to control famine should not be looked at from the point of view of a natural disaster arising from a temporary drought, but rather from the view of a breakdown of social and economic institutions in the area rooted in colonialism; colonial division of labor; creation of artificial nation-states; and internal social disorder, at times exogenously generated.

The region's ability to control recurring famine has decreased since the sixteenth century. For example, in modern times the population has been unable to emigrate freely during periods of drought.

The solution to the problem facing the Sahel countries is neither one of improving allocative efficiency nor that of a temporary relief operation.

The solution lies in reorganizing economic units in the region. Certainly the problem lies in improving agricultural productivity in the area to generate surplus and stocks. The present nation-states will have a hard time building viable economies with the meager resources available. The societies must be reorganized into regional units to cross ecological zones so resources can be shared and allocated for production efficiently.

These are some of the issues that the Pan-African economic ideology theoreticians must address themselves to. Economic and political arguments for Pan-African unity under socialism must be based on well researched, articulated, and empirically grounded facts.

### SUMMARY

In this paper, an attempt has been made to integrate the politics of Pan-Africanism with its economic ideology. The basis and need for such an ideology has been explored. It has been argued here that the roots of underdevelopment in the Black World lie in the historical evolution of the world market economy; that continued participation in monopoly capitalism serves to reinforce the international inequality; and that the localization of economic activity by multinational firms within the Black World countries deepens internal inequality by suffocating the internal markets and impoverishing the indigenous class. It is argued further that the Absorption hypothesis, seeking wage employment in the "modern" sector for the army of unemployed being generated under international monopoly capitalism, is an hypothesis of the impossibility. The "modern" sector cannot expand fast enough nor adapt its techniques of production to absorb the unemployed.

An alternative strategy of development based on Pan-African Socialism has been suggested. The preconditions for viable economic development in the Black World are: (1) Pan-Africa should extricate itself as an organic part of Western monopoly capitalism, and (2) development should take place within a framework of a political union so that programs could be coordinated to prevent the multinational corporations from controlling the internal markets. These basic conditions are essential for the Black World to regain control of its means of production and use its resources for the development of its people.

Pan-African economic development ideology needs to be worked out, theorized about, and developed fully, so that it can become a theory for social action.

## NOTES

1. George Padmore, "A Guide to Pan-African Socialism," in W.H. Friedland and C.G. Rosberg, Jr., eds., *African Socialism*, Stanford University Press, 1964, p. 230.
2. Keith Griffin, *Underdevelopment in Spanish America*, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1969.
3. Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications, London and Tanzania, Publishing House, Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania, 1972.
4. John Hicks, *A Theory of Economic History*, Oxford University Press, 1969.
5. D.C. North and R.P. Thomas, *The Rise of the Western World: A New Economic History*, Cambridge University Press, 1973.
6. John Hicks, op. cit., p. 2.
7. D.C. North and R.P. Thomas, op. cit., inside cover.
8. Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*, Capricorn Books, New York, 1966.
9. Walter Rodney, op. cit.
10. Raul Prebisch, Economic Survey of Latin America 1947: Growth, Disequilibrium and Disparities, Interpretation of the Process of Economic Development, United Nations Sales 51, II, 91 (1951).
11. Raul Prebisch, "Commercial Policy in the Underdeveloped Countries," *American Economic Review*, Proceedings, May 1959.
12. John Hicks, op. cit., p. 53.
13. Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. II, E.P. Dutton, New York, 1930, p. 832.
14. Joan Robinson, *An Essay on Marxian Economics*, MacMillan and Co., Ltd.
15. Otto Eckstein, as quoted by Lawrence S. Lifshultz, "Could Karl Marx Teach Economics in America," *Ramparts*, April 1974, p. 29.
16. L.J. Zimmerman, *Poor Lands, Rich Lands: The Widening Gap* (New York), 1965, p. 38.
17. Paul Baran, "The Political Economy of Growth," *Monthly Review Press*, New York, 1962, p. 174.
18. S. Hymer and S. Resnick, "A Model of an Agrarian Economy with Non-agricultural Activities," *The American Economic Review*, Vol. LIX, No. 4, September 1969, pp. 493-506.
19. S. Hymer, "Economic Forms in Pre-Colonial Ghana," and S. Resnick, "The Decline of Rural Industry Under Export Expansion: A Comparison Among Burma, Philippines, and Thailand, 1870-1938," *The Journal of Economic History*, XXX, March 1970, pp. 33-73.
20. Theodore Morgan, "The Decline of Rural Industry Under Export and Economic Forms in Pre-Colonial Ghana: Comments," *The Journal of Economic History*, XXX, June 1970, pp. 442-5.
21. British Parliamentary Papers 03295, Select Committee on British Establishments in West Africa, 1865 (V).
22. Alexander Hamilton, "Report on Manufactures" in *Papers on Public Credit, Commerce and Finance*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1934, p. 192.
23. V.I. Lenin, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, International Publishers, New York, 1972.
24. George Padmore, *Pan-Africanism or Communism*, Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co., New York, 1972, p. XXVIII.
25. George Padmore, *ibid*, p. XXVII.
26. M.R. Delany and Robert Campbell, *Search for a Place: Black Separatism and Africa, 1860*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1969.



27. George Padmore, "A Guide to Pan-African Socialism," in W.H. Friedland and C.G. Rosberg, eds., op. cit. p. 228-9.
28. Dorothy Nelkin in W.F. Friedland and C.G. Rosberg, eds., *ibid.*, p. 66.
29. Donald Winch, *Classical Political Economy and Colonies*, Harvard University Press, 1965, Ch. VII and VIII.
30. E.G. Wakefield, as quoted in D. Winch, *ibid.*, p. 153.
31. Karl Marx, *Capital*, The Modern Library, New York, 1906, p. 839.
32. E.G. Wakefield, as quoted in D. Winch, op. cit., p. 96.
33. Karl Marx, op. cit., p. 848.
34. Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, Grove Press, New York, 1963, p. 40.
35. John Hicks, op. cit., pp. 156-7.
36. John Hicks, op. cit., pp. 160-1.
37. Ronald L. Meek, *Economics and Ideology and other Essays*, Chapman and Hall Ltd., London, 1967, p. 219.
38. Ronald L. Meek, *ibid.*, p. 219.
39. John Hicks, op. cit., p. 160.
40. Teresa Hayter, *Aid to Imperialism*, Penguin Books Ltd., England, 1971.
41. Paul Baran, "On the Political Economy of Backwardness," in C.K. Wilber, ed., *The Political Economy of Development and Underdevelopment*, Random House, New York, 1973, p. 82-93.
42. Albert O. Hirschman, "The Political Economy of Import-Substituting Industrialization in Latin America," in C.T. Nisbet, ed., *Latin American Problems in Economic Development*, The Free Press, New York, 1969.
43. John W. Gurley, "The New Man in the New China: Maoist Economist Development," *The Center Magazine*, Vol. III, No. 3, May 1970.
44. Tetteh A. Kofi, "Development and Stagnation in Ghana—Abibirim Strategy," *Universitas*, University of Ghana, forthcoming 1974 (also see "Elites and Underdevelopment in Africa: the Case of Ghana," *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, Vol. XII, 1972-73).
45. Ali A. Mazuri, *World Culture and the Black Experience*, University of Washington Press, Seattle, 1974, p. 17.
46. William K. Tabb, *The Political Economy of the Black Ghetto*, Norton, New York, 1970.
47. Donald J. Harris, "The Black Ghetto as 'Internal Colony': A Theoretical Critique and Alternative Formulation," *The Review of Black Political Economy*, Vol. II, No. 4, 1972.
48. Kwame Nkrumah, *Class Struggle in Africa*, International Publishers, New York, 1970, pp. 87-88.
49. W.G. Wakefield, as quoted in Donald Winch, op. cit., p. 96.
50. V.I. Lenin, op. cit., p. 102.
51. Sèkéné-Mody Cissoko, "Famines et Epidemies à Tombouctou et dans la Boucle du Niger du XVI<sup>e</sup> au XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle," *Bulletin de l'Institut Fondamental d'Afrique Noire*, Tome XXX, No. 3, July 1968.
52. A.G. Hopkins, *An Economic History of West Africa*, Columbia University Press, 1973, Ch. 3.